

NREL  
 NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY  
 1617 Cole Blvd.  
 Golden, CO 80401-3393

**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION**

Solicitation No. RFJ-8-77550 Request for Proposal	Amendment No. 08	Date: March 20, 2008
ISSUED BY: National Renewable Energy Laboratory 1617 Cole Blvd. Golden, CO 80401-3393	PROJECT NAME & LOCATION  Design/Build Subcontract for the Research Support Facility Golden, CO	
The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth below. The hour and date specified for receipt of offers  [X] is not extended and remains 4 p.m. MDT, 3/27/08.    [] is hereby		
FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THIS AMENDMENT MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. EXCEPT AS PROVIDED HEREIN, ALL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SOLICITATION DOCUMENT REMAIN UNCHANGED AND IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.		
Subcontract Administrator: Karen Leitner		

Amendment No. 8 to Request for Proposal, RFJ-8-77550 is issued to: 1) Answer questions presented at the one-on-one meetings held March 17 and 18, 2008; 2) Provide Proposal Checklist; and 3) to provide information on changes to information contained in the RFP.

Question No. 1: Please advise on the rates that we should use in our calculations for using central chilled water or district hot water.

Answer No. 1: Average Seasonal Delivery temperatures are noted below for the chilled water supply and heating hot water supply temperatures. The chilled water and hot water supply temperatures are recorded daily every 15 minutes and the location of the temperature sensor is on the supply main prior to the FTLB and Spline chilled/hot water pumps.

<b>Chilled Water Supply Temps</b>		<b>Occupied 6:30 am - 6:30 pm (deg. F)</b>	<b>Unoccupied 6:30 pm - 6:30 am (deg. F)</b>
spring	April 15, 2007 thru June 30, 2007	48.9	54.4
summer	July 1, 2007 thru Sept. 30, 2007	48	59.3
fall	Oct 1, 2007 thru Dec. 3, 2007	47.3	47.5
winter	Jan 1, 2008 thru Feb 29, 2008	47.5	45.3

<b>Hot Water Supply Temps</b>		<b>HWS Temperature (deg. F)</b>
spring	April 1, 2007 thru June 30, 2007	137.4
summer	July 1, 2007 thru Sept. 30, 2007	96.8
fall	Oct. 1, 2007 thru Dec. 31, 2007	156
winter	Jan. 1, 2008 thru Feb. 29, 2008 (& March 2007)	161.5

RFHP is designed to run at 190F supply water temp. In practice it will follow temperature reset schedule used by existing FTLB hot water system.

Question No. 2: Can you please clarify what entity has the jurisdiction control for enforcement of the federal water quality regulations? Does the EPA oversee this issue for the NREL site or does that authority rest with the State of Colorado or the City of Golden?

Answer No. 2: The EPA has jurisdiction.

Question No. 3: Please clarify if the application of the MBE/WBE percentages for participation in subcontracts are to be applied “per trade” as stated, or if the intent and application will be to apply these goals to the project at large?

Answer No. 3: The application of MBE/WBE percentages for participation are to be applied “per trade” as described in the RFP.

Question No. 4: Please clarify NREL’s expectations of “method of calculation” identified in substantiation Item f.2.B.2. under FACILITY PERFORMANCE “identification of method of calculation of energy efficiency to be employed”?

Answer No. 4: NREL’s expectation is the offeror will submit and follow an acceptable (following recognized industry standards) method of calculating the energy efficiency of alternative designs in order to decide the final design and construction of the facility.

Question No. 5: Please clarify the difference between the two objectives, “Measurable ASHRAE 90.1 – 50%, plus” and ASHRAE 90.1 plus 50%+” identified in the project Objectives Checklist under “Highly Desirable”.

Answer No. 5: The following is the response to this question:

Highly Desirable: Measurable ASHRAE 90.1-2004-50%

If Possible: Measurable ASHRAE 90.2-2004-50% Plus

It is highly desirable to have 50% savings over ASHRAE 90.1-2004, and if possible, exceed 50% savings.

For further clarification, Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Part 1 – Procedures, Attachments to Proposal Form, Project Objectives Checklist (pages 43 and 44 of 300) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

**PROJECT OBJECTIVES CHECKLIST**

This Project Objectives Checklist is to be submitted with the Proposal Form for evaluation purposes. Offeror’s proposal must meet all Mission Critical Objectives in order to be “responsive”. Objectives noted as “Highly Desirable” or “If Possible” will be evaluated as part of the Best Value Selection process. Write either “included” or “not included” corresponding to each objective your proposal will achieve or not achieve respectively. Each of the “included” objectives must have a corresponding narrative (one or two paragraphs) on how your proposal achieves the objective.

<b>MISSION CRITICAL</b>	
Attain Safe Work Performance/Safe Design Practices	
LEED™ Platinum	
ENERGY STAR First “Plus”, unless other system outperforms	
<b>HIGHLY DESIRABLE</b>	
Up to 800 Staff Capacity	
25 kBtu/sf/year	
Architectural Integrity	
Honor “Future Staff” Needs	
Measurable ASHRAE 90.1-2004-50%	

Support culture and amenities	
Expandable building	
Ergonomics	
Flexible workspace	
Support future technologies	
Documentation to produce a "How to" manual	
"PR" campaign implemented in real-time for benefit of DOE/NREL and DB	
Allow secure collaboration with outsiders	
Building information modeling	
Substantial Completion by May 2010	
<b>IF POSSIBLE</b>	
Net Zero/Design approach	
Most energy efficient building in the world	
LEED™ Platinum Plus	
ASHRAE 90.1-2004-50% Plus	
Visual displays of current energy efficiency	
Support public tours	
Achieve national and global recognition and awards	
Support personnel turnover	

Question No. 6: For the purpose of the oral board presentations, will design materials be limited to the materials that are shown in the proposal?

Answer No. 6: The purpose of the oral board presentations is to augment information requested in the RFP. Oral board presentations also provide an opportunity for dialogue among the parties. The information provided in the oral board presentations will be used to augment written information provided as part of the proposal and will be used by the Source Evaluation Team to evaluate the offeror against the established evaluation criteria. The offeror's time for their portion of the oral board presentation is limited and the offeror should make good use of the time provided.

Question No. 7: Is the Mutual Letter of Commitment to be provided in advance of the proposal or with the proposal?

Answer No. 7: The Letter of Mutual Commitment is to be provided with your proposal.

Question No. 8: Regarding the substantiation requirement for the Executive Order: Strengthening Federal Environmental and Transportation Management described on pages 250-251 of 300 of the RFP, these items seem to be more specifically related to overall performance of the respective Agency rather than specific projects. Also, there are several references to general goals and baseline performance assumptions that are not specifically provided in this section of the RFP (e.g. reference to the Agency's baseline energy use in 2003, which is not specifically defined). It would seem that the extensive substantiation defined elsewhere and throughout the RFP would provide the evidence of specific techniques and systems being used for this project to achieve the objectives defined by the Executive Order (as called for in article i. Substantiation, 1) Proposal Stage, and that the substantiation itself provides the appropriate reporting mechanism. Please confirm if this item is required and what is required.

Answer No. 8: Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Part 3 – Performance, Facility Performance, Section A.4.h. and A.4.i., pages 250 and 251 of 300, is hereby deleted in its entirety.

Question No. 9: For the Oral Interview, please confirm the location, size, and set up of the room and the number of attendees.

Answer No. 9: Currently the location for Oral Board Interviews is in Building 7, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, at the Denver West Complex. You are welcome to contact the Subcontract Administrator to walk down the area prior to the oral board presentations. There is not a limit established for attendees for this meeting. This room has the capacity to hold approximately 100 people.

Question No. 10: Will the Proposal Checklist be made available.

Answer No. 10: Yes. The Proposal Checklist is Attachment No. 1 to this Amendment.

Question No. 11: The unit prices for vehicular paving requested on page 34 of 300 do not appear to be a useful measure of pricing. Would you consider changing the unit of measure on vehicular paving? The unit price metrics for trench and backfill also are not useful tools for the NREL team to evaluate, as no depths are reported, and the resulting unit prices will be rendered meaningless without better definition.

Answer No. 11: Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Part 1 – Procedures, Proposal Form, Page 34 of 300, is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Add-Alternate No. 1: In addition to the Phase I and II work (described in the Conceptual Documents), the Offeror will complete the alternative Scope of Work in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Subcontract for the Unit Prices listed below. At the time of this RFP, the alternative Scope of Work is defined by the following “Unit Breakdown”, quantities of which will be determined by Owner during the execution of the base subcontract. The Scope of this Alternate is generally defined as “Site Improvements”, including design services, infrastructure, utilities, roads, parking, grading, and related site improvements. All work identified as Add-Alternate No. 1 is an option to this Subcontract and does not imply any obligation on the part of the Owner to place any of the Add-Alternate No. 1 work with the Subcontractor. Add-Alternate No. 1 is contingent upon receipt of adequate funding for that work effort. For purposes of completing the Proposed Unit Prices below, assume a budget of Thirteen Million Dollars (\$13,000,000.00) for work identified in Add-Alternate No. 1.

Proposed Unit Prices: The Subcontractor proposes the following Unit Prices (Fill in the blanks):

- a) Offeror’s Profit: \_\_\_\_\_% (percent) of the proposed price
- b) General Conditions Cost: \_\_\_\_\_% (percent) of the proposed price
- c) Design Services: \_\_\_\_\_% (percent) of the proposed price
- d) Excavation: \$\_\_\_\_\_ per cubic yard
- e) Structural fill: \$\_\_\_\_\_ per cubic yard
- f) Vehicular paving:
  - 1. Flexible \$\_\_\_\_\_ per ton
  - 2. Rigid \$\_\_\_\_\_ per square yard
  - 3. Paving base \$\_\_\_\_\_ per cubic yard
- g) Curb & gutter \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- h) Material and Installation Costs:
  - 1. 4” PVC conduit in trench \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 2. 6” water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 3. 8” PVC water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 4. 8” steel water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 5. 10” PVC water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 6. 10” steel water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 7. 12” water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
  - 8. 16” PVC water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot

- 9. 16" steel water line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 10. 8" PVC sewer line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 11. 10" PVC sewer line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 12. 24" Storm sewer line \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot

i) Excavation Costs:

- 1. Trench & backfill, up to 4" \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 2. Trench & backfill, 4-8" \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 3. Trench & backfill, 8-12" \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 4. Trench & backfill, over 12" \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot
- 5. Trench, Install & Backfill duct bank \$\_\_\_\_\_ per linear foot

All Industry and local standards must be met for the depth of the applicable utilities.

Question No. 12: Can you provide information on the emissions factor (LBs of CO2/kBtu or Kwh) for the central chilled water or district hot water?

Answer No. 12: Please refer to Attachment No. 2 to this Amendment, titled; **“Evaluation of Replacing Natural Gas Heat Plant with a Biomass Heat Plant, A Technical Review of Greenhouse Gas Emission Trade-offs” dated May 2007.**

The following changes/information is provided as part of the Request for Proposal RFJ-8-77550:

Notice: The Draft Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory’s South Table Mountain Complex (DOE/EA 1440-S-1) is posted on the Golden Field Office public reading room website for a 30-day public review and comment period that closes April 17, 2008. The document can be accessed at the following link:  
[http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading\\_Room.aspx](http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading_Room.aspx) .

1. Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Part 1 – Procedures, Referenced Documents, Governmental Regulations and Publications (page 56 of 300), is amended to include Section E. CDR – Contractor Requirements Documents as incorporated in DOE Orders made applicable under Prime Contract # DE-AC36-99GO10337 with Midwest Research Institute/National Renewable Energy Laboratory Division. Referenced DOE Orders can be found at Section J – “List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments”; Attachment 5 – “Operating and Administrative Requirements” located on page 13 at the following URL:  
[http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/PDFs/ReadingRoom/PrimeContract/Mod\\_M195/Modification\\_No\\_195.pdf](http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/PDFs/ReadingRoom/PrimeContract/Mod_M195/Modification_No_195.pdf).  
 The full text of referenced DOE Orders can be located at the following URL: <http://www.directives.doe.gov/>
2. Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Part 1 – Procedures, Instructions to Offerors, Section 8.9, Confidence Factors Scale (page 14 of 300): The Confidence Factors Scale is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following Confidence Factors Scale:

**Confidence Factors Scale**

<i>Adjective Score</i>	<i>Definition</i>
<span style="background-color: #0000FF; color: white; padding: 2px;">High Confidence</span> Blue	Evaluated that virtually no doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort with no potential cause for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation in performance. No owner oversight or intervention is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance.

<p><b>Significant Confidence</b></p> <p>Green</p>	<p>Evaluated with a certainty that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort with minor potential cause for disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation in performance. Little owner oversight or intervention is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance.</p>
<p><b>Confidence</b></p> <p>Yellow</p>	<p>Offeror can successfully perform the required effort with little cause for disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation in performance. Some owner oversight and/or intervention is expected to be required to meet the contract requirement.</p>
<p><b>Little Confidence</b></p> <p>Magenta</p>	<p>Substantial doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort with likely potential cause for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation in performance. Substantial owner oversight or intervention is expected to be required to meet the contract requirements. Changes to the Offeror's existing approach may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.</p>
<p><b>No Confidence</b></p> <p>Red</p>	<p>Extreme doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort with significant potential cause for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation in performance. Regardless of the degree of owner oversight or intervention, successful performance is doubtful.</p>

3. Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Instructions to Offerors, Section 16. Responsibilities for Completion Delay and Safety or Environmental Occurrences is deleted in its entirety and replaced with:

Section 16. Responsibilities for Completion Delay and Safety or Environmental Occurrences

The Subcontract will include articles delineating the Subcontractor's responsibilities for completion delay and environmental, safety and health violations. Please refer to the articles (Article 24) "Liquidated Damages" and (Article 26) "Allocation of Liability and Responsibility for Violations of Safety and Environmental Requirements" in the Subcontract schedule.

4. Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Instructions to Offerors, Section 19. (Lower-Tier) Small Business Subcontracting Plan is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

Section 19. Small Business (Lower-Tier) Subcontracting Plan

The following requirement does not apply to small business offerors.

Proposals submitted in response to the Request for Proposal for Phase II work shall include a lower-tier subcontracting plan that separately addresses lower-tier subcontracting with small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns. If the subcontractor is submitting an individual subcontract plan, the plan must separately address lower-tier subcontracting with small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned business concerns with a separate part for the basic subcontract and separate parts for each option (if any). The plan shall be included and made a part of the subcontract. The lower-tier subcontracting plan shall be negotiated within the time specified by the NREL Subcontract Administrator. Failure to submit and negotiate a lower-tier subcontracting plan shall make the subcontractor ineligible for award of Phase II work under the subcontract (see NREL website).

5. Appendix A – Conceptual Documents, Instructions to Offerors, Section 20. Solicitation Provisions – Incorporated by Reference – general access is hereby amended to include the following:

- NREL Organization Conflicts of Interest Forms (as applicable)