

Shailee Jain

From: Noah Allen <Noah.Allen@bhccconsultants.com>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 4:28 PM
To: Shailee Jain; Nathanael Palmatier
Cc: Mike Haley
Subject: RE: Control and Telemetry Ph 4 - Request for Quote for Design Build
Attachments: 9301 Redmond Telemetry Upgrades Phase 4_bhcrev.pdf; Project SOV_bhcrev.xlsx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

External Email Warning! Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Shailee,

Nate and I reviewed TSI's proposal and have the following comments, also included in the attached annotated format.

1. Comments on the proposal scope are in the attached pdf file. The magenta highlights are just tracking of scope item and can be ignored.
2. Cost Proposal (excel spreadsheet of comparison is attached for reference):
 - a. The pretax overall cost difference between the OPCC and the proposal is approximately \$1.44 million lower.
 - b. The primary impact is due to applied contingency and removal of bypass pumping by a third party vendor that total approximately \$1.08 million of the discrepancy.
 - c. The remaining approximate \$360,000 in cost difference is due to a few factors that include refinement of scope for the electrical contractor, approach to back panel replacement, and further definition of the work determined during the scoping site visit.

In summary, no red flags, but I would suggest considering a higher "minor change" or contingency amount in the order of \$100,000 to allow for field adjustments to the design.

Let us know if you have any questions on this review.

Thanks,

Noah Allen, PE, PMP
d. 206.357.9937
m. 206.604.7728
e. noah.allen@bhccconsultants.com

This email and all attachments are confidential. For further information about emails sent to or from BHC Consultants or if you have received this email in error, please refer to <http://bhccconsultants.com/disclaimer/>