



The following questions have been posed by Commissioners prior to the scheduled Board Meeting on October 3, 2023. Staff responses are included below and are sorted by Agenda topic.

#### Consent Calendar

##### CONTRACTS

**Conсор North America, Inc. – for Engineering Services for Two New 7.5-million-gallon (MG) Storage Tanks, and Associated Pipelines, at the EWEB College Hill Site – (KELLEY/MASTERS)** The past contract with this firm for the E. 40th project was submitted for \$400,000 and the final cost was \$1,230,000 which was almost three times the cost. Can that be expanded, and if E. 40th was \$1.2 million how can they expect to do Collage Hill – as that seems to me to be a more challenging site for \$1.0 million?

*RESPONSE:* Thank you for sending your questions in advance Commissioner Barofsky. I too wondered the same thing and talked with the project manager, Laura Farthing, about this.

*The original scope of work for the E. 40th site included the design of a single tank only and the bid received from MSA (now Conсор) was for \$400,000. Once the decision was made to build both tanks at one time, the scope was expanded to include design of the second tank, conduct a Triple Bottom Line (TBL) analysis for the placement of the tanks on the property, and add full time daily inspection services throughout the entire construction period. The added scope of work totaled up to the additional \$830,000.*

*Given the College Hill tanks are intended to be very similar to the E. 40th tanks, we did expect this bid to be lower overall since some of the design work can be repeated. In addition, we intend to build these new tanks in the same footprint of the existing tanks, so we do not believe a TBL is necessary for tank placement. This is why the College Hill bid is lower overall than the total for E. 40th engineering services.*

*Please let us know if you have additional questions.*

**Mason, Bruce & Girard – for an increase to existing contract for Forest Management Services – (KELLEY/KRENTZ)** Please explain why we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to kill perfectly healthy trees for habitat since the recent wildfires created thousands of dead trees and habitat in our powerline corridor that this contract is trying to mimic. I suspect the criteria for habitat creation was developed long before the recent wildfires.

*RESPONSE:* There has been a miscommunication about this contract amendment. Staff originally prepared it for the September Board meeting, but it was pulled because of the fire. Given the fire impacts, we need to reevaluate the work. We did not intend for it to be in the October Board packet.

*Standing snags, dead wood debris, and early seral habitat are requirements of EWEB's FERC license. Creating this type of habitat along the transmission line has the added benefit of removing trees tall enough to hit the line in storm events. Certainly, the fire has created a lot of snags and fallen large wood, but the situation on the ground needs to be assessed before we can determine how that impacts EWEB's license requirements. The assessment work will be done this fall once there is full access to the T-line. EWEB will likely then need to work with the Settlement Parties to confirm what is needed going forward.*

*Apologies for the confusion on this. Let us know if you have any questions.*