Addendum #1

RFP Number: AA14-PR-4872

Title: Energy Master Plan

The attention of the bidders submitting proposals for AA14-PR-4872 is called to the following addendum to the specifications and drawings. The items set forth herein, whether of omission, addition, substitution, or clarifications, are all to be included in and form a part of the proposal submitted.

The number of this Addendum (1) must be referenced on the proposal.

Note: No MBE/WBE participation is required for the RFP

Energy Master Plan RFP #AA14-PR-4872 Questions

1. Will the study team have access to speak to WMECO during this project? Answer: Yes.

2. Are individual utilities metered at each existing building? Answer: Generally yes, for most of the buildings. For all buildings over 29,000 SF we meter electricity, steam and water.

3. To what extent have existing buildings had energy audits to date? Answer: Every building over 29,000 sq. ft. have had an energy audit within the last 10 years. For new project design, we require energy models for the buildings.

4. Do energy profiles exist for the new buildings listed as “under construction, in planning or design...”? Answer: Only new buildings within the last 5 years have energy models. All new buildings are required to meet a minimum of LEED Silver.

5. To what extent is energy auditing of existing buildings to be a part of this scope of works? Answer: This will not be part of the scope of work. However recommendations on which buildings should be audited could be part of the recommendations.

6. Is the MA DEP currently studying an anaerobic digestion facility adjacent to the campus? Will this study be available? Answer: Yes. The feasibility study will be made available to the successful vendor.
7. Can you provide additional information on existing fuel and energy contracts?  
   Answer: Yes, we can provide that information to the successful vendor.

8. Is there a preferred page limit for the submission?  
   Answer: No.

9. The University Contract for Services web link in Section IX did not appear to work. Could you reconfirm the link if the file differs from the “Contract for Services” included in Appendix C?  
   Answer: It should be working and the contract there is our standard long form contract.

10. How many buildings in total are included in the SOW?  
    Answer: There are approximately 200 major buildings on campus.

11. What is average sqft/bldg.?  
    Answer: Refer to Appendix B. We have approximately 200 major buildings that make up 11.3 million SF.

12. Can we get Appendix B details in Excel file?  
    Answer: Yes. It will be posted as an Excel file.

13. The ‘Discovery’ phase of SOW lists ‘Energy audit and benchmarking building EUI’. How many audits are envisioned? Are these to be ASHRAE Level 1, Level 2, Level 3 audits?  
    Answer: We would like the successful vendor to tell us which buildings should be audited and to what level.

14. Is benchmarking to be a comparison of UMA bldgs. to one another across bldg. types?  
    Benchmarking against peers? Against CBECS? How many bldgs to be benchmarked?  
    Answer: Benchmarking should be done for the largest 20 energy use buildings on campus. We are looking to the successful vendor to provide guidance on how we should do benchmarking.

15. What level of support can we expect from UMA Facilities Mgmt personnel in terms of ensuring timely access to bldgs. and their mechanical rooms? Can we expect that these personnel will have intimate knowledge of a particular bldg’s systems and operations?  
    Answer: Yes. We will provide access to buildings and personnel familiar with the building systems.

16. What are UMA’s investment criteria in terms of ROI, Simple Payback, etc? Different for renewable energy vs energy efficiency?  
    Answer: We use simple payback and look for 7 years or less. It has not been different for renewable energy vs energy efficiency.

17. RFP covers a very expansive SOW. What is the indicative budget for this work?  
    Answer: Maximum of $300,000.

18. The indicative period of performance of 4 – 6 months appears to be inconsistent with the expansive SOW. Does UMA have flexibility to set the project timeline to reasonably reflect the SOW?  
    Answer: Yes.

19. Does UMA currently have a campus-wide Energy Information Management System providing real-time data? Or at the other extreme, are real-time energy data available only at indiv bldg. level? Or most likely its somewhere in between?  
    Answer: Yes, Metasys. Real time data for our major buildings (over 29,000 SF).
20. Please describe current state of metering, submetering, centralized monitoring/control.
   Answer: Campus building information system monitors and controls all major buildings.

21. How does UMA currently apportion energy costs in indiv bldgs.?
   Answer: Revenue base operation like our auxiliary services, housing services and some athletic facilities utility costs are assessed based on building meters. For other buildings metering is only for internal use.

22. Page 8: Please indicate the number of buildings for which need to be energy audited? What is the deliverable? ASHRAE-I, II, or III? Answer: Refer to answers for questions 13 and 14.

23. Page 8: Is the retro-commissioning scope related to question 1 above? Do you require buildings to be energy audited and retro-commissioned? If so, how many? Answer: Refer to answers for questions 13 and 14.

24. Does the master planner own all coordination with the local utility company for rebates/incentives, including custom spreadsheets and applications? Answer: No.

25. Is metering data available for each building, to what extent (steam, condensate, chilled water, electric, potable water, sewer and storm) and in what format will it be provided?
   Answer: See answer to question 2. It is available for steam, water, electricity and chilled water. We don't have metering data for condensate, sewer and storm.

26. For water, sewer and stormwater study, what is the expected deliverable as it is not mentioned in the analysis section?
   Answer: We were supposed to receive a full blown detailed 3D model in GIS format, but do not know when that product will be delivered.

27. For steam and condensate system assessment, describe extent of survey effort already performed on UMA campus for current condition assessments, including infrared surveys.
   Answer: We do annual infrared surveys and we determine system losses with an excel spreadsheet analysis.

28. What utility systems are expected to be included in demand analysis? Answer: At a minimum, chilled water, steam, electrical and natural gas should be included.

29. Provide descriptions of current energy procurement contracts. Answer: We will provide this information to the successful vendor.

30. Provide budget range established for the expected fees to perform this comprehensive EMP study. Answer: Please refer to question 17.
31. Is there going to be a pre-bid meeting walkthrough?  
   Answer: No.

32. 2. Section “VI. Proposal Submission Requirements” of the RFP does not make mention of a Technical  
   Answer: See answer for question 33.

33. Proposal. Is a technical Proposal expected as part of this RFP?  
   Answer: We are looking to the bid responders to provide their recommendations for the need for a technical proposal.

34. What is the expected fee format (e.g. T&M, Lump Sum w/ technical proposal)?  
   Answer: Lump sum as defined by schedule of values submitted with the successful bidders work plan.

35. What are we expected to base our fees on (if a technical proposal is not expected)?  
   Answer: See question 34.

36. What are the proposed deliverables of this project? What is the expected format of these deliverables?  
   Answer: We are looking to the bid responders to provide the deliverables that will provide the most value to the University for the proposed scope of work.

37. Because deliverables are not specifically defined, all contractors may have very different proposals, how is the university prepared to compare the different consultants with different approaches to award the contract?  
   Answer: Please refer to Section VII. It is incumbent on the vendors to make the case why their proposal is going to provide the best value to the University.

38. Is the awarded contractor expected to perform, analyze or create all of the items on the list labeled “Scope of Work” on pages 8 & 9 of the RFP? Which of them are expected?  
   Answer: “Scope of Work” on pages 8 & 9 are meant only as a guideline. We are looking to the vendors to use their expertise to provide us with the best scope of work to meet our needs as defined in the background section.

39. Is the intent to perform a comprehensive energy analysis of the entire site, energy audits and load analyses for every individually listed building, and look into every type of alternative or renewable energy? Is the intent for the contractor only to review existing reports and studies already performed? Is it a mix of the two?  
   Answer: See answer to question 38.

40. The 4-6 month timeline, listed on page 10, seems very short. Is the awarded contractor only expected to review pre-existing studies and reports and not perform any site visit analyses, designs, or studies of their own?  
   Answer: See answer to question 18.

41. For pre-existing reports, what is expected of the consultant for the “review” of it? How much detail is expected?  
   Answer: Complete review for all pertinent details.
42. If while reviewing designs errors become apparent, things are determined outdated, or there are reasons for questionable accuracy, is it the awarded contractor’s responsibility to fix errors, redesign, or disregard the report? Answer: Note the errors, provide summary of value of report, but no need to fix errors.

43. What is expected concerning project qualifications? How many write-ups are expected? Answer: Refer to Section VII.

44. I also wanted to confirm that you do NOT want the submission in a DSB form. Answer: No. The submission should not be on a DSB form.

45. Would you provide the last one to three years of hourly data for
   1. total water consumption?  2. total steam consumption?  3. total electrical consumption?
   Answer: We can provide daily data, but not hourly. This data will be provided to the successful vendor.

47. The sample contract seems to be for design and construction service and not necessarily apply to this type of consulting work (e.g. reimbursement schedule has construction milestones). Does the university intend to use a construction contract for these consulting services? Can a sample consulting services contract be provided for review? Answer: See question 9.

48. Are there any incumbent energy consultant firms with expertise in audits, finance, and master planning? Answer: Yes, this information will be provided to the successful vendor.

49. What consultant(s) did the University contracted with to develop the Campus Master Plan? Answer: Wilson Architects, Ayers St. Gross, VHB, Tighe and Bond.

50. What firm(s) developed the design documents for the CHP Plant? Answer: Vanderweil Engineers, Boston, MA.

51. We believe the scope of work may be best delivered through a team approach. Can the list of potential bidders be provided? Answer: This is an open public bid process so we have no way of knowing who the potential bidders are.

52. What is the anticipated budget allocation for the development of the Energy Master Plan? Answer: Refer to question 17.

End of Addendum 1 – John O. Martin, Director of Procurement