

---

## RE: Niagara refit project manual

---

**Rybka, Walter** Tuesday, July 31, 2018 at 12:14:24 PM Eastern Daylight Time  
**To:** [REDACTED] Anthony, Bryan, [REDACTED] McCrory, Lou, [REDACTED] Andrew Davis,  
[REDACTED] William Sabatini, [REDACTED] Fox, Charles  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] Merlo, Peter, [REDACTED] Tassin, Marcel

Bryan,

1. I was confusing the project manual with the RFP. Received the draft RFP this morning and read through it. Am satisfied the language in it regarding stating experience and resumes of key personnel is adequate to establish qualifications.
2. Accept that it cannot be changed, which still leaves me concerned, but if we can't change it lets just get on with the job.
3. It definitely saves money for the FNL to rig the ship down and up again. In discussing this with Andy Davis, I learned that Andy recommends not refloating the ship as soon as possible. He said it slows down the work if the craftspeople are traversing

brows and climbing into cramped interiors with the vessel moving even the little it will. So even if it were permissible to have our crew onboard, it sounds like we would not be able to get much of a head start on rigging. I also get the picture that having any of our work ongoing while the ship is "property" of the contractor is against DGS policy and not going to change. I won't bring it up again.

Walter

---

**From:** Anthony, Bryan

**Sent:** Monday, July 30, 2018 4:36 PM

**To:** Rybka, Walter [REDACTED] McCrory, Lou [REDACTED] Andrew Davis [REDACTED] William Sabatini [REDACTED] Fox, Charles <[REDACTED]>

**Cc:** Merlo, Peter <[REDACTED]>; Tassin, Marcel [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Niagara refit project manual

**Importance:** High

Walter,

1. As stated previously, the qualifications will be dealt with in the RFP.
2. The language in Section 013110 is standard DGS language and cannot be changed.
3. PHMC determined that this was something the FNL was going to do because it saves money on the project by using league personnel. Division 2, Section 020300 paragraph 3 was inadvertently included and will be deleted by Andy. During construction DGS cannot have the League working on the vessel while it is the "property" of the Contractor.

Thank you,

Bryan

**Bryan J. Anthony, P.E.** | Portfolio Manager

Department Of General Services | Public Works | Bureau Of Pre-Construction

Arsenal Building | 1800 Herr Street | Harrisburg, PA 17103-1540

Phone: 717.787.5616 | Cell: 717.836.4824

branthony@pa.gov | www.dgs.pa.gov

*At DGS, our mission is to help government operate more efficiently, effectively and safely, delivering exceptional value for all Pennsylvanians*

---

**From:** Rybka, Walter

**Sent:** Monday, July 30, 2018 2:55 PM

**To:** Anthony, Bryan [REDACTED]; McCrory, Lou [REDACTED]; Andrew Davis [REDACTED];  
William Sabatin [REDACTED]; Fox, Charles [REDACTED]; Rybka, Walter [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Niagara refit project manual

In reviewing the project manual, I see that almost all comments from previous reviews have been incorporated. There are three things still troubling me. The first is I failed to find any language defining or describing the skill level needed, particularly by the shipwrights. I thought we were going to put in something like ..."worked on at least one plank on frame construction/repair project in the last ten years on a vessel of over 100 tons displacement". The second is on page 013110-3, under milestones and construction sequence. Under 1.6 Construction program, Par. A begins "Due to the compressed timetable....inefficient conditions." Par. B begins "Time is of the essence.....multiple shifts." Par. D. states "Contractor shall work outside of normal hours....to meet milestones..." I raised this issue at the last conference call. Where did this wording come from? Yes we want the job done as soon as possible because, assuming a start date in late summer or fall of 2019, if the job drags past March 1, 2021, the typical starting date for Niagara seasonal crew, the lost earning time of a shorter season will severely impact the Flagship Niagara League. Yet the most important consideration is achieving high standards of workmanship to give the ship the longest possible service life. I fear stressing "Time is of the essence..." will create problems with QA.

The third thing I find worrisome is the conditions of acceptance for completion, sea trials unrigged. The Niagara crew can most efficiently rig down the ship without damage. To a large extent she is rigged down in two weeks every year in the fall, and rigged up and tuned over six weeks by the crew in the spring. This kit is held together by hundreds of seizings, there are no bolts or screws involved. If the contractor hired a few competent riggers, they could rig down successfully. Rigging up, however, is much more exacting because all of the elements have to be tuned, tensioned properly in relation to each other. The rig has to be in the ship for her to have a valid inclining, which I am told will have to be an expense to the FNL, because we did not have the contractor rig the ship. Why?

We have it in the manual that periodically the ship's crew will be onboard for maintenance work. It is quite normal in shipyards to have the ship's own crew working onboard while one or more contractors are working as well on different projects. Once the structural work on the hull and ballast keel, thru-hull valves, and shafts, props, struts are in, the ship would typically be relaunched and tanks, piping, machinery and electrical would all be done afloat. With the contractor working the interior of the hull, the crew working aloft would not be in their way. It saves the Commonwealth of PA to have our crew, working at low hourly rates, do this. But there is no way of reimbursing the Flagship Niagara League for this service. From my perspective the job is done when we get a renewed COI from the USCG. The cost of an inclining is about \$10,000, and the ship should be as close as possible to her "at sea" configuration of weight distribution. The Contractor can only be held responsible for the work they are contracted to do. But if we accept the norms of the maritime industry and have our crew rigging the ship simultaneously with the contractor's working on other items. The sea trials will be more realistic and the inclining can be included in the contract. Re-issuance of a COI can be made the benchmark for completion. Walter