

Western Inter-States Hydrogen Hub WISHH Prime Contractor Request for Proposals

Q&A

Posting Date: August 10, 2022

Q1. It appears that Part 3 of the SOW is focused on facilitation, coordination, and writing of the proposal. Other work would be outside the scope of this proposal. Is this a correct interpretation?

A1: Correct. Part 3a also includes the continued refinement of the project portfolio and network initiated in Parts 1 and 2. Note, subsequently the prime contractor team would manage and implement the project portfolio and network of physical projects if future DOE funding were to be awarded for project engineering and implementation.

Q2. Cost Breakdown

Q2.a: The cost breakdown section appears to be geared towards time and materials contracts. Is this the only acceptable pricing structure?

A2.a : The cost breakdown should be for all materials and services for at least 12 months **and** a not-to-exceed monthly amount. Also, include a proposed cost structure for **both** 1) work performed at risk prior to the proposal receiving DOE funding (the On-board, Concept Paper, and Proposal Development), and 2) payment commencing upon engagement.

Q2.b It only mentions parts 1&2 potentially being performed “at risk”. Does this mean that part 3 would not be performed “at risk” and would be paid regardless of whether DOE funding is secured?

A2.b: If you are proposing an “at risk” cost approach, then Parts 1, 2 and 3 should be presented as an “at risk” cost proposal. Or you may propose a cost structure that includes hourly costs for service and materials, etc., with a not-to-exceed monthly amount. Note that after DOE funding is received then service, materials, travel and other justifiable expenses are eligible for reimbursement for either cost model. Regardless of either approach, both cost models should have a not-to-exceed monthly amount.

Q2.c: We should include estimated pricing and cost breakdown for Part 4 Phase 1 but do not need to include any pricing estimates for any subsequent work. Is this correct?

A2.c: Correct. The Cost Breakdown should be for at least 12 months, and at a minimum should include the cost for prime contracting during the process of Onboarding, Planning and Preparation of the coalition, in addition to preparing a Concept Paper and subsequently preparing the Full Proposal if encouraged by DOE. Note that the work for Part 4 is contingent on further guidance from the DOE.

Note: This refers to Part 4 – Hydrogen Hub Planning, Development, Construction & Operation. (see Correction issued and posted on August 1, 2022)

Q2.d. Besides our pricing, is there anything else we need to include in the cost breakdown?

A2.d: Include a not-to-exceed monthly amount for at least 12 months, and your proposed approach to compensation for managing a hub during the multi-year period of DOE funding. Note the RFP is asking you to propose two different cost structures: what it would cost if it was 100% at risk prior to receiving DOE funding vs. if you were paid as you go.

Q3. It appears that a “board” comprised of representatives from each state agency will be the decision-making party for this work, and the State of Wyoming through WEA will be the contracting party for the prime contractor. Is this correct, and can you clarify how operational management will be handled among the state participants?

A3: Correct, WEA will be the contracting party. Regarding operational management, refer to the Scope of Work - Part 1 that states it is the role of the prime contractor to propose a management structure for the WISHH coalition.

Q4. Are you able to share a list of RANGE participants or industry partners who have signed on to participate in WISHH?

A4: The contacts for RANGE are:

- Maury Dobbie, RANGE Operational Lead. (Executive Director, Colorado Energy Research Collaboratory): Maury.Dobbie@rangecollaborative.org
- Dr. Bryan Willson, RANGE Project Manager. (Executive Director CSU Energy Institute, Presidential Chair in Energy Innovation, Professor, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering): Bryan.Willson@rangecollaborative.org

Q5. Does winning this contract preclude the prime contractor or teaming partners from other contracting opportunities or self-performing activities such as environmental, NEPA, EJ, community engagement, etc. for any phases of the work or implementation of WISHH once a DOE grant is awarded? Does winning this contract preclude the prime contractor or teaming partners from working with other potential hydrogen hubs?

Q5.a: Does winning this contract preclude the prime contractor or teaming partners from working with other potential hydrogen hubs?

A5.a: Winning the prime contract would not per se prohibit the prime contractor/teaming partners from working on other potential hydrogen hubs; however, under such scenarios the prime contractor and any teaming partners working on the WISHH hub would be expected to provide dedicated teams that are not assigned to or aware of work on other hydrogen hub efforts.

Q5.b: Does winning this contract preclude the prime contractor or teaming partners from other contracting opportunities or self-performing activities such as environmental, NEPA, EJ, community engagement, etc. for any phases of the work or implementation of WISHH once a DOE grant is awarded?

A5.b: Without a more specific scenario, it is hard to definitively answer these questions. As stated above, winning the prime contract would not per se prohibit the prime contractor/teaming partners from other work. We would anticipate that any potential conflicts associated with such other work would be evaluated and addressed consistent with applicable laws/conflicts of interest requirements (see e.g., answer regarding work on other hydrogen hubs).