

## ADDENDUM #22

**KITSAP TRANSIT**  
**Request for Proposals**  
***Bow Loading Ferry Vessel Design Build***  
**RFP #KT 17-559**  
**May 18, 2018**

60 Washington Ave. Ste.  
200  
Bremerton, WA 98337  
Phone: 360.479.6962  
Fax: 360.377.7086

[www.kitsaptransit.org](http://www.kitsaptransit.org)



### **Clarification, Additions, Revisions and Corrections:**

**Revise:** Answer #1 of Addendum #21 as follows:

**Answer #1:** Kitsap Transit is working on an answer to this question. The answer will be released by ~~May 18, 2018~~ May 22, 2018.

### **Questions Asked and Answers Provided:**

**Question #1:** In the interest of reducing delivery lead times and project risk, and with clear understanding that sole responsibility for all contract performance resides with the prime contractor, would Kitsap Transit allow a bidder to sufficiently revise the original build plan submitted in prequalification Step 1 in order to team with a well-qualified subcontractor partner to handle a significant portion of the overall production work? Would a change of this magnitude result in rejection of a Step 2 proposal submitted?

**Answer #1:** Proposals that deviate from the original approach offered in Step 1 will not be rejected for the deviation if the deviation maintains the same level of quality, Contractor/Subcontractor integrity and overall proposal value. Proposers should provide enough information in accordance with Appendix A of Step 2 Section II 4 c. Build Plan and Proposed Vessel Delivery/Acceptance Schedule to demonstrate these requirements.

**Question #2:** Freeboard requirement: 000-1 states: "Forward loading area and both side doors shall be between 7' 6" and 8'- 0" at all loading conditions" Answer to question #3 states: "This will result in a reaction of about 13,000 pounds upon the boat if the hydraulics are relaxed"  
A 13000 lb load on the foredeck may significantly affect freeboard. Should the freeboard requirement of 7' 6" to 8' be achieved with, or without the load of the ramp?

**Answer #2:** The freeboard does not need to remain within the range when the bowloading ramp is being used.

**Question #3:** Designing the freeboard to remain within 6" between lightship and fully laden at the stern and the bow at the same time is already concerning – will this also have to be achieved considering the ramp load?

## ADDENDUM #22

**Answer #3:** See answer #2

**Question #4:** Vertical acceleration: 79-5. Previously it stated “Vertical accelerations -0.2g RMS measured in the Pilothouse” [Note  $0.2g = 1.96 \text{ m/s}^2$ ] Now it states: “Vertical Acceleration shall not exceed  $0.5\text{m/s}^2$  RMS at all locations in the passenger cabin”

- a. This is a 4x reduction of the allowed acceleration
- b. Furthermore, this now covers the complete passenger area. The seating in the forward area of the maindeck will have ~30% larger accelerations than the pilothouse, which raise the criteria by a total factor of more than 5.

Is this the intention of this amendment? If so, this may be impossible to achieve

**Answer #4:** Yes, this is an increased requirement due to the shipyard requested motion sickness index acceptance criteria. Motion control systems are acceptable.

**Question #5:** Trim tabs: 561-2 TRIM TABS Provide hydraulically or electrically operated trim tabs with trim tab control on the pilothouse console. Trim tabs are to be sized to trim the Vessel  $2^\circ$  from running-trim in such a way as to permit minimizing wake wash at service speed. Will interceptors be an acceptable alternative to trim tabs? Interceptors are far more effective. Also, with quad jets there will be no space to fit trim tabs.

**Answer #5:** Yes, interceptors are acceptable.

**All other terms and conditions remain the same.**

END ADDENDUM 22