

Answers to Questions following the Consultant Information Meeting
July 24, 2006
Seattle City Light Boundary Integrated Licensing Process

Q1. What is SCL's estimate of the value of the scope of work?

A1. SCL estimates a range from \$6M to \$16M, including expenses and project management. We will include our cost estimates for each of the studies together with the RFP.

Q2. Is there a goal to use "small business" consultants from the Consultant Roster in the performance of this work?

A2. No, there is no specific goal to use "small business" consultants from the Consultant Roster for the Technical Consultant RFP process. We do however remind all of the City's Outreach Plan requirements and the need to make affirmative efforts to recruit women and minority owned firms as part of your teams. Many of these firms may also be small businesses and several may be on the City's Consultant Roster.

Q3. Will the Technical Consultant be responsible also for preparing the PMEs under a separate contract?

A3. The Technical Consultant will assist City Light in identifying, developing, and evaluating possible PME measures based on information gained through performance of the studies in this contract. Information on possible PME measures will be provided to SCL separately from study reporting. Preparing recommendations for actions pursuant to the studies will be a joint responsibility of City Light staff, LVA, and the Technical Consultant team, and will be performed after analysis of the study reports. It is currently anticipated that City Light staff will lead the effort in conjunction with LVA and the Technical Consultant team to synthesize the results from the individual studies, address crossover issues between studies, and develop potential PME measures for consideration. It is possible that cost-estimating PMEs could be requested of the Technical Consultant by the City at any time during the term of the contract, but is likely that it would be concentrated in late 2008 and early 2009. The task of cost estimating PMEs will be negotiated and added to the contract by amendment at the appropriate time.

Q4. Will the technical consultant also be responsible for implementing the PMEs and will that be under a separate contract?

A4. Implementing the PMEs is not part of this Technical Consultant contract. A separate contracting process for the implementation of the PMEs will be conducted after the terms of the new FERC license have been established.

Q5. Who are the people on the TDG Panel?

A5. The Seattle City Light TDG expert panel consists of Henry Falvey (hydraulics expert, formerly with the USBOR), Glenn Tarbox (dam safety engineer), and Ken Kozmo Bates (fish passage engineer, formerly with WDFW).

Q6. Will there be just one RFP for all of the work or will City Light be breaking it into pieces?

A6. There will be a single RFP process to solicit proposals for performance of the entire study program.

Q7. Will public institutions who are part of proposing teams need to provide overhead rates?

A7. Yes

Q8. Might more studies be added to the study program?

A8. It is possible that more studies will be added to the program after the RFP has been published. However, we are reasonably confident that the study program as identified to date is very largely representative of the scope of work that will need to be performed. In the event that studies are added to the Study Program after the contract with the Technical Consultant has been signed, those new studies will be negotiated and added to the contract by amendment.

Q9. In addition to the period of time from July 24 to Aug 4, will there be a time when questions about the RFP will be answered by the City during the formal RFP process itself.

A9. Yes, we anticipate there will be a two-week period immediately after publication of the RFP when the City will entertain questions.

Q10. Will the City establish a fixed over-head rate and profit multiplier, or may consultant teams propose overhead rates and multipliers? Also will the City allow primes a markup for subcontractors on prime teams?

A10. The City does not have fixed overhead or profit rates that must be adhered to. Overhead rates should be based on firms' actual and allowable costs based on Part 31, Federal Acquisition Regulations. While profit rates are negotiable, the City typically considers reasonable profit rates to be in the range of 10% to 13%.

The City will not allow primes a mark-up for subcontractors.

Q11. If a firm that is interested in pursuing the study plan RFP is fully owned by a parent corporation that also owns a firm on the relicensing team, would this exclusion policy apply to the firm interested in pursuing the study plan RFP? If not, what degree of ownership or control by an affiliate would result in the application of your exclusion policy?

A11. The exclusion policy that was described in the RFP for the Strategic Consultant contract stated that the successful Strategic Consultant and any of its sub-consultants would not be eligible to apply for the Specialty Technical Consultant contracts. This policy did not anticipate that the exclusion would apply to parent corporations or affiliates of affected firms. The exclusion applies only to the firms directly working as part of the Long View Associates team.

Q12. Is periphyton a subject for study in the study program?

A12. Study of periphyton is included in the Aquatic Productivity studies.

Q13. With the study plans for the Boundary Project moving toward completion, will there be an opportunity in the proposal process to present study options (moderate changes) that would increase the cost-effectiveness of the study without losing study integrity?

A13. For the sake of consistency, it is important that proposers respond to the study descriptions contained in the RFP. Therefore, proposers should not suggest changes to the studies. Some study descriptions are very specific and others less so. In cases where study descriptions are loosely described, proposers are encouraged to describe the methodologies that they think will best address the intent of the study, while staying within the parameters of the study description. In cases where the study description is very specific proposers will have no opportunity to suggest any changes.

The City will discuss opportunities for the most effective and efficient performance of the studies after signing a contract with the winning consultant. Moderate changes that would increase effectiveness without losing study integrity would be discussed at that time.

Q14 In addition to performance of the studies, project management, and development of PMEs, can Consultants suggest additional tasks that they think the City may benefit from and illustrate how they are qualified to perform those tasks. Where in the proposal should they do that?

A14. Yes. If a proposer believes that tasks that are beneficial to City Light have not been included in the RFP they should feel free to identify them, describe how they would propose to perform them, who would perform the work, and provide a cost estimate. This information should be included as part of the proposal for project management services. Proposers should not propose additional field studies that they think should be added to the study program.

Q15. There are several ongoing contracts in place that may extend into the 2007 period (e.g., Battelle for temperature modeling). Will these contracts continue as stand-alone contracts or will the City encompass them into the technical studies contract?

A15. The scope of work to be performed by the Technical Consultant was described at the July 24, 2006 meeting, and will be incorporated in the RFP. The City anticipates that existing contracts with other consultants will continue as stand-alone contracts.

Q16. Should technical study team members plan on attending the Resource Work Group Meetings in 2007 and 2008?

A16. Yes. We expect that the Technical Consultant will be represented at quarterly resource work group meetings in 2007 and 2008. We are interested in seeing how teams will propose to represent themselves at these meetings.

Q17 Is it appropriate for consultants to attend Resource Workgroup Meetings that will be held in August or any time prior to awarding of the contract?

A17 No. Resource Workgroup Meetings are specifically designed for discussions between City Light and stakeholders and Tribes. The City feels that consultant attendance at those meetings may be disruptive to the Workgroups. City Light strongly discourages consultants from attending Resource Workgroup Meetings prior to the award of the Technical Consultant contract, and their attendance at such meetings may jeopardize their ability to compete for the contract. Consultants can stay well informed of Resource Workgroup Meeting discussions by reviewing the meeting summaries. Meeting summaries are available on the Relicensing website at www.seattle.gov/light/news/issues/bndryRelic/br_schedule.asp

Q18 Will there be any socioeconomic studies?

A18 Socioeconomic studies are not part of the study program as currently drafted. It is our intention to analyze potential socioeconomic impacts later in the relicensing process when more is known about potential PM&Es and their potential socioeconomic impacts.

Q19. Is there already a document management system in place for the relicensing program?

A19. Yes. This allows for sharing of documents and information between members of the City Light and Longview teams. We anticipate that the Technical Consultant team would be given rights to this document management system.

Q20. Will SCL provide any study equipment?

A20. Proposers should make the assumption that they will need to provide all study equipment.

Q21. What fisheries studies are being done in 2006 and when will the reports be available?

A21. Two studies will be conducted in 2006 and the final reports should be available in January 2007. The first study is being conducted by LGL, who is conducting a program to determine the relative performance of acoustic and radio telemetry systems in close proximity to Boundary Dam, including the immediate forebay, turbine intake area, tailrace below the spillgates, and the tailrace below the turbine draft tubes. No fish are being tagged in this study. The second study is being conducted by Terrapin Environmental. Terrapin is a) identifying conditions that affect launching and retrieving boats at Boundary tailrace boat ramp, b) determining whether target species (bull trout, rainbow and westslope cutthroat trout, and whitefish) can be captured in the Boundary tailrace area using gill nets and c) identifying whether target species (bull trout, rainbow and westslope cutthroat trout, and whitefish) can be captured at the mouth of selected tributaries to the Boundary Reservoir using gill nets. Collection and take permits have been obtained for this work and sampling began in July.

Q22: Is SCL planning to complete a turbine and spillway mortality study?

A22. No. SCL has proposed to use estimates of turbine and spillway mortality. The specific estimates are identified in an Early Information Development report about fish connectivity at the Project. This is explained in materials on our relicensing web page under the Fish and Aquatics meeting that was held in April 2006.

Q23. How will the City evaluate firms whose work for agencies, utilities, or companies on other projects in the area might present potential conflicts of interest?

A23. Each potential conflict of interest will be evaluated on its own particular set of circumstances. Firms are not automatically disqualified from the Technical Consultant RFP process simply because they are working for other agencies, utilities, or companies on projects that are geographically or thematically related to Boundary studies. However, the City will evaluate the potential for conflicts of interest on a case by case basis, and will take into account the perceptions of stakeholders and the general public when evaluating the selection of consultants.