

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE K		PAGE 1 OF 17 PAGES	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 04 August 2001		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. SCO600-01-0236		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY DEFENSE ENERGY SUPPORT CENTER 8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD, SUITE 4950 FT. BELVOIR, VA 22060-6222 FAX (703) 767-8757 BUYER/SYMBOL - V. VELEZ/DESC-APP PHONE (703) 767-9405 P.P. 8.2			CODE SCO600		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (NO., street, city, county, State, and ZIP Code)				X	9a. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. SP0600-01-R-0047	
					9b. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 09 MARCH 2001	
					10a. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
					10b. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS						
<p>[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [] is extended, [X] is not extended</p> <p>Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>						
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)						
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.						
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A. I2.05 CHANGES-FIXED PRICE (AUG 87)						
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b)						
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: FAR 43.01						
OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)						
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [] is not, [] is required to sign this document and return <u>1</u> copies to the issuing office.						
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)						
See Following Pages						
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.						
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME OF CONTRACTING OFFICER VERNA L. VELEZ		
15B. NAME OF CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR BY _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY VERNAL. VELEZ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 03 AUGUST 2001	

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

30-105

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

The purpose of this amendment is to provide responses to questions proposed by prospective offerors concerning the solicitation and site visits.

System Questions

Electric Distribution System Questions & Requests applying to all installations (Ft. Eustis, Ft. Lee, Ft. Monroe, Ft. Story)

1. Please provide one-line diagrams, circuit maps, feeder maps, or similar drawings that show the connectivity of the electrical distribution system.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): All maps that are available are in the Utilities Privatization Technical Library (Tech Library).

2. Please provide drawings or sketches of the electric manhole layouts (also referred to as butterfly drawings). These drawings should show the number of conduits and cables in each conduit.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): We do not have the drawings requested.

3. Please provide a copy of the PCB survey (transformers, switchgear, etc.). Please provide copies of the most recent substation relay test reports.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Information on the PCB survey results for Fort Eustis is in the Tech Library. At Fort Story, the recent upgrade of the electric distribution system to 13.2 KV included replacement of components with potential for having PCB's. We could not locate any relay test reports.

4. Please provide a copy of the fault study, coordination study, relay setting study, or similar document that recommends relay settings and/or fuse sizes.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A report of a protective device coordination study that was made recently is available in the Tech Library. Data other than that in the report is not available.

5. Please provide a copy of any load flow analysis performed on the distribution system in recent years.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A report of a protective device coordination study that was made recently is available in the Tech Library.

6. Please provide a copy of any street lighting plans, or any construction drawings (as-built or design) of street lighting systems in use at the bases.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Some street light drawings are available but are not current.

7. Please provide a copy of the installation disaster preparedness plan, as it relates to the electric distribution system.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A copy of USATCFE PLAN 600-2, Severe Weather and Disaster Preparedness is in the Tech Library.

8. Please provide a copy of twelve months of meter reading log data, showing a list of all electric meters, a location number if available, monthly kWh and kW demand amounts, and billing data where applicable (i.e., for reimbursable accounts).

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A copy of two-years' billing data is now available in the Tech Library.

9. Please provide a copy of a recent twelve-month electrical billing history for reimbursable customers. This could possibly be combined with item 6.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A copy of two-years' billing data is now available in the Tech Library.

10. Please provide a copy of a log or report, which shows the number of meters by type (1-phase or 3-phase). This could possibly be combined with item 6.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A list of meters is in the Tech Library. All electric meters on the list are single-phase.

11. In some cases, points of existing service attachments (the point where the secondary service attaches to a home or building) may not meet applicable industry standards. *If work is required to modify these services to meet standards/codes, will the Contractor be required to make modifications beyond the point of demarcation? If so, please explain. If not, how would the Government accommodate required changes beyond the point of demarcation?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The Contractor will not be required to accomplish work beyond the points of demarcation. The Director of Public Works staff will address each instance of existing violation as it becomes known on case basis and consider corrective action.

12. *If there is PILC cable that is abandoned in place (in existing conduits), will the contractor be liable for future disposal of this cable? If no disposal is required, who will be responsible for any future environmental impact from this cable?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Any abandoned cable in conduit taken by the Contractor will be the responsibility of the Contractor.

13. *Are there any generators that operate in parallel with the electrical distribution system to reduce the system's peak electrical demand? If so, please identify? Will the contractor be responsible for the maintenance or control of the inter-tie equipment?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): There are generators that operate in parallel with the electrical distribution systems at Fort Eustis and Fort Story. There is a fuel cell that operates in parallel with the electrical distribution system at Fort Eustis. These three systems are described in the applicable Sections "J." The Contractor will not be responsible for the maintenance or control of the inter-tie equipment.

14. *Please define specifically the point(s) of demarcation between the Contractor owned system and any generators used to reduce system peak demands.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The points of demarcation are described in the applicable Sections "J."

15. *Please provide the following factual data concerning Fort Eustis, Fort Monroe, Fort Lee and Fort Story electric distribution systems:*

- a. Frequency of underground inspection [primary and secondary], and date of last inspection

- b. Frequency of substation inspection, and date of last inspection
- c. Frequency of substation transformer testing and date of last test
- d. Frequency of OCR and OCB testing and date of last test
- e. Number of and rated sizes of capacitors on the system, along with any supporting study identifying the need for and placement of capacitors
- f. Frequency of Capacitor inspections and date of last inspection
- g. Frequency of underground/pad-mounted transformer inspection and date of last inspection
- h. Frequency of substation switchgear testing and date of last test. Also, please provide non-PCB test verification.
- i. Frequency of Switch Gear Testing and inspection and date of last test and inspection

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The requested data is not available.

16. *Please provide the Government's current policy requirements for trimming and removing trees from the overhead electric system and route of underground conductors.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Our policy is to provide 12 feet clearance between vegetation and electric lines but lack of funding has thwarted efforts to comply with the policy. Fort Eustis has a commercial contract for maintenance of vegetation around electrical lines. Fort Story vegetation around electrical lines is maintained by Navy Public Works Division under the Interservice Support Agreement for maintenance of Fort Story facilities.

17. *Please provide the Government's requirements on individual metering of buildings.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Individual buildings are metered for billing of reimbursable customers and for determination of the cost of utilities in the operation of certain facilities. Most buildings are not metered.

18. *Please provide the Government's current requirements on notification of outages, street light outages, necessary maintenance, etc.; that is, how such reports are made and addressed.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): At Fort Eustis, there are no formal procedures for notification of street light outages, necessary maintenance, etc. Customers of DPW telephone some street light outages to the Service Order Desk; Directorate of Public Works (DPW) personnel document others. DPW has a delivery order contract with a contractor who makes street light repairs on an "as notified" basis. Fort Eustis has a formal system for notification of need for electrical outage, notification of planned outage, and notification of electric distribution work. This system allows coordination of work on the electrical system between the DPW, the contractor who maintains the Fort Eustis distribution system, and third-party contractors involved in electrical work. Unplanned or emergency electrical outages are generally called in to the Service Order Desk. The Service Order Desk then initiates repairs.

19. *What contracts already exist for use of utility poles by the Phone Company and/or cable companies, and any other users of pole or conduit space shared with the electric distribution systems on Fort Eustis, Fort Monroe, Fort Lee and Fort Story? When do these contracts expire?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Forts Eustis, Monroe, and Story have a cable franchise with Cox Communications, Virginia Beach, VA, with all aerial portions of the CATV system in the rights-of-way on utility poles. The current franchise agreement for the three installations continues from 28 July 2001 through 27 July 2016. Telephone service may also be on the utility poles. Copies of the cable company contract and applicable portions of the telephone contract are being added to the Tech Library.

20. *Do all existing contracts with the phone and cable companies require compliance with the National Electric Safety Code (NESC)? Please explain.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The cable franchise requires compliance in all respects with the technical performance requirements set forth in the FCC's Rules for Cable Television, and all other applicable Federal, State, or local laws and regulations, including the latest editions of the National Electric Safety Code. We are in the process of verifying that the telephone contract requires compliance with NESC.

21. *Does the Government have any private communication wiring on the Overhead pole lines at Fort Eustis, Fort Monroe, Fort Lee, and/or Fort Story? If so, do all installations meet NESC height and separation requirements?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): It is unlikely that all of the communications wiring meets all NESC requirements.

22. The RFP gives the government the right to attach to the overhead facilities. *Will all future government attachments meet NESC requirements?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Consistent with the Easement, the Government will make a reasonable effort in making future attachments to meet applicable codes.

23. *Does the military have a preferred form or format for providing meter readings? Electronic or manual?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Electronic format is preferred but its advantage must be weighed against cost to accomplish.

24. System owner/operators of poles and lines have historically charged a fee for the capacity reduction caused by additional attachments. Where attachments to poles require upgrades to the pole structure, the costs are typically borne by the attaching party. Based upon an initial reading of the RFP, it would appear that the owner/operator of the electric distribution system might not be able to rely upon joint use fees or reimbursement for structure upgrades. *Is this the case or is the handling of pole attachments subject to negotiation?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The Government expects to pay reasonable additional costs resulting from changes in its joint use and joint use would normally be accomplished on a not-to-interfere basis. The Government will not pay rental for such use. The Government owned systems are not to be considered subordinate to the electrical distribution systems. In the absence of a specific conflict or concern, the Government can only commit to good faith discussions.

25. The RFP calls for various plans extending from spill containment to foreign object damage prevention. *Are there current plans in place at the respective bases? If so please provide copies for review or advice if they may be reviewed at the Technical Libraries for each base.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): A copy of the Integrated Contingency Plan (ICP) is in the Tech Library. The ICP addresses spill containment. In addition, see answer to question number 50.

26. *Since Fort's Eustis, Monroe, Lee and Story have underground distribution, do they have any manholes or any other spaces that require the use of OSHA "permit-required confined space" rules as listed in 29 CFR 1910.146? Note: OSHA confined space is defined as*

- a. A space that is large enough and so configured that an employee can bodily enter and perform assigned work; and
- b. Has limited or restricted means for entry or exit (i.e., silos, vaults, bins etc.)
- c. Is not designed for continuous employee occupancy.

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Yes, there are confined spaces. Fort Eustis maintains a confined space entry plan and operating procedure for permit required confined spaces. We are adding to the Tech Library a copy of Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) PWD 35 dated 19 Jan 1993, Working in Confined Spaces, and a list of areas that have been identified as confined spaces. At Fort Story, Navy Public Works Division (PWD) maintains the facilities under an Interservice Support Agreement. PWD is responsible for the confined space entry program at Fort Story. At this time, we do not have the SOP or list of confined spaces at Fort Story.

27. *Is any past engineering data such as amperage loading of electrical circuits and/or end-of--circuit voltages at any of the bases available for use in designing Capital Improvement Plans? If so, please advise if and where such information is located if and when it may be reviewed.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): No such data is available.

28. *Is any past operational data such as number, location, and cause of outages available to use in designing Capital Improvement Plans? If so please provide such information for each base or advise where such information may be reviewed.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): No such data is available.

System Specific Questions

Ft. Eustis System

29. From the map handed out at the pre-proposal conference, it appears there may be submarine cable of some type or voltage running to the idle fleet at Fort Eustis. *Where is the point of demarcation for the bidder in this case? Are there any other submarine cables on Fort Eustis and where are the demarcation points for them?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): There are no submarine cables in the electrical distribution system being privatized. The Maritime Administration facility serving the Idle Fleet anchored in the James River is on land leased from the Army. The points of demarcation between the utility distribution system and the Maritime Administration electrical system are at the high voltage (13.2KV) terminals on the transformers. All of the transformers are the property of the Maritime Administration. Some of the 13.2KV wire is on Maritime Administration property.

30. It appears that Fort Eustis has some type of Utility Monitoring and Control System in

place. *Are any control points on the utility side of the demarcation points, such that the Contractor would be able to connect to the same monitoring points with its own SCADA system?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The availability of connection points is dependent upon a number of variables, which points are desired, and what SCADA system is going to be used. A possible solution is to set up a “monitor only” access to the existing system.

Ft. Story

31. *Are there any submarine cables on Fort Story and if so where are the demarcation points for them?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): There are no submarine cables in the Fort Story electrical distribution system that is to be privatized.

32. *Please provide drawings or sketches of the electric manhole layouts (also referred to as butterfly drawings). These drawings should show the number of conduits and cables in each conduit.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): We do not have such drawings.

33. Fort Story also appears to have some type of Utility Monitoring and Control System in place. Are any control points on the utility side of the demarcation points, such that the Contractor would be able to connect to the same monitoring points with its own SCADA system?

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The availability of connection points is dependent upon a number of variables, which points are desired, and what SCADA system is going to be used. A possible solution is to set up a “monitor only” access to the existing system.

Ft. Monroe

34. In Re: J07.8. Within the description of the facilities at Fort Monroe, subsection J07.8, Off Installation Sites, describes facilities serving Big Bethel Reservoir. All of these facilities are described as being transferred to the owner/operator of the electric distribution system. A field examination of the facilities indicates that the line in question has been opened at a point approximately 1,000' east of the reservoir pumping station. The remaining portion of the line proceeding east, toward Langley Air Force Base, appears to have been abandoned in place while the 1,000' to the west of the opening point, to the reservoir, appears to be utilized by Virginia Power for routine distribution service in the area, with an underground feed in the reservoir property with Virginia Power transformation and metering at the site. It would appear that the facilities at this point serve no useful purpose, would be a liability, and should be removed. *The question at hand is, of course, what is the desire of the military as it relates to these abandoned and unutilized facilities? Please explain fully.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): This is specific to Fort Monroe.

35. There is signage along the beach at Fort Monroe indicating the presence of submarine cable. *Please confirm that submarine cable does, in fact, exist at this location and provide a description of such cable. Also, please identify the point of demarcation related to these facilities. Are there any other submarine cables on Fort Monroe and where are the demarcation points for them?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): This is specific to Fort Monroe.

36. Fort Monroe has, at some locations, both a breaker panel next to the padmount transformer and an old meter base or entrance cable at the building. *Which is the demarcation point, the breaker panel, the meter base, or other? If "other," please explain.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): This is specific to Fort Monroe.

RFP Specific

37. In Re: B.2. *What kind of "permits" will be needed to make repairs, upgrades or improvements to utility systems on a military base?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The reference to "permits" in this context means the permits required to operate the system such as water system permits and permits for individual actions such as digging. Operational permits such as those that apply to water systems do not apply to the electric distribution system. Permits such as those for digging are applicable to all utility systems.

38. In Re: C.4.3.1. *What happens when installation of new property and equipment requires upgrades of existing utility facilities (i.e. attachments added to utility poles may require replacement of that pole to facilitate adequate separation of facilities and minimum heights for safety requirements)?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): See answer to Question 24.

39. In Re: C.4.3.2. *What are the current agreements in place? Can a copy of any agreements and/or contracts currently in place be provided or made available for review?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Copies of current telephone and cable television contracts/franchises are being added to the Tech Library.

40. In Re: C.5.1.5. *What system does the government use? If the government uses proprietary software, will the government accept drawings in commercially available software format or provide a license to use the government's proprietary software at no charge to the contractor?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Fort Eustis uses spatial (graphic/vector) electronic design files for general site map and utilities. Fort Story uses spatial (graphic/vector) electronic design files for general site map. Format type is .dgn Bentley Microstation SE. Fort Eustis maintains a GIS development site at Fort Eustis Building 1407, Room 107B, for both Fort Eustis and Fort Story. Electronic GIS data will be available to the successful offeror.

41. In Re: C.5.2.1 *Can a mixture of uniforms and badges be used to meet C.5.2? Example: permanently assigned employees in uniform and subcontractors or employees from another section of the company using badges.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): This is negotiable.

42. In Re: C.5.4. *If the offeror already has a valid FCC assigned radio frequency for a geographic area that includes the base, is there any need to change to an army assigned frequency?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): No.

43. In Re: C.7. *Does Fort Eustis, Fort Monroe, Fort Story or Fort Lee have an already written "Emergency Restoration Plan"? If so, please provide copies of each for review or advise where such may be reviewed?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): Emergency restoration is addressed in USATCFE PLAN 600-2, Severe Weather and Disaster Preparedness. A copy of this document is in the Tech Library. Order of restoration will be discussed with the successful offeror during the turnover transition period.

DESC Model Easement Questions

44. *Can the model easement be modified to incorporate pre-determined right-of-way cutting standards so that there is a consistent set of standards for long-range planning, even with changes in base command?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The details of the actual easement will be negotiated with the successful offeror based on the model easement used as a guide/starting point.

45. In Re: 7a. *Is it necessary that the "...construction, operation, maintenance, repair, or replacement" be subject to the approval of the Installation Commander? Please explain what type of approval will be required and what will be required to achieve approval.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The Government owns the land on which the electrical distribution system is located. The Contractor will have appropriate access to the Contractor owned system. The Government reserves the right to control new installation of and major changes to facilities and equipment on the Government's property. The Director of Public Works acting as a representative of the Installation Commander will give approval for most changes/additions to the utility systems.

46. In Re: 7c. *This section lists a long string of possible conflicts with Historic Register, State Remediation orders, Army IRP, etc. Please identify the areas on each base affected by one or more of these programs? Also, are any of the roads on the bases considered part of the Virginia road system?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): None of the roads on Fort Eustis and Fort Story are part of the Virginia road system. Section 9 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act prohibits the government from disclosing archeological site locations. However, the vast majority of archeological sites at Fort Eustis eligible for the National Register of

Historic Places are away from the cantonment and areas where utilities are located. There are no archeological sites at Fort Story, but there are over 70 historic buildings. The DPW Environmental and Natural Resources Division is available to discuss with your representatives site locations where conflicts may occur and any other environmental restrictions.

47. In Re: 15a. This section provides that the government may encumber or modify any of our easements so long as in the opinion of the “officer,” such will not interfere with our operations. In this regard, it may be helpful to the “officer” to have the grantee’s input in such decision. *Please explain how the grantee’s point of view would be solicited and considered in such decision.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): The details of the actual easement will be negotiated with the successful offeror based on the model easement used as a guide/starting point.

48. In Re: 15b. In this section, reference is made to the use of the grantee’s easement and poles and ductbanks by the government and it’s suppliers/contractors without charge. *Is this intended to mean that the government or its suppliers/contractors would not pay the costs incurred by the grantee, such as upgrades/make-ready cost, necessary to accommodate the government’s or its supplier’s/contractor’s use?* It would appear to be appropriate to require or provide that any such use by the government or its suppliers/contractors meet NESC requirements and if improvements are needed to meet NESC, then those costs would be payable by either the government or it’s supplier/contractors?

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): See answer to Question 24.

49. In Re: 16. *What are the cost responsibilities if and when the government orders a relocation with thirty days notice? Specifically, how would the contractor be reimbursed for the cost of such required relocations?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): **If a relocation is at the government’s request due to the interest of National Safety, WAR time emergency etc, the cost will be negotiated at the time they are incurred. The government has no way of knowing what cost might be involved in an possible effort such as a relocation.**

50. In Re: 19d. In this section, reference is made to notification of the installation “Fire and Emergency Services Division” in the case of hazardous chemical or POL spill, although no reference is made to the amount of spilled material. *Please provide the criteria, if any, as to the notification requirements relative the amount of any spill?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): We are adding two additional documents to the Tech Library, (1) [Fort Eustis and Fort Story Hazardous Materials & Waste Management Standing Operating Procedures \(HMWM SOP\)](#), March 1999 with changes dated 09/22/99 and (2) [Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Handbook](#), March 1999. These documents give details on management of hazardous materials. These documents are available in the Tech Library and a limited number of copies are available for distribution. The HMWM SOP defines “spill” as “Any accidental or unpermitted spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, or dumping of hazardous wastes or

materials, which when spilled become hazardous wastes into or on any land or water.”

51. In Re: 27b. The District Engineer requires annual electronic map updates, but does not specify the type. *When submitting the updates, what type of format is needed?*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): See answer to Question 40.

52. In Re: 39. As provided in this section, if buried explosive ordinance is encountered, the Contractor must cease work and call the military police who will summon explosive ordinance disposal personnel, who will dispose of such ordinance “at no expense to the government?” *Please explain the use of the phrase, “at no expense to the government,” in this context? In particular, does this simply mean that the Contractor may not charge the government for down time or does it mean that the Contractor is expected to reimburse the government for the disposal group’s time and cost? Please explain fully.*

ANS (Fort Eustis and Fort Story): In the event that unexploded ordnance (OE) is found, the military police are to be notified. The Government will not pay for down time. There is no cost for OE disposal for the Contractor or the Government.

Section C.2.3. - Reference is made to the model Easement as attachment J31 instead of J33. Please clarify that the correct attachment is J33.

ANS Model Easement is attachment J33.

Section C.3.4. - Energy and Water Efficiency and Conservation - Please clarify the requirement that Contractor “facilitate the implementation” of future third-party energy- and water- savings projects will not require any activity on the part of the Contractor that will negatively impact the functionality of the utility system, Contractor’s cost of maintaining the system, or otherwise adversely affect Contractor’s ability to perform it’s obligations to the Government. Rather, please clarify that this obligation only will require that Contractor use its best efforts to assist third-parties.

ANS Government programs for energy and water conservation are not intended to be a burden on contractors. Participating third party contractors are paid a portion of the savings resulting from the conservation programs. The Government expects to pay all reasonable costs resulting from implementation of these programs. The vast majority of the conservation programs involves utilities internal to buildings and does not involve the distribution systems. We would expect to pay all reasonable costs to the contractor who owns the distribution system if and when support from that contractor is needed.

Section C.4.3.1, Joint Use, Government Use - Please clarify that the Government’s joint use of the utility system will be exercised in a manner that will not unreasonably interfere with Contractor’s use of the system or with Contractor’s ability to perform it’s obligations to the Government, and will be subject to the Government, at its sole expense, complying with applicable safety standards. In addition, will the Government be

responsible for any utility system modifications that may be required to accommodate the Government's joint use?

ANS The Government expects to pay reasonable additional costs resulting from changes in its joint use and joint use would normally be accomplished on a not-to-interfere basis. The Government will not pay rental for such use. The Government owned systems are not to be considered subordinate to the electrical distribution systems. In the absence of a specific conflict or concern, the Government can only commit to good faith discussions.

Section C.4.3.2, Joint Use, Commercial Use - Please provide a copy of all agreements between the Government and commercial service providers subject to this Section. Also, please clarify that any third-party service provider's joint use of the utility system(s) will not unreasonably interfere with Contractor's use of the system or with Contractor's ability to perform its obligations to the Government. In addition, please clarify that Contractor only is precluded from seeking reimbursement from the Government for costs resulting from a third-party service provider's joint use of the system(s); Contractor is otherwise entitled to recover any such costs directly from third parties, consistent with applicable law and regulation.

ANS

1st sentence: Forts Eustis, Monroe, and Story have a cable franchise with Cox Communications, Virginia Beach, VA, with all aerial portions of the CATV system in the rights-of-way on utility poles. The current franchise agreement for the three installations continues from 28 July 2001 through 27 July 2016. Telephone service may also be on the utility poles. Copies of the cable company contract and applicable portions of the telephone contract are being added to the Tech Library.

2nd sentence: As stated in Section J33, page 4, paragraph 15.a, the easement granted to the Contractor is subject to all currently existing easements. Future easement will be negotiated by the Government with the intent to not interfere with the contractor's use of the premises.

3rd sentence: in accordance with paragraph 15.b, Section J33, page 4, utility poles and duct banks, currently existing or subsequently erected, may be used jointly by the Government and its suppliers/contractors without charge. The Contractor will not be entitled to recover any such costs directly from third parties or from the Government.

Section C.4.3.2. Wording of this term conflicts with the Model Easement paragraph 15 b – we prefer the wording in section C.4.3.2. Typically JU fees are appropriate for any attachments by third parties after the term of existing agreements.

ANS The second sentence in C.4.3.2 needs to be changed to read, "The contractor shall permit joint use by other commercial service providers at no cost."

Section C.5.1.5. Reference to Government GIS – please provide a detailed description of the GIS at each post. Will electronic data from the GIS be available to the successful

offeror? If so, please describe the data types and format of data that will be made available. What is the current status of GIS development at each Post?

ANS Fort Eustis uses spatial (graphic/vector) electronic design files for general site map and utilities. Fort Story uses spatial (graphic/vector) electronic design files for general site map. Format type is .dgn Bentley Microstation SE. Fort Eustis maintains a GIS development site at Fort Eustis Building 1407, Room 107B, for both Fort Eustis and Fort Story. Electronic GIS data will be available to the successful offeror.

Section C.5.2.3. Please confirm the existence of secured areas requiring clearance that contain electrical distribution facilities on these posts and identify them for us. Please provide confirmation of the nature of security clearances that may be required and the process involved in obtaining clearance.

ANS We will provide guided tours upon request of Fort Eustis and Fort Story secured areas that contain utility systems. The successful offeror will be provided escorted access to any utility systems and components in secured areas on an as-needed basis. A very small amount of utility distribution systems are in secure areas.

Section C.5.4. Contractor Radios – specifies a requirement to obtain approval for use of radio frequencies. Dominion Virginia Power intends to use frequencies already under license by the FCC. Please confirm that this requirement will not be necessary for frequencies already assigned and in use by the offeror.

ANS We have no problem with use of FCC assigned frequencies in areas where their use is approved.

Section C.10 – requires that Contractor comply with “all applicable environmental laws and regulations.” Contractor is required to review all applicable Installation procedures relating to environmental protection and either accept same or provide alternatives to be reviewed by the Government and, if found acceptable, incorporated in the contract. Please provide a copy of all Installation procedures that the successful offeror will be required to review.

ANS For Fort Eustis and Fort Story, this paragraph applies to the Integrated Contingency Plan (ICP). A copy of the ICP is in the Utilities Privatization Technical Library for Fort Eustis and Fort Story. Management of hazardous materials is a part of the integrated contingency plan. We are adding two documents to the Tech Library, (1) Fort Eustis and Fort Story Hazardous Materials & Waste Management Standing Operating Procedures (HMWM SOP), March 1999 with changes dated 09/22/99 and (2) Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Handbook, March 1999. These documents give details on management of hazardous materials. These two listed documents are available in the Tech Library and a limited number of copies are available for distribution.

Section C.10.1 - states that, once ownership is transferred, the Contractor shall become the party of record for all permits relating to operating the system and shall be

responsible for obtaining new or revised permits. Please identify all permits that are proposed to be transferred for the electrical distribution system, as well as any permits that the Government intends to retain that are deemed “not transferable.”

ANS There are no such permits that apply of the electrical distribution system.

Section C.10.3 - states that Contractor may be required to perform an environmental impact assessment prior to the modification of the utility system. Please make copies available of the assessment process and requirements that will be applicable for the owner of the electrical distribution system.

ANS Army Regulation AR200-2 gives requirements for Environmental Impact Assessments. A copy of AR200-2 is in the Utilities Privatization Technical Library for Fort Eustis and Fort Story. The title of AR200-2 is “Environmental Effects of Army Actions” and the current revision is dated 23 January 1989.

Section F.1. Contract Term - In the event of a Termination for Convenience, due to base closure or otherwise, how will the Government address the Contractor’s residual value in the utility system, remaining payment obligations for the conveyance and removal or transfer of ownership in the system? In conjunction, will the Government consider using FAR 52.241-10 or similar provisions which provide for the Contractor’s recovery of its capital costs in the event the contract is terminated prior to the Contractor’s recovery of its total capital costs?

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Previously addressed in amendment 0002](#)

Are offerors expected to detail exceptions to Example Bill of Sale and Model Easement in their proposals, or should offerors assume that these documents will be negotiated after intent to award is determined?

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

Section L.3.9- instructs offerors to include full text documents for documents incorporated by reference. Please clarify the number of copies of attachments the Government expects to receive. Note: as a major utility, we maintain a significant number of manuals covering standards, regulations, and procedures that will be referenced in our proposal. Some of these documents are published in hard copy and many are available to employees through the Company Intranet.

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

Section L.5 – Volume II: Past Performance - This section first asks for past performance information submitted on Attachment 1 with regard to “projects of similar complexity and type as that required in the RFP.” There is no limitation on the number of projects nor any indication of how recent the projects should be.

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

It then also asks for references for “up to 6 of its largest customers (by demand capacity), and /or projects of similar scope.” It does not stipulate providing this information on

Attachment 1, but rather indicates that “the references should be limited to a brief description of the services and facilities provided, together with name of client contact. Ensure reference contact has the capability of addressing the items in the past performance questionnaire . . .”

1. Are these to be two separate sections: (a) past performance information provided for an unlimited number of projects of similar complexity and type on Attachment 1, and (b) references with brief description of services for up to 6 or largest customers and/or projects of similar scope within 5 years of date of proposal? If there are two sections, can some of the projects be used for both sections?
2. Will the Government provide the past performance questionnaire to our references or are we to provide the questionnaire? Is it to be responded to via Government phone or personal interview or mailed to the Government? If there are two separate past performance sections, is it to be provided for all references or only those references cited in question 1(b) above?

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

Section M.1.- Basis for Contract Award - Section B.4 (RFP, p. 7) allows offerors to submit proposals for individual systems or for groups of systems on an “all or none basis.” Section M.1 states that a contract will be awarded to the offeror “whose proposal is determined to represent the best value to the Government . . .” Based on Section B.4, the Government may receive a wide variety of proposals, including single system, multi-system, multi-installation and all or none proposals. It is not clear how the Government will evaluate all those different types of proposals.

1. When evaluating the different types of proposals permissible under Section B.4 (e.g., single system proposals, multi-system proposals, multi-installation proposals, and “all or none” proposals), how will the Government determine which proposal represents the “best value” to the Government?
2. What criteria will the Government use to determine “best value”?
3. For example, how will the Government determine whether a single-system proposal or an all or none, multi-system, multi-installation proposal represents the best value for a particular utility system?

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

Section M.2 - states that that offerors "lacking an acceptable accounting system will be determined non-responsible and ineligible for award." The provision, however, does not define the criteria for an "acceptable accounting system." Please specify what criteria will be used by the Government to determine whether an offeror has an "acceptable accounting system" under Section M.2?

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

Section M.3 - Factor 5 states that the Government will determine a “total evaluated price,” but does not state whether a single “total evaluated price” will be calculated for the total proposal (i.e. for all systems covered by a proposal) or for each individual system in a proposal. Also, if the total evaluated price is determined on a proposal basis, it is not clear how the Government will compare the total evaluated price for a multi-

system proposal with the total evaluated price of a single-system proposal in conducting a best value evaluation and in making the final source-selection decision.

1. For Factor 5: Price, will the “total evaluated price” be determined on a system basis (i.e., for each individual system) or a proposal basis (i.e., a single total price for all systems covered by a particular proposal)?
2. How will the “total evaluated price” be considered in the best value evaluation?
3. If the “total evaluated price” is determined on a proposal basis (i.e., a single total price for all systems covered by a particular proposal), how will the Government determine which proposal represents the best value if some proposals will cover only a single system at an installation, some will be multi-system, multi-installation and some will be “all or none” proposals?
4. How will the Government compare the total evaluated price of a multi-system proposal with the total evaluated price of a single-system proposal in making the final source-selection decision?

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) [Response provided in amendment 0002](#)

Section M.3 - DESC and OSD participated in a briefing at Energy 2000 in Pittsburgh last summer. The presenter indicated a decision to evaluate costs at the “Government level” instead of “Agency level”, thus eliminating the potential impact of any tax effect of CIAC on the economic analysis. Please confirm this intent and include appropriate wording in Section M.3.

(DESC SHOULD ANSWER THIS.) - [I am not familiar with the information that may have been discussed during that conference. However, the government will evaluate each proposal that is received against the criteria identified in the RFP.](#)

Section M.4 - Section M.1 (RFP, p. 77) states that “[a]ward will only be made if (1) the long-term economic benefit of the conveyance to the United States exceeds the long-term economic cost of the conveyance to the United States, and (2) the conveyance will reduce the long-term costs of the United States for utility services provided by the utility system concerned.” Section M.4 (RFP, p. 79) indicates that this will be determined by comparing the present value estimate of a projected 50-year cash flow for contractor ownership with a present value estimate for a 50-year cash flow for Government ownership and operations and maintenance. The RFP, however, does not identify the cost components included in the calculation of the 50-year cash flow estimate for Government ownership and operations and maintenance. A fair comparison requires that the estimates for both contractor ownership and Government ownership include the same cost components. Accordingly, Does the Government estimate of a 50-year cash flow based on Government ownership and operations and maintenance (RFP Section M.4) include capital upgrades and renewals and replacements (RFP Section C.11)? If so, please identify the upgrades and renewals and replacements included in the Government estimate. [Information that is identified is the specific section J attachment.](#)

Does the Government estimate of a 50-year cash flow based on Government ownership include the costs of compliance with “all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, as they may be amended from time to time, including those requirements relating to health, safety and the environment” (RFP, Section C.2.6)? [There are some instances where a law or regulation may have been implemented however, the government may have been grandfather from having to comply with that requirement](#)

because “it’s the government.” However, the government does comply with laws and regulations where applicable.

Does the Government estimate of a 50-year cash flow based on Government ownership include the costs of Government compliance with RFP Sections C.3 (Requirement), C.7 (Response to Service Interruptions and Contingencies), and C.10 (Environmental Compliance)? - Yes

Disaster Recovery Ratio (DRR). The disaster recovery ratio is a measure of the current maximum expected cost of system restoration to the capital investment of an offeror.