

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
<p>The 3-5 year development term is unrealistic given schedule risks associated with NEPA process, environmental mitigation efforts, BPA coordination which is well known for severe interconnection study delays, and Tribal nation coordination/consultation. In particular, given that BPA is currently undergoing queue reform and all active BPA requests at POI's within or immediately adjacent to the Hanford Site were submitted in 2022 later, more time is likely needed on project development. 5-7 years would be a better range than 3-5 years given the situation and uncertainty around interconnection and when the current projects in the queue will be studied and when a future window will open.</p> <p>The industry is also currently facing long lead times for large equipment procurement. DOE could support a shorter development timeline if it expedites the BPA interconnection study process and NEPA process for the site.</p>	<p>While DOE acknowledges the development period is ambitious, DOE also considers the time frame as feasible, it is subject to negotiation and could be extended if necessary due to legitimate delays or time needed to complete applicable regulatory processes. Given those flexibilities, DOE does not plan to revise the durations in the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>The draft RFQ states "All operations are expected to cease in time for the project owner to complete the activities needed to restore the site to its present condition prior to the completion of EM's cleanup mission, including the removal of all facilities, equipment, and waste associated with the project." What is EM's current estimated timeline for completion of its mission at Hanford? That will be key for understanding the lease duration, potential PPA durations, and financial modeling for the project.</p>	<p>The DOE Hanford cleanup lifecycle extends beyond the anticipated realty agreement period. DOE currently anticipates completing cleanup activities at the Hanford Site in the 2078-2091 timeframe (From the DOE EM Strategic Vision 2023).</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>Will the Government provide the proposed Realty Agreement documentation with the release of the Final RFQ for review/questions/comments?</p>	<p>Yes, DOE intends to provide the draft realty agreement with (or soon after) release of the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>The definition of "carbon pollution-free electricity" does not include energy storage, nor does the description of the type of facility being considered for a realty agreement. In addition to a 200+ MW CFE generation facility, could the proposed project include some form of battery storage alongside electrical generation?</p>	<p>Yes, energy storage is consistent with the goal of this initiative and up to offerors to consider in their proposals. DOE's goal is to develop CFE and energy storage projects on this land.</p>
<p>DOE is considering major, consequential changes to the landscape at Hanford. These changes will impact people all over the Northwest. DOE should solicit comment in a more transparent fashion. The expectations laid out in the Draft RFQ offer important information that can assist both potential developers and the public in understanding whether the objectives of the Cleanup to Clean Energy program are achievable and appropriate, and whether Energy is establishing sufficient protections to reduce negative impacts to communities while protecting the Government from risk. Please change your approach to accept comments in multiple formats, and please also plan to offer responses to public comments publicly.</p>	<p>DOE will consider comments on the Draft RFQ when preparing the Final RFQ. Further, DOE intends to post its responses to Draft RFQ comments to provide timely information back to interested Offerors. DOE will request and review comments/questions on the Final RFQ and post responses to the website.</p> <p>In addition to the opportunity to comment on the Draft and Final RFQs, other opportunities for public comment and participation are likely to be available during applicable regulatory review processes such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and federal and state permitting.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>DOE should recognize the inadequacy of Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). The Draft RFQ states, "The southern industrial area of the Hanford Site was established as part of the Hanford Site Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), under DOE/EIS-0222 Record of Decision (64 FR 61615; November 12, 1999). "The CLUP is outdated, and it should not be relied upon. ..., the CLUP is not the only relevant document about potential future use of the Hanford site.</p>	<p>DOE previously issued its Record of Decision for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and the implementing procedures in chapter 6 of the associated EIS to guide land use decisions at Hanford for the period of time the land remains in DOE control. The proposed land use would not extend beyond the period of DOE control of these lands. Over 300 square miles of Hanford Site lands are managed for preservation purposes under the CLUP and in accordance with provisions of the Hanford Reach National Monument Proclamation. While the CLUP designated lands for Industrial uses, the Department is fully committed to continue to engage in tribal consultation as appropriate and in accordance with regulatory processes such as the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act in consideration of proposed clean energy projects, as appropriate.</p>
<p>Under Section 1c, the Executive Summary describes how companies may seek to enter into agreements with Energy for "financing, permitting, developing, constructing, installing, owning, maintaining and operating a carbon pollution-free electricity (CFE) generation facility and such conduits, lines, wiring, electrical systems, interconnection facilities, and other ancillary facilities and equipment reasonably required for the installation, maintenance, and operation of a 200+ MW CFE generation facility and its interconnection with the local public electric utility system for private and/or public use and operation." This description should include decommissioning and removal of all waste material as well as restoration of the site. Decommissioning and restoration are important for meeting key objectives, including to "enter into a realty agreement for use of the Property in a manner that minimizes risk to the Government." The Government has expressed elsewhere in the document that decommissioning and restoration would be required, and so it would make</p>	<p>Decommissioning and restoration responsibilities of selected projects are important, required, and captured in the RFQ and considered in the factors for consideration. The obligation will also be captured in any final realty agreement. Decommissioning activities will be added to the Executive Summary, as suggested.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>sense to include this expectation in the Executive Summary, as well.</p>	
<p>Five years is likely insufficient to complete development of a project in this environment, including permitting and interconnection studies.</p>	<p>While DOE acknowledges the development period is ambitious, DOE also considers the time frame as feasible, it is subject to negotiation and could be extended if necessary due to legitimate delays or time needed to complete applicable regulatory processes. Given those flexibilities, DOE does not plan to revise the durations in the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>The draft RFQ notes an expected operations period of 30-40 years with potential renewal periods. What are the renewal period durations? What is the expected maximum realty agreement duration?</p>	<p>DOE has not established specific renewal periods at this time, this will be dependent on the project type, needs, performance, and continued consideration of the DOE mission at the site. DOE currently anticipates completing cleanup activities at the Hanford Site in the 2078-2091 timeframe (From the DOE EM Strategic Vision 2023), and the realty agreement will not extend beyond this timeframe.</p>
<p>What is implied by the following statement? What are the requirements for the project owner? Is this regarding temporary construction facilities and equipment? "All operations are expected to cease in time for the project owner to complete the activities needed to restore the site to its present condition prior to the completion of EM's cleanup mission, including the removal of all facilities, equipment, and waste associated with the project."</p>	<p>DOE expects the owner of the CFE project(s) sited in accordance with this solicitation to restore the land to its present condition within a reasonable time after the CFE project ends. That time is expected to be prior to the end of the active cleanup mission at the site. DOE currently anticipates completing cleanup activities at the Hanford Site in the 2078-2091 timeframe (From the DOE EM Strategic Vision 2023).</p>
<p>If NEPA must be completed for each iteration or phase of the project, doing so will be burdensome and will likely impact the anticipated realty agreement period durations.</p>	<p>The scope and timing of NEPA review and completion will depend on the project(s) selected for further analysis.</p>
<p>Please provide clarification on what is planned for each phase in terms of additional acreage, timing, etc.</p>	<p>DOE has determined that it will evaluate proposals for the land without limiting what may be considered within the identified acreage.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>The results of the radiology report and environmental survey when available will be essential in determining project viability. Renewable energy companies conduct hydro, geotech, wetlands, and ALTA surveys for all new projects, but the Hanford site has a history of nuclear activities and an added layer of complexity from a typical greenfield site. Any information the DOE can provide regarding the history of nuclear activities, radiation on the site, and next steps regarding radiation safety, waste management, and ongoing cleanup layers can help a qualified proposer fully understand the scope of risks present at the site and if these risks can be properly assessed/mitigated. At a minimum, a Phase I ESA report and any additional site studies that have been conducted would assist in our review of historical contamination and associated development risks.</p>	<p>DOE has posted available and relevant Hanford Site environmental information to the Cleanup to Clean Energy initiative website. DOE’s current understanding is that the lands that have been preliminarily identified to support the initiative either have not been used for active Hanford Site operations or any necessary remedial actions have been completed. Nevertheless, DOE will need to complete additional activities to characterize the property for industrial use. DOE will provide additional information on the lands under consideration for CFE proposals as part of the Final RFQ. DOE will also provide documentation of radiological characterization information and ASTM compliant Environmental Site Assessment reviews of the property once these processes, which are currently underway, are complete.</p>
<p>Any surveys, studies, reports, and associated GIS files would greatly assist interested parties in assessing site viability for clean energy projects. Examples of surveys and studies include Hydro Studies, Geotech Studies, Wetlands/Waterbodies Surveys, ALTA surveys, and any documents associated with the burial sites, onsite hazards, or remediated areas. If there are any capped or un-capped landfills onsite beyond what was disclosed in the encumbrances outline, that will be essential to understand as landfills and landfill caps are limited as far as the type and weight of equipment that they can support.</p>	<p>DOE has posted available and relevant Hanford Site environmental information to the Cleanup to Clean Energy initiative website. DOE’s current understanding is that the lands that have been preliminarily identified to support the initiative either have not been used for active Hanford Site operations or any necessary remedial actions have been completed. Nevertheless, DOE will need to complete additional activities to characterize the property for industrial use. DOE will provide additional information on the lands under consideration for CFE proposals as part of the Final RFQ. DOE will also provide documentation of radiological characterization information and ASTM compliant Environmental Site Assessment reviews of the property once these processes, which are currently underway, are complete.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>Remediation of any discovered hazards or hazardous materials should be the responsibility of DOE</p>	<p>DOE remains responsible for remediation of conditions that existed prior to the execution of a realty agreement or that are a result of DOE, or predecessor agency, activities. DOE will prepare an ASTM compliant Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) covering the project property. The ESA will contain existing environmental information on past or current storage, release, treatment or disposal of hazardous substances or petroleum products on the project property. Response action responsibility for environmental conditions described in the ESA remains with DOE. The ESA will form the basis for allocating environmental clean-up responsibilities between DOE and the Selectee. Prior to commencement of the construction term, DOE will provide a representation and warranty that, based on the ESA, all remediation action necessary to protect human health and the environment with respect to hazardous substances (as defined in 42 U.S.C. 9601(14) and including radionuclides) on the property has been taken, is currently on going, or is being monitored. If, after the execution date of a realty agreement, any additional remedial action for conditions existing before the execution of the realty agreement are found to be necessary, it shall be conducted by and at the expense of DOE. DOE will retain all rights of access and ownership to conduct environmental remediation action or corrective action on the project property.</p> <p>The Selectee will perform its own due diligence assessment of the ESA and must state in writing that it accurately describes the extent of DOE's clean-up responsibility. DOE and Selectee will conduct a mutual inspection in order to document the physical condition of the project property. Selectee will accept the project property "as is." DOE and its contractors make no warranty to Offeror/Selectee regarding either the condition of the property or its suitability for the proposed project use. Accepting the project property "as is" does not relieve any responsibility of DOE for environmental conditions caused by activities of DOE, or predecessor agency of DOE, occurring before the execution of the realty agreement.</p>
---	--

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>The description of Energy Northwest lease holds is not correct. Please revise to read, "Energy Northwest retains a long-term lease for the construction and operation of the Columbia Generating Station (CGS or WNP-2) and restoration and limited re-use of the site of the partially constructed WNP-1 and WNP-4."</p>	<p>DOE will revise Appendix A for the Final RFQ to address the comment.</p>
<p>A discussion should be added regarding Energy Northwest's responsibilities under 10 CFR 50. Specifically, please add the following discussion: In addition to the 1.2 miles exclusion area, Energy Northwest is required to evaluate the potential effects of nearby industrial facilities (e.g., manufacturing plants, chemical plants, commercial chemical storage facilities) and hazardous chemicals located within a 5-mile radius of the site. Hazardous chemicals of interest are listed in Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulatory Guide 1.78 Revision 1, "Evaluating the Habitability of a Nuclear Power Plant Control Room During a Postulated Hazardous Chemical Release."</p>	<p>DOE will revise Appendix A for the Final RFQ to address the comment.</p>
<p>Does this apply to the radiation check? Is respondent supposed to hire their own radiation specialized safety experts? Would government personnel need to monitor all activities at all times?</p>	<p>DOE has posted available and relevant Hanford Site environmental information to the Cleanup to Clean Energy initiative website. DOE's current understanding is that the lands that have been preliminarily identified to support the initiative either have not been used for active Hanford Site operations or any necessary remedial actions have been completed. Nevertheless, DOE will need to complete additional activities to characterize the property for industrial use. DOE will provide additional information on the lands under consideration for CFE proposals as part of the Final RFQ. DOE will also provide documentation of radiological characterization information and ASTM compliant Environmental Site Assessment review of the property once these processes, which are currently underway, are complete.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>When will this be completed? Will respondent be responsible for pricing without knowing when or if the developer would be responsible?</p>	<p>DOE anticipates this process being concluded during the first period of an agreement that allows for due diligence on both sides.</p>
<p>Providing a sample lease agreement or a list of key terms that a lease must include for legal review would be helpful.</p>	<p>DOE intends to post the draft realty agreement for information purposes with (or soon after) the Final RFQ. The draft realty agreement will be subject to change, as required, to address requirements and conditions resulting from regulatory reviews, including, for example, National Historic Preservation Act and National Environmental Policy Act.</p>
<p>The General Realty Agreement Requirements are clear. It would be helpful to list if there are any strict requirements that are non-negotiable and cannot be amended during the negotiation period.</p>	<p>Noted. DOE will consider the comment in preparing the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>The developer must also maintain the right to terminate the realty agreement during the development phase, in the event that permitting, or interconnection requirements prove to be too detrimental to the economic viability of the project. What would be our ability to terminate the lease agreement during the development period of an agreement?</p>	<p>DOE intends to post the draft realty agreement for information purposes with (or soon after) the Final RFQ. The draft realty agreement will be subject to changes. DOE intends to have an initial period for project “development” in the draft realty agreement. During the development period, the Selectee will diligently pursue all permits, complete design work and other project requirements, and obtain needed approvals required to commence construction of the project. If any of the project requirements are not completed by expiration of the development period, then either DOE or selectee may terminate the realty agreement within a specified time for submitting a written notice.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>An option to lease is typically used in this situation while developing and derisking the project from a permitting and interconnection standpoint. Would we be able to treat the initial development and permitting period as an option period with corresponding rents as we would typically do with a private landowner?</p>	<p>DOE intends to post the draft realty agreement for information purposes with (or soon after) the Final RFQ. The draft realty agreement will be subject to changes. DOE intends to have an initial period for project “development” in the draft realty agreement. During the development period, the Selectee will diligently pursue all permits, complete design work and other project requirements, and obtain needed approvals required to commence construction of the project. If any of the project requirements are not completed by expiration of the development period, then either DOE or selectee may terminate the realty agreement within a specified time for submitting a written notice. The intent of the realty agreement Development Period is as indicated, to develop and de-risk the project. Offerors are able to propose rental considerations as they see fit and provide justification accordingly.</p>
<p>The developer must retain the right to assign the realty agreement without requiring DOE approval in order to facilitate finance ability. If this is not acceptable, please provide the reasons under which DOE can withhold approval of assignment must be limited.</p>	<p>DOE intends to post the draft realty agreement with (or soon after) the Final RFQ, which includes additional information. However, the right to assign is allowable, with DOE approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld.</p>
<p>Item 3.1.b states that transfers are not permitted; however, a land transfer agreement would alleviate several challenges and would allow the recipient brownfield opportunities.</p>	<p>DOE is not considering a land transfer at this time.</p>
<p>Secretarial Memorandum EXEC-2023-006758 reaffirmed the Indian Energy Purchase Preference of the Energy Policy Act, providing DOE authority to give preference to Tribal majority owned business organizations when purchasing electricity or any other energy projects and byproducts. This preference should be honored for Tribal-led development proposals at Hanford.</p>	<p>Noted. DOE is analyzing whether or not IEPP would apply to this specific solicitation given it is not for the purpose of acquiring energy products or by-products. BPA reviews and approval processes for interconnection would follow BPA's normal process of adhering to the requirements of its Open Access Transmission Tariff.</p>
<p>Secretarial Memorandum EXEC-2023-006758 also commits to use DOE authorities to the maximum extent practicable to get Tribal electric generations projects connected to the grid and accessible for Federal</p>	<p>Noted. DOE is analyzing whether or not IEPP would apply to this specific solicitation given it is not for the purpose of acquiring energy products or by-products. BPA reviews and approval processes for interconnection would follow BPA's normal process of adhering to the requirements of its Open Access Transmission Tariff.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>procurement. DOE should expedite BPA interconnection process and NEPA for any Tribal-led proposal under this solicitation.</p>	
<p>Paragraph a.) - In order to provide documented evidence of funds and financing necessary to the required project, does the government anticipate formally identifying the locations and energy requirements for the specific sites so the contractor can ensure verifiable funding for the project?</p>	<p>The potential locations are provided in the RFQ. The energy (requirement) generation is dependent on the approach and details of the offerors proposed project. DOE is not soliciting the purchase of power for our own needs through this RFQ.</p>
<p>Which tax equity partnership structures are/are not acceptable to DOE?</p>	<p>DOE is aware that proposers may include available tax incentives as part of their financing plans. DOE's evaluation of financing structures will be focused on ensuring Selectees have adequate financing to responsibly execute the proposed project in accordance with federal laws and DOE requirements as specified in the RFQ.</p>
<p>In order to create the certainty needed by potential sources of project finance, would the Government be willing to provide written consent on the Offeror's ability to change or transfer ownership in part or whole? Can the Government provide further information on the criteria used to determine if such written consent will be provided?</p>	<p>DOE intends to post the draft realty agreement with (or soon after) the Final RFQ, which includes additional information. However, the right to assign to others is allowable, with DOE approval, which shall not unreasonably be withheld.</p>
<p>Can these requirements be further elaborated so that the Offeror can have confidence that it is possible, and economical, to meet them?</p>	<p>The Route 4, 10 and 40 roadways are private roads owned and maintained by DOE for its site activities. While DOE allows the public to drive on these roads, DOE may have need to close them at any time; and DOE roads are subject to state and local traffic laws and regulations. Route 4S is closed periodically for radiological shipments.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>Clarification is needed regarding “Any ultra-hazardous uses or activities involving the storage, treatment, transportation, disposal or manufacture of hazardous materials, hazardous substances or hazardous wastes.” As the C2CE website laid out, we firmly agree that new advanced nuclear power sources can and should be included in the deployment of CFE on these lands. Clarifying the term “ultra-hazardous” is needed to ensure this does not preclude the deployment of Nuclear Regulatory Commission-approved advanced nuclear technologies.</p>	<p>DOE will further address this comment in the Final RFQ and anticipates deleting the language or clarifying further.</p>
<p>What is meant by "ultra-hazardous uses or activities"? It appears that the storage, treatment, transportation, disposal or manufacture of hazardous materials is allowed as long as the use or activity is not deemed to be "ultra-hazardous". Please clarify if this applies to used nuclear fuel or other hazardous chemicals required for thermal power plant operations. Are projects involving special nuclear material or cadmium, as found in solar panels, permitted on the land?</p>	<p>DOE will further address this comment in the Final RFQ and anticipates deleting the language or clarifying further.</p>
<p>Can DOE provide a detailed list of activities that are prohibited? Are activities such as drilling, boring and trenching acceptable? Is there a certain depth of land penetration that respondent shouldn't exceed? Can the government provide details of the radiation clean-up activities that it completed?</p>	<p>DOE has posted available and relevant Hanford Site environmental information to the Cleanup to Clean Energy initiative website. DOE’s current understanding is that the lands that have been preliminarily identified to support the initiative either have not been used for active Hanford Site operations or any necessary remedial actions have been completed. Nevertheless, DOE will need to complete additional activities to characterize the property for industrial use. DOE will provide additional information on the lands under consideration for CFE proposals as part of the Final RFQ (Appendix A). DOE will also provide documentation of radiological characterization information and ASTM compliant Environmental Site Assessment review of the property once these processes, which are currently underway, are complete.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>Please provide specific expectations for "specifically demonstrating verified commercial demand and need for the electricity" as a developer could only provide a plan to obtain offtake at this stage in the development process.</p>	<p>DOE will consider the comment in preparing the Final RFQ. Of note, this particular reference is supporting information for the detailed submission instructions within Section 4. The language emphasizes that the Government makes no representations regarding the Offeror's ability to secure an agreement(s) for sale and purchase of the services or products arising directly or indirectly from the Project, Realty Agreement, or the Property. Furthermore, as described in Section 4.4.2 and Section 5.1.2, a viable market demand is vitally important in demonstrating confidence in project success.</p>
<p>What could qualify as verified commercial demand? Developers may have potential targets based on prior conversations and IRP's, but it is unlikely they will have anything concrete to show in this response with regards to offtake (and especially since many offtakers will look for transmission service to their load or to Mid-C.</p>	<p>DOE will consider the comment in preparing the Final RFQ. Of note, this particular reference is supporting information for the detailed submission instructions within Section 4. The language emphasizes that the Government makes no representations regarding the Offeror's ability to secure an agreement(s) for sale and purchase of the services or products arising directly or indirectly from the Project, Realty Agreement, or the Property. Furthermore, as described in Section 4.4.2 and Section 5.1.2, a viable market demand is vitally important in demonstrating confidence in project success.</p>
<p>The expectation of completed project plan, schedule, market demand and feasibility analysis is an extensive undertaking; one that will consume considerable time and resources from the submitting parties.</p>	<p>DOE anticipates revisions to the Final RFQ which may lessen the number and magnitude of submittals requested, to some extent.</p>
<p>Respondents prioritizing true engagement and partnership with relevant Tribal Nations may require additional time structuring partnership details with Tribes.</p>	<p>Noted, and will be considered.</p>
<p>The 45-day proposal preparation period is insufficient to support the breadth of detail required for this project proposal. Consider extending the preparation period to 120 days or longer.</p>	<p>DOE considers the time frame for proposal preparation appropriate for this effort, however the comment will be considered.</p>
<p>The 45-day proposal preparation period is insufficient to support the breadth of detail required for this project proposal.</p>	<p>DOE considers the time frame for proposal preparation appropriate for this effort, however the comment will be considered.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>Consider extending the preparation period to 120 days or longer.</p>	
<p>The conceptual plan submissions required are extremely detailed for bid stage and not all information about property will be available prior to site investigation and required surveys/studies. Preserving flexibility in project design is essential prior to conducting studies and surveys under NEPA that could reveal constraints or required mitigation measures to buildable area. Detailed conceptual design packages and compliance plans are typically submitted once all AHJ permitting requirements are understood and permitting application is underway. Design flexibility also supports cost containment.</p>	<p>DOE anticipates revisions to the Final RFQ which may lessen the number and magnitude of submittals requested, to some extent. DOE is not requesting detailed conceptual design packages (i.e., 30% designs). However, Offerors with more mature project proposals and supporting details would have increased likelihood of demonstrating higher performance expectations and higher confidence in project success.</p>
<p>The analysis seem extremely hard to determine for such a unique site, particularly prior to site due diligence. There may not be comparable properties.</p>	<p>DOE understands that very similar properties may not be available for determining rental consideration. DOE is seeking a rental consideration rationale and justification analysis utilizing comparable properties as they exist and are available. Offerors may increase/decrease the rental consideration through analysis of the comparable properties and other relevant factors and circumstances, and include such rationale in their analysis submitted.</p>
<p>The draft RFQ asks offerors to provide: 1) a price (\$/acre-year) and 2) a binding indicative price range (low and high). Does this mean DOE would like a price in \$/acre-year as a range for each period (development, construction, and initial operations)?</p>	<p>DOE intends to revise the language in the Final RFQ and request a binding price (\$/acre per year) for each period (development, construction, and initial operations). Deleting the "binding indicative price range".</p>
<p>While rental consideration is likely appropriate for commercial energy projects, it would likely present a very significant barrier for community and/or tribal-led efforts. Additionally, requiring any community/tribal-led efforts to pay anything more than a nominal fee seems to be incongruous with other DOE efforts</p>	<p>The Rental Consideration is only one factor of many. DOE is ultimately after the best value that enables successful deployment of a clean energy project considering all the evaluation factors described in the RFQ.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>to support economic development, reindustrialization, and capacity building. We suggest that the scope/approach for the C2CE initiative be expanded (or another pathway be created) to enable submissions by entities other than commercial energy project developers.</p>	
<p>DOE should provide additional guidance on assumptions to be used to assess the current real estate market conditions for similarly situated property. For example, are there any known legacy issues with surface or underground contamination within the Property from the production of nuclear weapons such as the tritium plume associated with the 618-11 burial ground?</p>	<p>DOE will provide additional information on the lands under consideration for CFE proposals as part of the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>Selection that is focused on benefits to the government and minimizing government risk is not necessarily in alignment with the publicly stated goals of C2CE, which include climate change and clean energy for the benefit of the citizenry and selected C2CE communities.</p>	<p>Noted, and will be considered.</p>
<p>In keeping with DOE's long-standing goal of encouraging economic growth and diversification to reduce local dependence on federal funding, we believe that permanent, family-wage job creation should be explicitly stated (and highly prioritized) in the Factors for Consideration.</p>	<p>Noted, and will be considered.</p>
<p>The community has a very well-defined clean energy/decarbonization vision, referred to as the "Northwest Advanced Clean Energy Park." In order to maximize Community Benefits from the C2CE initiative, alignment with the community's vision should be included in the Factors for Consideration.</p>	<p>DOE appreciates the extensive work Tribes and community members have done in developing visions for future use of the land. This specific RFQ is focused on selecting project(s) for further analysis that comply with both the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan and further the Administration's goal for deploying carbon pollution free energy generation and storage.</p>
<p>The listed financial requirements should be limited to private entities. Non-profit and public entities should not be evaluated on the financial capability criteria contained in section 4.6.2.</p>	<p>Noted. DOE will be reviewing the provided evidence of sufficient or projected financing in the context of the proposed project. All entities, whether non-profit, public, or private, will be treated the same in terms of requirements for financial capability, however, as the goal of this requirement is to provide reasonable assurance that a project is viable, DOE will be reviewing the</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

	provided evidence of sufficient financing in the context of the proposed project.
The listed financial requirements should be limited to private entities. Non-private entities should not be evaluated on the financial capability criteria contained in section 4.6.2.	Noted. DOE will be reviewing the provided evidence of sufficient or projected financing in the context of the proposed project.
The requirement to provide evidence demonstrating sufficient funds/financing is potentially excessive, especially in the case of a parent guarantee or letter of credit. This requirement typically does not exist when a developer negotiates site control with private landowners. Can the DOE please provide the specific expectations for providing evidence during the bidding phase?	Noted. DOE will be reviewing the provided evidence of sufficient financing in the context of the proposed project.
Given the need for due diligence efforts, interconnection studies, and the NEPA process, 3-5 years may be a tight timeline for the development phase. It may be good to allow up to 6 or 7 years.	While DOE acknowledges the development period is ambitious, DOE also considers the time frame as feasible, it is subject to negotiation and could be extended if necessary due to legitimate delays or time needed to complete applicable regulatory processes. Given those flexibilities, DOE does not plan to revise the durations in the Final RFQ.
It would be helpful for offerors to understand how each factor will be weighted in the review process. The DOE should consider weighing tribal partnerships, operational experience, operational plan, and project development experience among some of the most critical factors.	DOE has not defined, and is not intending to, a specific percentage weighting on the factors for consideration. However, DOE has identified elements within the factors for consideration and which factors may be given more consideration in the evaluation.
Will there be an opportunity to submit additional clarifying information in response to any questions DOE has regarding submitted bids?	Yes, The Government may, at its sole discretion, conduct discussions with one or all Offeror(s), at any time, and for any reason, to clarify information in the submittal, typically through evaluation notices (ENs) after Offeror(s) submissions and prior to selection of a Qualified Offeror(s). Any EN responses become part of the Offeror('s) submission and will be considered by the Government in making its Qualified Offeror(s) selection.

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

	<p>There will also be an opportunity in accordance with the RFQ, "During the Negotiation Period, the Qualified Offeror(s) will work in good faith with the Government to negotiate terms and conditions of the Realty Agreement and any other agreements and documents that may be necessary or required for executing the Realty Agreement with the Qualified Offeror(s)."</p>
<p>Can the DOE provide a more detailed timeline for the evaluation of bids and negotiation period for qualified offerors?</p>	<p>DOE anticipates release of the Final RFQ in March 2024 and further the Government desires to complete negotiations with the Qualified Offeror(s) in order to execute a realty agreement by the end of Calendar Year 2024.</p>
<p>Can the 'Withdrawn lands' in figure 9 be used for development? Please elaborate on the meaning of 'withdrawn lands' and the constraints for developing on these areas.</p>	<p>DOE anticipates being able to allow usage of withdrawn lands (public lands) for this purpose in accordance with relevant authorities in the Atomic Energy Act and is coordinating with the DOI. In addition, there will be regulatory reviews (e.g., National Historical Preservation Act and National Environmental Policy Act) which also could inform and determine necessary constraints on development.</p>
<p>What is the setback from the burial grounds for the 15ft maximum excavation depth?</p>	<p>An institutional control is in place that limits excavation below 15 feet for a perimeter of approximately 60 feet from this area. DOE will provide additional information on the lands under consideration for CFE proposals as part of the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>What are Withdrawn Lands? Are there any special prohibitions respondent should know about withdrawn lands?</p>	<p>DOE anticipates being able to allow usage of withdrawn lands (public lands) for this purpose in accordance with relevant authorities in the Atomic Energy Act and is coordinating with the DOI. In addition, there will be regulatory reviews (e.g., National Historical Preservation Act and National Environmental Policy Act) which also could inform and determine necessary constraints on development.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>Columbia Generating Station's 1.2-mile exclusion zone includes BPA's 230kV Ashe Substation. Appendix A says that the exclusion zone "precludes activities by other entities." Does that mean that a proposed project could not interconnect to the Ashe Substation?</p>	<p>BPA reviews and approval processes for interconnect at the Ashe Substation would follow BPA's normal process of adhering to the requirements of its Open Access Transmission Tariff.</p> <p>Access through the Columbia Generating Stations exclusive zone to the Ashe Substation for an electrical transmission line right-of-way easement would require coordination with Energy Northwest subject to potential impacts to plant operations. Energy Northwest is required to evaluate the potential effects of nearby industrial facilities (e.g., manufacturing plants, chemical plants, commercial chemical storage facilities) and hazardous chemicals located within a 5-mile radius of the site. Hazardous chemicals of interest are listed in Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulatory Guide 1.78 Revision 1, "Evaluating the Habitability of a Nuclear Power Plant Control Room During a Postulated Hazardous Chemical Release."</p>
<p>The withdrawn lands are depicted in Appendix A, but there is no explanation of the implications of the withdrawn lands. Can a proposed project incorporate these withdrawn lands into the proposal?</p>	<p>DOE anticipates being able to allow usage of withdrawn lands (public lands) for this purpose in accordance with relevant authorities in the Atomic Energy Act and is coordinating with the DOI. In addition, there will be regulatory reviews (e.g., National Historical Preservation Act and National Environmental Policy Act) which also could inform and determine necessary constraints on development.</p>
<p>Would it be possible for DOE to provide applicants with a kmz showing this information (with details on land leases, exclusion zones, easements, environmental studies, etc.)? Having it in this format would help to expedite accurate responses to the final RFQ.</p>	<p>KMZ files and other GIS layer files associated with the figures will be made available to Offerors after the RFQ is released, upon request.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>The Energy Northwest lease surrounds a possible POI for a new clean energy project. More information on if there is an ability to get easement through the Energy Northwest encumbrances would be of great assistance in determining if this POI (BPA Ashe 500 kV/230 kV sub) is a viable POI for the project. While the encumbrance exhibit does a good job outlining existing encumbrances, GIS files of these encumbrances would greatly enhance any proposer’s ability to define a buildable area least impacted by these encumbrances.</p>	<p>BPA reviews and approval processes for interconnect at the Ashe Substation would follow BPA's normal process of adhering to the requirements of its Open Access Transmission Tariff.</p> <p>Access through the Columbia Generating Stations exclusive zone to the Ashe Substation for an electrical transmission line right-of-way easement would require coordination with Energy Northwest subject to potential impacts to plant operations. Energy Northwest is required to evaluate the potential effects of nearby industrial facilities (e.g., manufacturing plants, chemical plants, commercial chemical storage facilities) and hazardous chemicals located within a 5-mile radius of the site. Hazardous chemicals of interest are listed in Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulatory Guide 1.78 Revision 1, "Evaluating the Habitability of a Nuclear Power Plant Control Room During a Postulated Hazardous Chemical Release."</p>
<p>Can the DOE share access requirement specifications? For example, is there a minimum pathway/road width respondents need to abide by?</p>	<p>While access requirements will be evaluated on a proposal-by-proposal basis and specific to a project, the following are general requirements: entering and existing Route 4S and other major routes will need to meet Washington Department of Transportation standards (Design Manual M22-01) including improvements to acceleration and deceleration lanes if necessary. Gravel roads must have a minimum width of 20ft per NFPA 1 codes and standards.</p>
<p>Could the DOE provide further details on activity timings? Would respondent be allowed to work during the 8 am to 6 pm hours without interruption?</p>	<p>Noted, and will be considered.</p>
<p>Can the Final RFQ files include shapefiles or KMZ files of the areas shown in Appendix A, including the Industrial Area, the Operational Areas, the existing</p>	<p>KMZ files and other GIS layer files associated with the figures will be made available to Offerors after the RFQ is released, upon request.</p>

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>encumbrances, Energy Northwest and its 1.2-mile exclusion zone?</p>	
<p>Would the DOE provide Figures 1-9 in Appendix A in a digital format, such as a KMZ or ArcGIS versions to take into consideration when creating a preliminary site plan?</p>	<p>KMZ files and other GIS layer files associated with the figures will be made available to Offerors after the RFQ is released, upon request.</p>
<p>The Property Damage deductible (during operational phase- All risk Coverage) would not be less than \$5,000,000. The Owner and Operator will likely pay this so may not need to be limited by the DOE.</p>	<p>Noted, detailed insurance requirements will be tailored to the specifics of the project(s) selected and will be further specified during the negotiations period.</p>
<p>Why would mold coverage be required for a CFE generation facility?</p>	<p>Detailed insurance requirements will be tailored to the specifics of the project(s) selected and will be further specified during the negotiations period.</p>
<p>Why would UST insurance be required for a CFE generation facility?</p>	<p>Detailed insurance requirements will be tailored to the specifics of the project(s) selected and will be further specified during the negotiations period.</p>
<p>With a large utility scale project we can't assure full replacement cost value as a limit. We suggest to add: " Or any other agreed amount based on commercial availability."</p>	<p>Detailed insurance requirements will be tailored to the specifics of the project(s) selected and will be further specified during the negotiations period.</p>
<p>There is no apparent avenue for tribal preference considering all of the conditions required for tradeworkers and apprentices.</p>	<p>As part of this initiative, DOE or its contractors are not hiring employees for construction and/or operation. Hiring practices and preferences would be the responsibility of the offeror(s), in compliance with all applicable regulations and requirements. In the unlikely event that Davis-Bacon Act construction occurs as part of this realty agreement, these requirements would apply to any contractor/subcontractor that does not qualify for an exception under the Davis-Bacon Act. Tribal entities would be welcome to conduct business as required by law. In addition, DOE is analyzing whether or not IEPP would apply to this specific solicitation given it is not for the purpose of acquiring energy products or by-products.</p>
<p>Will you accept redlines to the Appendix E Non-Disclosure agreement?</p>	<p>Offerors should submit specific wording changes for consideration before the due date for comments on the Final RFQ.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>[We] recommend a preferred Realty contract/lease length of at least 20 Years with an additional Option Period of 5 Years. This would align with the projected operational lifetime of the system and provide the Department of Energy with the most competitive energy costs over this time period.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>[We] suggest that this future contract opportunity be set-aside to a WOSB. Given our experience, technology innovation, and ability to meet and/or exceed the Department of Energy's requirements for transitioning to carbon-free energy generation and off-grid sustained operations by 2030, we believe that the submitted evidence provides the requisite detail to compel the government to set-aside this opportunity.</p>	<p>This RFQ will not result in a contract and/or funding provided by the government for goods or services. This RFQ is not or anticipated to be set-aside for small business.</p>
<p>No. The Government's proposed 3 phase development is acceptable and anticipated for the project.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Yes. The 45-Day Proposal Preparation Period is adequate and acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Yes. The Government has not provided a Draft Realty Agreement for the potential 19,000 Acre development project.</p>	<p>DOE anticipates providing a draft realty agreement with (or soon after) the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>Without reviewing the full Realty Agreement, the contractor cannot determine whether or not the terms are adequate and acceptable.</p>	<p>DOE anticipates providing a draft realty agreement with (or soon after) the Final RFQ.</p>
<p>Yes. The Government has provided adequate information to submit a proposal to with the exception of potential site visits to the identified acreage available for establishing a Renewable Energy Microgrid(s).</p>	<p>DOE anticipates providing drone footage to characterize lands under consideration for CFE proposals when (or soon after) the Final RFQ is posted.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>Yes. Specific Facility Energy Usage/Requirements would be advantageous to be posted as they will inform the contractor to energy specifics as well as enable the contractor to provide the government with an accurate return on investment as well as provide the necessary carbon reduction goal calculations.</p>	<p>The energy generation specifics in the Offeror's proposal are dependent on the RFQ requirements and Offeror's proposed clean energy project. The RFQ intent is to select qualified offerors to enter into a realty agreement with the Government for the purpose of operating a 200+ MW carbon pollution-free electricity (CFE) generation facility connected to the grid. It is not intended to supply electricity to DOE Hanford facilities.</p>
<p>No. The Factors for Consideration are Adequate and Acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Yes. The Instructions are adequate and acceptable to formulate and submit a competitive response.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>[We] feel the C2CE website and RFQ have by and large offered sufficient information for a near-term, smaller scale project or projects, such as a solar project on specified portions of the land marked "Other" A near-term opportunity like this to demonstrate the successful deployment of Carbon Free Energy (CFE) electricity generation is a win-win for everyone.</p> <p>The community also feels that the RFQ and C2CE website – and the overall approach currently taken by the Department – does not yet include the requisite scope to consider a long-term, strategic approach to the majority of the 19,000 acres that will ensure the most significant and equitable benefit for the entirety of the Tri-Cities and greater Mid-Columbia region (and, we believe, for DOE as well).</p>	<p>Noted. DOE does not anticipate that the potential C2CE project(s) will utilize the entirety of the 19,000 acres. Additionally, as indicated earlier, the DOE Hanford cleanup lifecycle extends beyond the anticipated realty agreement period. DOE currently anticipates completing cleanup activities at the Hanford Site in the 2078-2091 timeframe (From the DOE EM Strategic Vision 2023). The Cleanup to Clean Energy initiative timeframe duration is envisioned to align with the Environmental Management (EM) cleanup mission at the Department's EM sites, however it will not preclude the potential for land use decisions that may be made in the future.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>[We] believe, ..., that this C2CE initiative offers a genuine opportunity for a lasting, community-driven vision to be deployed on these lands – one that includes master planning the lands for a Northwest Advanced Clean Energy Park that co-locates CFE sources with energy-intensive, decarbonized industrial development, manufacturing, R&D, and energy storage. Doing so utilizing industrial, utility, and logistics corridors as depicted in our RFI response can maximize the most impactful reindustrialization and clean energy deployment opportunities of these lands and can serve as a national and international model for deep decarbonization.</p> <p>There are few, if any, places in the country where this would be possible, and likely none that have the available land, technical expertise, highly-skilled workforce, robust existing electrical transmission and transportation infrastructure, all located right next to one of the nation’s top experts on clean energy, grid-scale energy storage, and the advanced grid – DOE’s own Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). In addition to CFE, storage, and industrial colocation, we believe the lands can also be home to advanced demonstration projects, pilot deployments of new technologies, and further research and technology uses – an opportunity to capitalize on further collaboration between industry and PNNL.</p> <p>We continue to firmly believe that our community can support the Department’s goals through the execution of near-term CFE deployment on a limited scale – this year – while continuing to work on a long-term, holistic plan that includes intentionality and equity at the core of our land-use decision-making. In collaboration with</p>	<p>This specific RFQ is focused on selecting project(s) for further analysis that comply with both the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan and further the Administration’s goal for deploying carbon pollution free energy generation and storage.</p> <p>DOE does not anticipate that the potential C2CE project(s) will utilize the entirety of the 19,000 acres. Additionally, the Cleanup to Clean Energy initiative timeframe duration is envisioned to align with the Environmental Management (EM) cleanup mission at the Department's EM sites and does not preclude the potential for land use decisions that may be made in the future.</p>
--	--

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**

<p>local governments, regional tribes, industry, and community partners, we know we can ensure a successful C2CE initiative that will be a long-term win-win for everyone, including the Department, the Administration, and the community.</p> <p>As we support the Department’s near-term goals for the deployment of CFE on a limited basis, we firmly believe that keeping the option of land transfer to the community must remain at the forefront of our long-term approach. We know that actively decreasing the footprint of the Department is a goal for the Administration and lessens the long-term burden of land management as the Department continues to focus on its cleanup mission. Our community stands ready to help execute this. In the meantime, we believe a potential subleasing approach [...] will best serve our collective goals and lessen the burden on the federal government in the short term ahead of a long-term execution of land transfer.</p> <p>Our community has a track record of handling a transfer adeptly and successfully managing and deploying CFE and reindustrialization opportunities on these lands, as demonstrated by the 1,641 acres previously transferred. On this acreage alone, a first-of-a-kind clean fertilizer manufacturing facility and a 600-acre solar project are in active development, with other projects currently in the confidential site-selection phase likely to move forward as well. Regional tribes have been consulted over the course of this development, and our intention is to partner even more closely with them moving forward [...].</p> <p>As we have shared previously, these 19,000 acres that DOE has identified represent the only land near the Cities of Richland and Kennewick that would be</p>	
--	--

Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ

<p>suitable for future clean industrial development. Without access to it for development, the Tri-Cities will be severely limited in our economic development and diversification efforts moving forward. Recognizing the Department’s focus on building community capacity, including expanding workforce, reindustrialization, and clean energy deployment opportunities, we believe our vision builds upon all of these critical needs identified by the Department.</p>	
<p>Is there a cost to submit a bid?</p>	<p>There is no charge from DOE for submittal of a bid. By participating in the RFQ process, Offerors agree to indemnify and hold harmless the United States, its officers, employees, and consultants from all claims, liabilities, and costs related to this RFQ. Under no circumstances will the Government be liable for any real estate brokerage commissions, finder’s fees, or other forms of compensation related in any way to activities undertaken by any person as a result of this RFQ. This includes any and all activities related to negotiations with the Qualified Offeror(s).</p>
<p>"...private project on federal land" would seemingly exclude non-profit, public, and tribal entities. Suggest non-Federal or project for the benefit of the public.</p>	<p>DOE will revise the RFQ accordingly. There was no intent to exclude non-profit, public, and tribal entities with this language, and there is no such exclusion in the RFQ.</p>
<p>Selection that is focused on benefits to the government and minimizing government risk is not necessarily in alignment with the publicly stated goals of C2CE, which include climate change and clean energy for the benefit of the citizenry and selected C2CE communities.</p>	<p>Noted, and will be considered.</p>
<p>Please provide an explicit list of required deliverables including what each should include. Also, for files too large to email, is more than 1 email or a zipped file acceptable?</p>	<p>All required proposal information is provided in Section 4.0 Instructions to Offeror(s).</p>
<p>"...private project on federal land" would inadvertently exclude public / state entities. Suggest non-Federal or project for the benefit of the public.</p>	<p>DOE will revise the RFQ accordingly. There was no intent to exclude non-profit, public, and tribal entities with this language, and there is no such exclusion in the RFQ.</p>

**Cleanup to Clean Energy - Interested Party Comments and
DOE Responses on Hanford Draft RFQ**