

ELMENDORF/KULIS QUESTIONS #6

1. When was the last infrared inspection conducted? Please provide a summary of any problems found that were not corrected.

ANSWER: Infrared Inspections are not performed.

2. Please provide a copy of the transformer spreadsheet that the shop maintains.



Feeder database.xls

ANSWER: Transformer Spreadsheet is attached.

3. Please provide a copy of PCB test records.

ANSWER: PCB test records for the substations have been provided. Additional PCB testing for the other transformers is 300 pages in length. Documentation is available in the technical library for viewing. Please contact:

Matthew.Schierling@ELMENDORF.af.mil

4. Please provide a copy of the system one-line diagram.

ANSWER: No one line diagram is available.

5. Please provide a copy of any past studies of the electrical system, such as voltage drop studies and device coordination studies.

ANSWER: A relay coordination study is available for viewing at Elmendorf (Large Hard Copy – 2 Volumes). The data used in the report is electronic and can be mailed on a CD. Please contact: Matthew.Schierling@ELMENDORF.af.mil

6. Please provide records of the latest substation equipment test records.

ANSWER: A relay coordination study is available for viewing at Elmendorf (Large Hard Copy – 2 Volumes). Substation testing was included as part of the relay coordination survey. The data used in the report is electronic and can be mailed on a CD. Please contact: Matthew.Schierling@ELMENDORF.af.mil

7. Please provide base and substation peak demands, energy and kVAR for the past 36 months.

ANSWER: Attached are the electrical demands for the last 3 FY's, however, kVAR data is not reported on a regular basis and is not available.



EAFB Peak
Demands.doc

8. The solicitation references LUCs and ERPs. Please provide maps and details of their locations and restrictions.

ANSWER: They can be found at:

<http://www.elmendorf.af.mil/Othrgs/Restorat/Othrdocs/June%202003%20LUCMP.pdf>

<http://www.elmendorf.af.mil/Othrgs/Restorat/Webdocs/plans.htm>

9. The solicitation references GIS drawings. We understand that these will be released shortly. As these are necessary to meet your requirement to prepare costs of replacing all overhead lines with underground lines, please provide a minimum of three months after their release for the delivery of proposals.

ANSWER: These can be requested; Please contact:

Matthew.Schierling@ELMENDORF.af.mil

10. J1-29 Exhibit B to Attachment J-1, in Section B.1 on page J1-29, states that utility system right-of-way is “26-foot-wide, extending 13 feet on each side of the utility system, as installed.” This description of the right-of-way is ambiguous. For portions of the system that are not single points or lines (e.g. a pole line with cross-arms), please indicate whether the right of way is: a) 26 feet wide regardless of the width of the system, extending out from the midpoint or centerline of the system; or b) extending 13 feet from each side of the system, resulting in a right of way equal to the width of the system, plus 26 feet consisting of 13 feet on each side. For example, where a 10 foot cross-arm is attached to a utility pole, the right of way under a) above would be 26 feet from the center of the cross-arm, leaving only 8 feet of right-of-way extending from each end of the cross-arm. Under b), the right of way would be 36 feet, equal to the 10 foot width of the cross-arm plus 13 feet on each side.

ANSWER: We believe the 26-foot Right-of-Way (ROW) width should be sufficient for most electrical distribution system components. However, we agree that some components as you describe above may approach or even exceed 26 feet, so that additional ROW width is required to perform maintenance on the system. Therefore, we concur with your interpretation of the ROW scenario described in your option b) above (i.e., the ROW extends 13 feet from each side of the system).

The intent of the ROW width is that the contractor will have adequate space around the utility system to perform installation and maintenance operations.

11. Amendment 0001; The RFP originally included a detailed EAFB electric ROW agreement as item J-46. Amendment No. 1, item 5, deleted this attachment and indicates that it will be incorporated in a revised Attachment J-1, titled "Elmendorf AFB Electric Distribution System." A revised Attachment J-1 has been issued. Please confirm that no ROW agreement comparable to item J-46 will be executed in connection with this proposal or any resulting contract award.

ANSWER: J-46 Right of Way has been eliminated. Please see Amendment 0001 on DESC website with revised Attachment J-1.

12. Can a political subdivision of a state qualify as a small business as that term is defined in FAR 52.219-1(c)(1), which is included in Section K of the RFP?

ANSWER: Please refer to FAR Part 19.001 for definition of small business.

13. In order to submit an acceptable subcontracting plan in accordance with RFP Section L.8.3.3, must an offeror propose to pass through its subcontracting goals to subcontracts issued pursuant to the contract?

ANSWER: No, please refer to FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements.

14. In order to submit an acceptable socioeconomic proposal in accordance with RFP Section L.8.4, must an offeror propose to pass through its anticipated levels of subcontracting to SBs and/or HBCUs/MIs to subcontracts issues pursuant to the contract?

ANSWER: Please refer to FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements.

15. If an offeror has a requirement, by ordinance, for full and open competition for all procurements and includes an aggressive out reach program in its subcontracting plan, will compliance with the out reach provisions of the subcontracting plan be sufficient to demonstrate a "good faith effort" towards complying with the plan, even if numerical subcontracting plan goals are not met?

ANSWER: Please refer to FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements as well as Section L.8.4 in the RFP for socioeconomic requirements.

16. J-43 Specialized Training, Exhibits A, B, C and D are attached below.



J-43 Exhibit A -
Sample Course block



J-43 Exhibit B -
Sample Course Block



J-43 Exhibit C -
Sample Course Outlin



J-43 Exhibit D-
Sample Course Block

17. C.6.5 seems to say that government reserves the right to grant additional easements, rights -of-ways, leases and permits and make additional uses of the premises. This is fine as far as it goes. It then says," any interference with the use of or damage to property under control of the Air Force shall be corrected by the contractor." Why should the contractor be responsible for these additional grants of access that damage AF property. I can only see the contractor responsible for damage done by the contractor.

ANSWER: The UP contractor is only responsible for damage he causes to the Right-of-Access over or under his utility system. The grantee for the additional easements, Right-of-Access, etc. would be responsible for their own damage.

18. C.9.10 Plant Control For threatened or endangered plants or trees, would you please identify these? Also, if a certified arborist says that our efforts would not harm the tree could we do some moderate pruning with approval of Government?

ANSWER: Elmendorf has no threatened and/or endangered plants or animals present on the base, therefore pruning of trees in the way of utility lines would not be an issue.

19. C.10.5 Environmental Restoration. Please clarify the current status of Elmendorf AFB re NPL.

ANSWER: Elmendorf AFB is currently on the Final NPL

20. H.8 Unexploded ordnance: Please identify any known instances. If it is the responsibility of the government as stated, we would like to see some liability clause for damage caused by such to contractor personnel or equipment

ANSWER: For H.8, Restoration does not know of any known UXOs on the base. At site LF04 small arms rounds and casings and a howitzer case have been found at this site. These are the only items found since a 1997 cleanup effort began at LF04. The contractor doing this cleanup receives training from Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) before beginning fieldwork. EOD responds to inspect and properly dispose of suspect UXO and small arms ammunition. Additionally, there are three projects planned in the future to do a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) looking for munitions at each site. The projects are identified as a. RI/FS at Suspected Skeet Range in 2008, b. RI/FS at Small Arms Range in 2010, and c. RI/FS at B-26 Crash Site in 2012. The locations of these sites are in the northern part of the base away from any utilities. See location map attached.



Range Map.ppt