



# METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY

## RFP-19-11458 Live Fire Training Facility Improvements

June 17, 2019

### Questions and Answers

**Notice:** Questions may have been edited for clarity and relevance.

1. **Question:** Task 5 of the Statement of Work calls for the supply of a PA-28 Aircraft Simulator. Can you please provide a complete list of physical and salient characteristic for this prop (by which any proposed equivalent will be evaluated).

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3

2. **Question:** Will we be allowed to visit the site to inspect the simulator and associated buildings? Is so, how can we make arrangements to send 2-3 people to the training facility?

**Answer:** Site visit took place following the pre-proposal meeting on May 29<sup>th</sup>.

3. **Question:** The schedule award of the project is in September with three and half month project duration. This will require temperature sensitive construction to occur in the winter months including roofing, caulking, concrete, and waterproofing trades. Is there flexibility in the schedule to complete weather sensitive items in the spring?

**Answer:** Portions of work not directly related to the operations of the training facility and will not interfere with training may be evaluated for weather sensitive installation. Items that are architectural in nature to the control building can be recommended and evaluated for later install.

4. **Question:** The RFP states thermocouples need to be inspected and evaluated for repair/replacement. Should we assume 25% replacement as we are for the fuel spill burners, or only price inspection/assessment?

**Answer:** No.

5. **Question:** After attending the site visit on 29-May-19 and reviewing the Statement of Work in detail, there are no tasks or sub-tasks that explicitly require design work (most of the tasks are simply repairing or replacing what has already been installed).

It is common in the fire training industry that this type of work is not solicited as design-build, but simply through bids or proposals. The addition requirements included by the current design-build RFP do not appear to provide the Authority the best-value approach (as an extreme example – it does not seem practical to require a contractor to submit 60%, 90%, 100% drawings as well as specs and

related documentation signed by a PE for simply replacing a handful of damaged ceiling tiles (ref task 4.2)

As such, we respectfully ask that the Authority consider:

- a. Changing this procurement from Design-Build to simply an RFP,
- b. Specifically identify which of the 22 subtasks require design, and/or
- c. Remove or adjust the need for the contractor to include an A/E in the proposal

**Answer:** There will be no changes to the format selected.

6. **Question:** On page 4 of Attachment 01 it the RFP states that: The Airports Authority will make available its files of documents related to existing conditions. Is it possible for the Authority to provide access to these documents prior to the submission of our offer?

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

7. **Question:** Is the Contractor expected to: A. Propose a solution that results in a system that is 100% operational, or B. Simply complete the 22 subtasks as identified in the SOW? And depending on the answer to this question, we respectfully request the opportunity to ask follow-on questions.

**Answer:** The purpose of this RFP is to make the facility operational. The Authority finds A and B above to be synonymous, and not an either/or. Question period has closed.

8. **Question:** Can you please advise if any FAA AIP or PFC funds are planning to be used for this project?

**Answer:** No funds of these types are being used.

9. **Question:** Per The RFP, the Technical Evaluation Criteria includes 5 Factors, none of which appear to evaluate the Offeror's proposed technical solution. It is typical in the fire trainer industry that the offeror's proposed technical solution is the primary (and often only) technical criteria. For example – The proposed methodology by which an offeror plans to upgrade the software for the Fuel Spill Operator Workstation seems especially relevant for a Technical Evaluation, but at the moment, this is not one of the Factors. We therefore ask that the Authority reconsider the Technical Evaluation Factors and include the Offeror's proposed technical solution as one of them.

**Answer:** The Technical Evaluation Criteria will remain the same.

10. **Question:** During the site visit many details of the Mobile Aircraft Trainer (Task 5) were discussed and provided by the end-user of the equipment, including configuration, overall size, fuel type, tank size, etc. Can you please provide the revised specifications for this Trainer?

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

11. **Question:** During the site visit it was suggested that the submission of an approved equal for the Mobile Aircraft Trainer (Task 5) would take place after the award of the contract. Can you please confirm the timing of when alternative products can be offered? If this is to take place prior to the submission of proposals, we request that a minimum of 14-days is allowed to prepare the submission (once the full technical details of the prop are provided).

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

12. **Question:** Based on the configuration of the LPG tank relief valve, the tank will need to be emptied prior to this work being completed. Can you please confirm if the MWAA will take responsibility for the emptying (and re-filling) of the tank?

**Answer:** MWAA will empty the tank. No price inclusion necessary in the contractor's bid.

13. **Question:** The Project Schedule in the RFP only allows for a 40 day period from the final approval of documents until the completion of the project. This does not seem to consider for the procurement of long-lead items (expected up to 10-15 weeks). Is it acceptable for the offeror to propose a revised project schedule?

**Answer:** Offeror's proposed project schedule is acceptable to the Authority for review and consideration. However, provide justification explaining the reason for schedule revision proposal.

14. **Question:** Tasks 2.8 and 4.1 require that system be inspected/evaluated for repairs, but do not call for the repairs to be done. Can you please confirm that these repairs are not to be included by the offeror?

**Answer:** Repairs are part of the RFP.

15. **Question:** Task 1.3 describes work to be done on the vapor shut-off valves at the tank. Can you please confirm that this work is not to include the liquid shut-off valves?

**Answer:** Yes – work is not to include the liquid shut-off valves.

16. **Question:** Task 2.5 requires that the contractor "Replace PLC with vendor support". Can you please clarify what 'vendor support' is meant to describe?

**Answer:** Authority is requesting for equipment that is available for vendor service/maintenance and product support.

17. **Question:** Can you please confirm that for Task 2.5, the contractor is required to replace the PLC CPU, all of the PLC I/O Cards, all supporting equipment, as well as a new and/or modified PLC software package to operate the system?

**Answer:** Yes

18. **Question:** Can you also please confirm that all HMI and PLC software licenses, passwords, access codes, and source code are required to be provided to MWAA without limitation?

**Answer:** Yes

19. **Question:** Based on the number of clarifications submitted, we respectfully request an extension of the proposal closing date of 30 days to allow for sufficient time for MWAA to respond to the clarification and for bidders to incorporate the responses into their proposal.

**Answer:** Refer to Amendment No. 2 – Proposal submission extended to June 26, 2019.

20. **Question:** Is this an acceptable alternate to the Alpine Metal Tech PA-28 small aircraft? Please see specs below.

**Manufacturer/Model Number:** KFT Fire Trainer/ O-100 Cessna

**Transport Mode:** L: 16.1' x W: 7.1' x H: 7.5'

Training Mode: L: 26.75' x W: 32' x H: 7.5'

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

21. **Question:** Is this an acceptable alternate to the Alpine Metal Tech PA 28 aircraft simulator?  
Please see specs below.

Manufacturer / Model Number: KFT Fire Trainer/ O-100 Helo (UH-60)

Transport Mode: L: 24' x W: 7' x H: 8.9'

Training Mode: L: 30.3' x W: 7' x H: 8.9'

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

22. **Question:** Please confirm if any of the options below are required for the fire trainer?

- a. Engine
- b. Passenger/cargo area
- c. Wheel
- d. Fuel spill
- e. 3-D/Running Fuel Spill
- f. Cockpit

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

23. **Question:** What is the available well water capacity in gpm to refill the water cistern?

**Answer:** 20,000 gallons

24. **Question:** Please make available drawings of the existing control building and existing gas distribution system.

**Answer:** Refer to question/answer no. six (6).

25. **Question:** Will the existing Cistern be emptied prior to the bid to allow for access and assessment of leaks, or is the initial scope of this RFP to price out emptying and assessing the tank after award to determine what type of leaks if any exist? This would be with the understanding that any remediation costs would be outside of the initial scope of work.

**Answer:** Yes, MWAA will empty.

26. **Question:** Please confirm that the scope of repairs to the cistern is minimal grouting and patching of cracks and applying waterproofing to the entire inside surface. If structural deterioration is discovered during the evaluation it will be considered a change of scope.

**Answer:** The scope is to provide repairs to existing as necessary to ensure leakage correction.

27. **Question:** Is it possible to extend the RFI deadline until Wednesday June 5th at 3:00 PM?

**Answer:** Refer to question/answer no. nine (9).

28. **Question:** We have been informed by Alpine Metal Tech that they will not be providing pricing to anybody bidding on this project. Please confirm?

**Answer:** Refer to revised SOW for mobile aircraft trainer requirements-Amendment No. 3.

29. **Question:** Please provide the capacity of the existing heat pump serving the control building. And please confirm that rightsizing analysis of the heat pump is not required.

**Answer:** Refer to the record drawings uploaded to the advertisement posting.

30. **Question:** Task 1, Item 2; Please provide the cistern tank size (HxWxD), including elevation of bottom and top and invert of drain piping in the tank.

**Answer:** Refer to the record drawings uploaded to with Amendment No. 3.

31. **Question:** Under Task 1 Item 1 there is a description that the existing Fire Pump does not maintain pressure. Please clarify if pump loses pressure immediately at the start of the test or while the test is 5-10 minutes under way.

**Answer:** Pump has a hard time at the start.

32. **Question:** Can the Past Experience criteria (Attachment 02, Factor 2, item 2) be adjusted from:

Submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) relevant design-build construction projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience on design-build construction projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the solicitation. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant design-build construction project is further defined as one that involves various types of new construction or renovation of facilities, such as fire training center, and buildings with mechanical systems and is a firm fixed priced project with a cost above \$1 million.

**To:**

Submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) relevant ~~design-build construction~~ projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience on ~~design-build construction~~ projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the solicitation. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant ~~design-build construction~~ project is further defined as one that involves various types of ~~new construction~~ or renovation of facilities, such as fire training center, and buildings with mechanical systems and is a firm fixed priced project with a cost above ~~\$1 million.~~\$350K.

**Answer:** There will be no changes to the format selected.