

Questions and Answers

1. **Question:** The RFP cover letter states “This acquisition is being solicited through full-and-open competition in accordance with FAR Part 15 – Contracting by Negotiation.” Please confirm that this solicitation is a small business set aside under NAICS Code 562910.

Answer: The original Cover Letter issued in the final RFP incorrectly stated that this acquisition is being competed via full and open competition. A Cover Letter (Revision 1) was posted to the acquisition webpage and an email was sent to all the Subscribers highlighting this error. To clarify, this acquisition is being solicited as a total small business set-aside. If an amendment is issued to the final RFP the Cover Letter in FedConnect will be updated with the Revision 1 document.

2. **Question:** Under Section NNS-L-2002, Page L-15, item (ii) (A) requires that we describe “The development and application of conceptual geologic source term and groundwater flow and transport models...” In the UGTA program, there is participation from different entities (national laboratories) that perform portions of the work. We assume that since the RFP asked us to describe the approach, we can describe the approach to modeling without having to distinguish in the description of each element if an aspect of that specific element is performed by a laboratory vs. the EPS contractor. Is that correct?

Answer: The Offeror shall describe its proposed technical approach for accomplishing its own portions of the work and how it will interact with the other entities. The EPS contractor will be responsible for some UGTA work scope that is currently being performed by the national laboratories. The national laboratories will continue to provide laboratory-controlled data to support model development as needed, but the EPS contractor will be responsible to define, develop, and implement source term models as necessary to meet conceptual model needs. Provision NNS-L-2002 (b) (1) (ii) (A) of the RFP will be amended as follows (see bolded items):

(A) The development and application of conceptual **geologic, source term** and groundwater flow and transport models to aid in the characterization of deep underground contamination (700 to over 4,000 feet below ground surface) for radiologically contaminated groundwater in complex geologic settings covering areas larger than 100 square miles. This includes the collection and utilization of data **to define, develop, and implement the source term models.**

Also, see the answer to question #61 in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers for additional information.

3. **Question:** The RFP requires that 20 facility evaluations be conducted for the RWAP scope (PWS 3.2.4.4). Can you please clarify how many audits and how many surveillances are in these 20 FEs?

Answer: For proposal purposes, of the 20 annual facility evaluations, assume 5 are audits and 15 surveillances. Provision NNS-L-2002 will be amended to incorporate this information.

4. **Question:** The RFP does not state how many waste profile reviews will be performed. Can you please provide the number of annual waste profile reviews required?

Answer: For proposal purposes, assume approximately 180 waste profile reviews annually. Provision NNS-L-2002 will be amended to incorporate this information.

5. **Question:** In reference to Section L NNS-L-2000 Instructions for Proposal Preparation - General (b)(9) (p. L-11) and Section L NNS-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume II--Technical and Management Information (b)(3) TAB 3 (p. L-15): Clause NNS-L-2000 states: "Corporate Experience (Attachment L-3 and Narrative)" are excluded from the Volume II 50 page limitation. Clause NNS-L-2002 states: "Attachments L-3 and L-4 are not part of the Volume II 50 page limit." Please clarify that *all* of the Corporate Experience, including Attachments L-3 and L-4 and the three-page narrative summaries for each team member, are excluded from the Volume II 50 page count.

Answer: Correct, the Corporate Experience submission is NOT part of the Volume II 50 page limit. However, Attachment L-3, L-4 and narrative have their specific page limitations in accordance with provision NNS-L-2002. Provision NNS-L-2000 will be amended to include Attachment L-4 in the page count exceptions.

6. **Question:** In reviewing the final RFP (including all attachments) and comparing that against the EPS WBS Scope Statement, Revision 1, there are inconsistencies regarding the scope. For example, the PWS Attachment 1 does not discuss Low Level Waste and PA/CA maintenance and modeling. Conversely, the EPS WBS Scope Statement, Revision 1 clearly calls this scope out under WBS 1.4.3.3, page 85. Which document is to be used to propose on this work? Will these documents be updated so both match the intended scope?

Answer: The RFP and the PWS identify the scope for the EPS contract proposal. The documents in the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room" provide additional detailed information in support of this scope. WBS elements 1.4.3 Waste Management, 1.4.3.3 Low-Level Waste, and 1.4.3.3.05 Waste Acceptance Program on page 85 of the WBS Scope Statement are the upper level (parent) WBS descriptions above the working level (child/control account) WBS Scope element 1.4.3.3.05.01 Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program (RWAP) on page 86 - which is consistent with the PWS. The PWS will not discuss Performance Assessment/Composite Analysis (PA/CA) activities (under WBS element 1.4.3.3.09 Disposal Operations) because these activities are not within the scope of this procurement. Offerors should also see the EPS Contract Baseline Schedule (FY 2015 – FY 2019) for confirmation of those activities within the contract scope and the associated WBS elements. Also, see the answer to question #122 in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers for additional information.

7. **Question:** If we are proposing one person to fill two key positions, can we provide two separate resumes so that the candidate's qualifications for each position can be highlighted?

Answer: A resume can be submitted for each key position identified in Section H, NNS-H-2013, Key Personnel. It is the Offerors determination whether the individual's qualifications should be separated or combined as long as the page limitations are adhered to for each resume/position.

8. **Question:** We assume that the resumes are to be submitted in the table format shown on Attachment L-2. Is that correct? If resumes are to be submitted in the table format, can they be in a font smaller than 12 point?

Answer: No, that is not a correct assumption and the Government is not requiring a specific format. In accordance with NNS-L-2002 (b)(2)(i) it states that "The proposed resumes shall address the elements described in Attachment L-2 entitled "Key Personnel Resume Elements."

See Section L, Provision NNS-L-2000 (b)(7) for information related to acceptable font size.

9. **Question:** Reference Reading Room document "Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) Scope Statement" Section 1.4.3 Summary Scope of Work: This states "The scope involves management support and operational development and/or maintenance activities for both storage and disposal facility operations." This is not consistent with the RFP PWS. It is our understanding that NNSA does not intend for the bidder to manage and operate the Area 3/5 facilities. Is this a correct assumption?

Answer: That is a correct assumption. Section 1.4.3 in the WBS Scope Statement is only provided for information regarding the hierarchy above the Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program item in the PWS (section 1.4.3.3.05.01 in the WBS Scope Statement). The EPS Contract Baseline Schedule (FY 2015 – FY 2019) in the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room" may offer further clarification. Also, see answer to question #6.

10. **Question:** Reference Reading Room document "Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) Scope Statement" Section 1.4.1.3 Low-Level Waste: This states; "Perform inspections of LLW in storage at Area 5." This is not consistent with the RFP PWS. It is our understanding that NNSA does not intend for the EPS contractor to perform inspections of LLW in storage at Area 5. Is this a correct assumption?

Answer: Section 1.4.1.3 in the WBS Scope Statement is associated with Industrial Sites. Based on your question, we believe you mean section 1.4.3.3 which is the Low-Level Waste section. With this correction to the section number, your assumption is correct. Section 1.4.3.3 in the WBS Scope Statement is only provided for information regarding the hierarchy above the Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program item in the PWS (section 1.4.3.3.05.01 in the WBS Scope Statement). The EPS Contract Baseline Schedule (FY 2015 – FY 2019) in the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room" may offer further clarification. Also, see answer to question #6.

11. Reference Question 180 (from Q&A received January 15, 2014: *What M&O contract scope changes will be made as a result of the new EPS contract? Answer: At the start of the EPS contract the following changes to the M&O contract will be implemented:*

REMOVED SCOPE:

- Soils document support
- Soils post-closure monitoring activities

- *Industrial Sites post-closure monitoring activities for all EM and Defense Program (DP) sites*

After reviewing all of the documents in the Electronic Reading Room and the RFP PWS, we are unable to determine what LOE the M&O provided in the soils area. The response to Question 180 refers to removed scope, reduced scope, and remaining scope for the M&O. To allow us to provide the best value to the government in our bid, we request additional clarification regarding the following responses to NNSA's answer to Question 180.

Question 11(a): What was the level of document support removed (by COCS labor code and annual level of effort [LOE])? Or stated differently, how many FTEs or partial FTEs supported development of the current soils documents in provided by NNSA in the electronic reading room? For example, did the M&O provide 50% of the LOE required to develop the associated documents?

Answer 11(a): The amount of support and associated FTEs removed from the M&O contract is not pertinent to the current RFP. Offerors are expected to submit proposals that deliver the best value to the Government based on the scope identified in the PWS.

Question 11(b): What post closure monitoring activities were conducted by the M&O over the previous 5 years on the Soils Sites? What was their LOE and/or budget to conduct these activities?

Answer 11(b): Copies of prior year's annual Post-Closure Report for Closed Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Corrective Action Units, Nevada National Security Site; Post-Closure Inspection Report for the Tonopah Test Range; and the Post-Closure Inspection Letter Report for Corrective Action Units on the Nevada National Security Site can be found on the Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI) website. A link to the OSTI website is located in the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room". The level of effort and/or budget for the M&O contractor to conduct post-closure monitoring activities is not pertinent to the current RFP. Offerors are expected to submit proposals that deliver the best value to the Government based on the scope identified in the PWS.

Question 11(c): What post closure monitoring activities were conducted by the M&O over the previous 5 years on the Industrial Sites? What was their LOE and/or budget to conduct these activities?

Answer 11(c): See answer to question #11(b).

REDUCED SCOPE:

- *Soils, Industrial Sites, and RWAP project management support*
- *UGTA project management and general support*

Question 11(d): What project management support for Soils and Industrial Sites is provided? What LOE will be transferred to the EPS contract?

Answer 11(d): The amount of project management support or level of effort activities reduced from the M&O contract is not pertinent to the current RFP. Offerors are expected to submit proposals that deliver the best value to the Government based on the scope identified in the PWS.

REMAINING SCOPE:

- *Soils field support of investigation and closure activities*

- *Provide estimates for Soils field support of closure alternatives*
- *Soils field support of post closure maintenance at sites on the NNSS or accessed from the NNSS (e.g., maintenance activities at TTR are not included)*
- *Radiation Services activities such as periodic assessments of posted Soils areas*
- *Maintenance activities for Soils and Industrial Sites post-closure sites and D&D sites*
- *Coordination of Soils and Industrial Sites field support activities*

Question 11(e): What type of field support is provided by the M&O during investigation and closure activities?

Answer 11(e): See the “Field Work” description under the “Scope” section of each applicable Corrective Action Unit (CAU) in the WBS Scope Statement which can be found in the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room”.

Question 11(f): What type of soil field support of post closure maintenance at sites on the NNSS is provided by the M&O?

Answer 11(f): See section 1.4.1.1.98 Soils Surveillance and Maintenance in the WBS Scope Statement in the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room”.

Question 11(g): We understand the incumbent EPS contractor has a radiological controls organization and several RCTs. What additional Radiation Services activities for periodic assessments of posted soils areas is provided by the M&O? How is the work split between the EPS and the M&O for assessment of posted areas?

Answer 11(g): The Radiation Services activities provided by the M&O are not pertinent to the current RFP. Offerors are expected to submit proposals that deliver the best value to the Government based on the scope identified in the PWS.

Question 11(h): What is the nature of the coordination activities for soils and industrial sites field support activities that is provided by the M&O under retained M&O scope?

Answer 11(h): See answer to question #11(e).

12. **Question:** In the EPS WBS Scope Statement, the Clean Slates II schedule calls for a CAIP on 3/14/2017 and a CADD on 11/7/2018, whereas the FFACO Appendix IV (p. 6) states the CAIP was submitted on 1/16/97 and the CADD was submitted on 1/4/05. What changes in the FFACO requirements or site conditions are requiring a new CAIP and a new CADD for this site?

Answer: The earlier CAIP and CADD are to be revised using exposure scenarios agreed to with the US Air Force and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection during the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process and using the Soils Risk-Based Corrective Action Evaluation Process document (DOE/NV-1475) issued in April 2012 (included in the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room”).

13. With regard to Clean Slates III, the EPS WBS Scope Statement indicates a CAP, but the schedule and PWS state only the CAIP and CADD are required.

Question 13(a): Should bidders assume the CAP listed in the WBS Scope Statement is due after the period of performance for this contract and, therefore, excluded?

Answer 13(a): Yes. The WBS Scope Statement will be revised to remove the CAP description and will be updated on the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room."

Question 13(b): Further, is there any significance to Clean Slates III not being addressed in Appendix III of the FFACO?

Answer 13(b): Although the work at Clean Slates III is identified in the baseline schedule beginning in 2017, activities are beyond the FY+2 timeframe that require prioritization per the FFACO process. Appendix III "...lists those CAUs that have been identified and prioritized for CAIs and/or for corrective actions as described in Part XII, Corrective Action Investigations/Corrective Actions..." of the FFACO. Therefore, Clean Slate III has not been moved to Appendix III following the process outlined in the FFACO.

14. For the EPS Baseline Schedule, the schedule links approvals of Double Tracks and Clean Slates I CRs by dotted line to Clean Slates II CAIP.

Question 14(a): What is the logic behind this link?

Answer 14(a): The dotted line is a technique used in scheduling to designate "free float" in the schedule. Also see the answer to question 14(c).

Question 14(b): Why is the CS II CAIP approval linked by a solid line to the start of the CS III CAIP?

Answer 14(b): The solid line is a technique used in scheduling to designate where "free float" does not exist in the schedule. Also see the answer to question 14(c).

Question 14(c): Why is the CS III CAIP linked to the Project 57 CAIP?

Other soils scopes do not appear to have the same linkages.

Answer 14(c): The CAIPs for the Soils activities on the Nevada Test and Training Range, including Tonopah Test Range, are linked in the baseline schedule in such a way to ensure regulatory review and approvals of numerous FFACO documents are not all occurring simultaneously.

15. **Question:** Per the EPS Baseline Schedule, please clarify the schedule for document approvals. The WBS Scope Statements for many CAUs (for example, but not limited to, CAUs 411, 412, and 413) state a 60-day review period is required, whereas the provided baseline schedule shows only 30 days between submission and approval.

Answer: The 60-day review period noted under the Assumptions in the WBS Scope Statement for Corrective Action Units 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, and 541 is for US Air Force review prior to official

submission to the regulator. The 30 days between submission and approval in the baseline schedule is the time period for review by the regulator in accordance with Section XII.8 of the FFAO.

16. **Question:** The CAIP and CADD documentation has been completed for CAUs in the work scope (CAUs 541, 571, 550, 568, and 573). These are not readily available on the internet. Will they be provided by the NFO to all bidders?

Answer: The CAIP and CADD documents that are associated with each of these Corrective Action Units (CAUs 541, 571, 550, 568 and 573) will not be provided and are not needed for any bidders because the WBS Scope Statement for each of these CAUs contains an Assumption (for proposal purposes) that states: The selected closure alternative is close-in-place to an action level of 25 millirem.

17. **Question:** NNS-L-2002 (b)(1) (p. L-14) states in part: "Page Limit: 50 pages; however, the Staffing Plan Summary does not count toward the page limitation." Further, NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(iv) (p. L-15) states: "Provide a Staffing Plan Summary consistent with the format contained in Attachment L-7 that delineates the staffing (types, quantities and skill mix) necessary to execute the entire PWS." Later that section states: "Discuss the Basis of Estimate to support the proposed hours by describing how the types and quantities of labor hours to perform the PWS were estimated and complete Attachment L-11 accordingly." Please confirm that the entire section required by NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(iv), Staffing Plan Summary, is excluded from the page count (i.e., all referenced forms and text required to address the requirements of this section of the solicitation is excluded).

Answer: Correct, the Staffing Plan Summary (Attachment L-7) and the Basis of Estimate Log (Attachment L-11) are not included in the Volume II 50 page limit. NNS-L-2002 page limitation will be corrected to clarify this as well as NNS-L-2000(b)(9), Page Count Exceptions.

18. **Question:** NNS-L-2002 (b)(3) (p. L-16) states: "Submit information for no more than 3 contracts for each proposed team member. (For example, a prime contractor with two subcontractors shall submit no more than 9 Forms. Two teaming partners and two subcontractors shall submit no more than 12 Forms.)" Please confirm that each member of an LLC is considered a teaming partner. For example, if an offeror consists of an LLC with three members and two subcontractors, the offeror should submit information for no more than 15 contracts (three contracts for each of the three members of the LLC and three contracts for each subcontractor).

Answer: Correct. See NNS-L-2000(a)(6) for definition of "Contractor Team Arrangement."

19. **Question:** Section L, Clause 52.222-46 (p. L-2) states: "As part of their proposals, offerors will submit a total compensation plan setting forth salaries and fringe benefits proposed for the professional employees who will work under the contract." Should this information be submitted in Volume I or in Volume III?

Answer: The requirements of FAR 52.222-46 shall be submitted in Volume III as indicated in NNS-L-2003(b)(12), Company Compensation Policies.

20. **Question:** Section L, Clause 52.222-46 (p. L-3) states (emphasis added): “Additionally, proposals envisioning compensation levels lower than those of predecessor Contractors for the same work will be evaluated on the basis of maintaining program continuity, uninterrupted high-quality work, and availability of required competent professional service employees. Offerors are cautioned that lowered compensation for essentially the same professional work may indicate lack of sound management judgment and lack of understanding of the requirement.” Will NNSA provide this information to all teams so that the incumbents do not have an unfair competitive advantage? If offerors are being evaluated based on how closely they can match the “predecessor Contractors” compensation, then teams with the information have an unfair advantage compared to teams without the information.

Answer: No, the Government will not reveal incumbent contractor proprietary information. The referenced RFP provision does not require Offerors to provide the exact same benefits of the incumbent contractors, but rather, compensation levels that should “reflect a clear understanding of work to be performed and should indicate the capability of the proposed compensation structure to obtain and keep suitably qualified personnel to meet mission objectives.” Offerors with sufficient experience and knowledge performing services required by the EPS RFP should know what compensation levels are required to attract and retain service professionals performing this type of effort, or should be able to reasonably estimate the requirement to conform with 52.222-46.

21. **Question:** PWS Section 3.2.3 (p. 8) calls for annual post closure monitoring of closed Industrial Sites. This work is discussed in the WBS Scope Statement at WBS 1.4.1.3. The WBS Scope Statement also includes Industrial Sites - Defense Programs (IS-DP) at WBS 1.4.9.3. Because IS-DP is not included in the PWS, should it be excluded from the proposal (i.e., excluded from the BOEs, staffing plan, cost proposal, etc.)?

Answer: The work identified in WBS 1.4.9.3 of the WBS Scope Statement is included under Section 3.2.3 of the PWS.

22. Reference: NNS-L-2003 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume III --Cost Proposal (b)(1) Proposal Cover Sheet, paragraph (iii) Page L-18 of 27 - “The Government solicitation number, DE-SOL-0005982, the Offeror Cost/Price proposal number and the expiration date.”

Question: Please clarify or define what is required as to the “Offeror Cost/Price Proposal Number.”

Answer: Offerors should clearly note on the cover sheet that the volume is “Volume III—Cost Proposal” and any company-specific identifier if desired.

23. Reference: RFP Attachment 1 Performance Work Statement 3.2.5.2 Project Planning and Control, page 12 states “The Contractor shall also provide financial analyst support for: coordination, validation, and confirmation of accounting and project control related data in the STARS financial reporting system, independent review of invoices and account reconciliations, and validation of contract related data for funds management and forecasting.”

Question 23(a): With regard to “independent review of invoices and account reconciliations,” are the invoices the EPS contractor will be reviewing going to be for other prime contracts for NNSA and how many invoices might be reviewed per year?

Answer 23(a): No, the EPS contractor will only review the invoices that the EPS contractor submits. Invoices can be submitted as frequently as every two weeks.

Question 23(b): With regard to the balance of this cited statement, will the EPS contractor be reviewing financial data in STARS for only the EPS contract or will the data be from other contracts as well?

Answer 23(b): The EPS contractor will only review financial data for the EPS contract.

24. Reference: RFP Attachment 1 Performance Work Statement 3.2.5.1 Administrative, page 11 states “These support activities include infrastructure, communications, facilities, vehicles, security management, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) miscellaneous expenses/travel, procurement, contract administration, document production, records management, information systems, lessons learned, and strategic planning.”

Question 24(a): Please clarify and elaborate on what support activities are included in “infrastructure, communications, and facilities.”

Answer 24(a): See WBS Scope Statement 1.4.2.1.01 Administrative Support which is described as providing management, integration, and oversight of administrative activities. These activities could include management, integration and oversight of the EPS contract infrastructure elements such as accounting, human resources, subcontracting, etc; communication elements such as computers, phones, Blackberries, etc; and facility space, furniture, and equipment needs at the North Las Vegas complex and at the Nevada National Security Site.

Question 24(b): With regard to “vehicles” - how many vehicles does the contract utilize? Are these provided by NNSA or GSA?

Answer 24(b): The current contract utilizes 16 vehicles; however, the number of vehicles utilized on the EPS contract will depend on the needs of the contract and the Offerors technical approach. The M&O contractor, on behalf of the Government, leases the vehicles and covers the cost of fuel and maintenance. These vehicles reside on the M&O’s property inventory and thus they are responsible for the appropriate reporting and tracking requirements. The EPS contractor, in accordance with PWS Section 3.2.5.1, shall be responsible for the management, integration and oversight of the vehicle needs and usage and would be responsible for reporting such information directly to the M&O contractor.

25. Reference: NNS-L-2002 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS: VOLUME II--TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT INFORMATION (OCT 2013)(b)(1) TAB - 1:page L-14 of 27, "Criterion 1, Technical Approach and Staffing Plan Summary (Page Limit: 50 pages; however, the Staffing Plan Summary does not count toward the page limitation)."

Question: In this sentence, does the phrase "Staffing Plan Summary" exempt all the pages required to respond to all of the requirements in the entire RFP 14-line paragraph (iv) "Staffing Plan Summary" in Section (b)?

Answer: The Staffing Plan Summary and Basis of Estimate Log required by NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(iv) are exempted from the Volume II 50 page limit. Also, see answer to question #17 above.

26. Reference: NNS-L-2001 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS: VOL I--OFFER AND OTHER DOCUMENTS (OCT 2013) (b)(4)(ii) page L-13 of 27 "The Offeror shall submit a Transition Plan in accordance with Attachment 1, Performance Work Statement, Section 4. "Transition Period" - "In accordance with Section J, Attachment 2, the Contractor shall submit a Transition Plan that describes their process for conducting an orderly transition and minimizing the impacts on continuity of operations. The plan shall include a schedule with defined milestones, milestone risks and the proposed approach to minimize the identified risks."

Question: In order to minimize the impacts on continuity of operations and risks, please identify what subcontracts and/or vendor service and/or maintenance agreements will be available for novation to the new contract during the 30 day transition period.

Answer: Novation has a very specific meaning in the FAR (FAR Part 2):

"Novation agreement" means a legal instrument--

(1) Executed by the--

(i) Contractor (transferor);

(ii) Successor in interest (transferee); and

(iii) Government; and

(2) By which, among other things, the transferor guarantees performance of the contract, the transferee assumes all obligations under the contract, and the Government recognizes the transfer of the contract and related assets.

Given the specific FAR reference and meaning, NNSA does not anticipate the requirement for any novation agreements resulting from this award.

27. Reference: RFP Attachment 1 Performance Work Statement 3.2.1 Soils page 5 states "The Contractor will conduct all activities necessary to ascertain the information for the preparation of FFACO documents as specified in the Soils-related milestones and/or activities below. These activities will include but are not limited to:
- Pre-field planning
 - Field work (site characterization)
 - Analytical work (Corrective Action Alternatives [CAA] Analysis; As-Low-As Reasonably Achievable [ALARA])

- Performance of waste management services to address waste generated in the course of field work”

Question: With regard to the 3rd bullet item above, is this item intended to be two activities versus one activity? That is, 1) Analytical work (Corrective Action Alternatives [CAA] Analysis); and 2) As-Low-As Reasonably Achievable [ALARA]? Please clarify.

Answer: As part of conducting analytical work, the CAA Analysis process takes into consideration the principles of ALARA as defined by nuclear industry to determine cleanup options. These are two distinct elements (a process and principles) that are utilized together.

28. Reference: Question and Answer #16 to Draft RFP and NNS-L-2002 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS: VOLUME II--TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT INFORMATION (OCT 2013) (b)(1) TAB – 1 Criterion 1, 2nd paragraph “The Offeror shall describe its proposed technical approach for accomplishing the following selected requirements of the PWS. As a part of the proposed approach, address any technical risks associated with these requirements and the proposed approach to avoid or minimize those technical risks.”

Question 28(a): We presume therefore that for Section (iii) Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program that our technical approach is only to address PWS Sections 3.2.4.2 Waste Facility Evaluations/Verifications and 3.2.4.3 Waste Acceptance Review Panel and only those risks and approaches to avoid or minimize those technical risks arising from the requirements of these two PWS subsections as opposed to the entire Section 3.2.4. Is this assumption correct?

Answer 28(a): No. The technical approach should address all elements of PWS as they relate to the evaluation criteria in the RFP.

Question 28(b): With the regard to the phrase “technical risks” in the cited sentence, is this phrase meant to refer to “Technical Categories” of risk (and not “Programmatic Categories” of risk) as precisely defined in DOE M 413.3 Project Management Practices? Or does it have a different meaning as used in this requirement?

Answer 28(b): DOE M 413.3 is not listed in the current or archived DOE Directives. DOE M 413.3-1, Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets, was cancelled on Jan 13, 2009. The technical risk in the cited sentence refers to any technical factor, element, constraint or course of action that introduces an uncertainty of outcome, either positively or negatively that could impact project objectives (DOE O 413.3B, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets, 11/29/2010).

29. Reference: NNS-M-1002 (1) Criterion 1 – “Technical Approach and Staffing Plan Summary (TAB 1) Page M-2 of 4, “The Government will evaluate the proposed Technical Approach and Staffing Plan Summary to assess the Offeror's understanding of the requirements, completeness and feasibility of the proposed technical approach associated with the PWS requirements identified for this Criterion in Section L, including any technical risks and associated strategies for minimizing or avoiding such risks.”

Question: We presume the phrase “to assess the Offeror's understanding of the requirements” only requires us to demonstrate our understanding of the those specific PWS requirements identified for this Criterion in Section L and not the requirements of the entire PWS sections of Soils (3.2.1), UGTA (3.2.2) and RWAP (3.2.4). Is this assumption correct?

Answer: See the response to question #19 in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers.

30. Reference: NNS-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume II --Technical And Management Information (b)(1) (ii) Underground Test Area (UGTA) page L-15 of 27, “(A) The development and application of conceptual geologic, source term and groundwater flow and transport models to aid in the characterization of deep underground contamination (700 to over 4,000 feet below ground surface) for radiologically contaminated groundwater in complex geologic settings covering areas larger than 100 square miles. This includes the collection and utilization of data to define, develop, and implement the source term models.”

Question: Considering the phrase “This includes the collection and utilization of data to define, develop, and implement the source term models,” it is not clear which of the PWS requirements contained in 3.2.2.1.2 Well Drilling Support and 3.2.2.1.2 Development and Testing are applicable to this sentence. Please clarify.

Answer: All activities in these sections should be considered. Also, see the WBS Scope Statement in the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room” for additional information.

31. **Question:** Regarding Attachment 11 (BOE Log), would DOE allow us to change the format of the table, as long as we provide the same information requested in the Attachment?

Answer: The Attachment L-11 BOE format was provided as an example, not a template. The format can be changed if the minimum information identified in the example is included. Information must be clearly linked to the appropriate PWS element identified in the Staffing Plan Summary. Information should clearly and concisely state the approach utilized to develop the BOE, inclusive of any assumptions. In support of the hours defined in the Staffing Plan Summary, the Offeror should define how types and quantities of labor hours were estimated. The BOE should not be used to expand the Offerors technical approach discussion. Formatting (i.e., font size, page size, etc.) requirements are defined in Section L, Provision NNS-L-2000 (b) (7). Also, see the answers to questions #79 and #133 in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers.

32. **Question:** Page L-16 requires that “the Offeror shall include a separate narrative description for each proposed team member, not to exceed 3 pages each, describing the proposed responsibilities of the team member under the contract” We assume that we can also submit a 3-page narrative for the prime contractor—is that correct?

Answer: Correct, the term “Offeror” includes the prime contractor.

33. **Question:** Page L-16 requests a 3-page narrative and states: “and an explanation of why the corporate experience listed for the team member is relevant (similar in nature, size and

complexity).” Does the word “nature” in this statement refer to scope? If not, can you please define what is meant by nature of the work? Do we also have to show that the experience is similar in scope? We kindly suggest that “relevant” gets defined as similar in size, complexity and scope.

Answer: The word “nature” refers to type of work. “Relevant” is defined as similar in size, complexity and scope.

34. **Question:** In page M-3 Criterion 2 (Key Personnel), it states that DOE will evaluate “considering the nature, size and scope of the work required in the PWS.” Can you please clarify in this case what is meant by nature of the work?

Answer: See answer to question #33.

35. **Question:** Page L-15 (iv), Staffing Plan Summary, requires: “Discuss the Basis of Estimate to support the proposed hours by describing how the types and quantities of labor hours to perform the PWS were estimated and complete Attachment L-11 accordingly.” This requirement appears to include two elements: (1) a discussion of the BOE to support the proposed hours and, (2) to complete Attachment L-11 accordingly (with a summary of the BOE discussion). Is this correct? Is there any required format for the BOE discussion or are we free to format those details?

Answer: All discussion related to the Basis of Estimate should be included in Attachment L-11. See the response to question #31.

36. **Question:** Page L-17, Cost proposal instructions, item (3) Narrative Support, requires: “the narrative should describe the Offeror’s supporting rationale, the estimating methodologies used, and **the basis of estimate** for the data provided in support of the proposed costs.” Since the BOEs for the staffing are provided in the Staffing Section, are we supposed to provide the same BOEs for the level of effort estimate here or are these BOEs focused on indirect costs and other parameters used in the cost proposal?

Answer: See the answers to questions #133 and #211 in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers.

37. **Question:** Regarding (4) TAB - 4: Criterion 4 - Past Performance (Page Limit: No page limit) For each contract identified in Criterion 3, the Offeror shall provide the Past Performance Questionnaire at Attachment L-5 to each technical and contracting points of contact listed in Blocks 10a and 10b of the Corporate Experience and Performance Self-Assessment Form.

For most of our commercial projects, the person in Blocks 10a and 10b are the same. In this instance, is it acceptable to only submit one Attachment L-5?

Answer: Yes, if the technical and contracting points of contact are the same individual only one Attachment L-5 shall be provided. The Offerors are highly encouraged if this applies to their past

performance references that they clearly annotate this situation in their TAB 4 proposal submission which requires the Offeror to provide a list identifying the contracts and the names, titles, and phone numbers of the respective points of contact to whom the questionnaires were provided.

38. **Question:** Response to the draft RFP question #180 states that RWAP support is removed from the M&O contract. PWS 3.2.4.2 states “The Contractor will perform and document the results of an estimated 20 annual FEs...” In addition to the RWAP Manager and Coordinator, will the Contractor also employ the audit staff who physically conduct the audits at the generator facilities or will the auditors remain employed by the M&O?

Answer: Yes, the EPS contractor will employ the audit staff who physically conducts the audits at the generator facilities.

39. **Question:** Please identify what role DRI will have (if any) on the development and implementation of a long-term monitoring program.

Answer: Desert Research Institute (DRI) will conduct Soils studies which will support long-term monitoring of Soils activities, and Underground Test Area closure activities necessary for long-term monitoring design and requirements through the end of their current contract period (October 31, 2016).

40. **Question:** If we are required to use the BOE Log (Attachment L-11) to discuss all the Basis of Estimate, are we allowed to provide additional backup and narrative to support the BOEs or does all information need to be provided in the BOE logs? The BOE Log format is more limiting and we respectfully suggest that allowing pages to provide additional information be permitted.

Answer: See the responses to questions #31 and #35.

41. **Question:** Will the human risk assessment for Rainier/Shoshone be completed prior to award of this contract?

Answer: A Health Risk Assessment has been completed in support of the development of the contaminant boundaries for the Rainier Mesa/Shoshone Mountain Corrective Action Unit (CAU); however, additional work may be needed in the future in support of the regulatory boundaries established as a part of CAU closure.

42. The Program Integration PWS 3.2.5 covers multiple diverse scope elements in support of the NNSA/NFO mission. Based on our discussions with incumbent staff members, we have determined that the current Program Integration Manager covers PWS elements 3.2.5.1, 3.2.5.2, and 3.2.5.6. A separate ESH&Q organization, not managed by the Program Integration Manager, manages scope elements 3.2.5.3, 3.2.5.4, and 3.2.5.5. In response to the Draft RFP question #50 regarding a ESH&Q manager, NNSA states “**Answer:** No, Offerors can propose other management personnel who will

not be evaluated as Key Personnel.” Clause NNS-H-2013 Key Personnel Positions and Criterion 2 Key Personnel request a resume for a Program Integration Manager.

Question: In our efforts to provide best value to the government, is the key position designated as Program Integration Manager intended to reflect the management of the entire Program Integration Scope? (similar to the UGTA Manager, Soils Manager, and Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program Manager) or does NNSA intend that this position manages none of the ESH&Q elements of this PWS (similar to the current EPS organization)?

Answer: NNSA will not direct the responsibilities of any position. It is the discretion of all Offerors to develop their own approach to staffing and to determine roles and responsibilities that will provide the best value to the Government.

43. **Question:** Draft RFP question #50 would lead us to believe that the position of Program Integration Manager is not tied to the entire PWS Program Integration scope and would manage PWS elements 3.2.5.1, 3.2.5.2, and 3.2.5.6. Is this a correct assumption?

Answer: No, that is not a correct assumption. NNSA will not direct the responsibilities of any position. It is the discretion of all Offerors to develop their own approach to staffing and to determine roles and responsibilities that will provide the best value to the Government.

44. **Question:** Attachment L-3, item 13 states: “13. Self-Assessment of past performance record. Provide information on any problems encountered and your corrective actions.” Instructions only ask us to describe unusual circumstances--can we provide a self-assessment of past performance, i.e., a list of accomplishments, in addition to addressing any negative issues?

Answer: No, block 13 on Attachment L-3 shall only be completed to tell the Contractor’s perspective related to any unusual circumstances or problems that occurred during contract performance. If the Contractor has no issues to cite this block shall remain blank. This information will be used to understand how the Contractor may have addressed any past performance issues cited under Attachment L-5, Past Performance Questionnaire.

45. **Question:** Is Attachment L-3 considered a table? Can we use the font size allowed for tables for L-3? Can we use a 10pt font?

Answer: Attachment L-3 is considered a table. Yes, Offerors can use 8 pt font or larger in accordance with provision NNS-L-2000(b)(7).

46. In reference to the EPS WBS Scope Statement Rev. 2 states: **1.4.1.2 UNDERGROUND TEST AREA (UGTA) F.** The CAU-specific modeling will be developed to achieve the required level of confidence in model forecast and will employ existing codes or minimal adaptations of existing codes.

Question: Does “existing codes” refer to current NNSS software only? Or is the term broadly referring to existing code in the market place?

Answer: The “existing codes” reference above from the General Assumption in the WBS Scope Statement Revision 2, refers to model codes that have been developed and/or are currently maintained and utilized by the NNSS UGTA activity. Additional information about these codes can be found in the modeling documents provided within the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room” and those listed on the Recommended UGTA Activity Reference Documents also found in the electronic “Reading Room”.

47. Reference: Request for Proposal Reading Room, link to Navarro- Intera, LLC EPS contract (<http://www.nv.energy.gov/about/business/contracts.aspx>).

Question: The Navarro-Intera, LLC EPS contract information is not up to date as the last contract amendment/modification listed is dated May 10, 2012. We request that you provide copies of subsequent amendments/modifications through February 2014 to this contract as well as copies of any and all amendments/modifications to this contract issued prior to the proposal due date.

Answer: The website has been updated to reflect all modifications through February 2014.

48. Reference: Request for Proposal Reading Room

No documents with any substantive information on the nature and extent of contamination at Soil CAU 415, Project 57; and CAU 568 Area 3 Yucca Flat Plutonium Dispersion Sites are available from the reading room link to OSTI (<http://www.osti.gov/home/>). The present ESP Contractor has performed or is performing ongoing activities at both sites. These activities include reconnaissance and radiation walkover surveys at CAU 415 and development of DQOs for CAU 568. These activities provide the present EPS contractor with knowledge that is not available to other offerers and gives the present EPS contractor an unfair competitive advantage. The walkover and radiation survey information directly influences the type and magnitude of the activities that must be addressed in the development of the CAIP for CAU 415.

Similarly, for CAU 568 the completion of the DQO process has provided the present EPS contractor with information on the types and extent of contamination and the physical features of the assigned CASs. The completion of the DQO process has also provided an understanding of which features have been combined into study groups that span more than one CAS’ as has been done on other CAUs, or if each CAS is being addressed separately. This information is essential to determining the complexity of the CADD that is to be developed.

Question: We request that you provide copies of all preliminary, draft or proposed final surveys, DQO process results, characterization results, analytical or evaluation information and any other information on sites included in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and not listed in the reading room or available on OSTI.

Answer: Regarding CAU 415, Project 57, the only pertinent additional site-specific data available for this CAU is the size of the site: area inside current fence is ~1.9 square miles and the perimeter of current fence is ~5.1 miles. Offerors should reference the approved Corrective Action Investigation Plan (CAIP) for CAU 366, Area 11 Plutonium Valley Dispersion Sites, for a relative comparison to CAU 415. The approved CAIP for CAU 366 is available on the Office of Science and Technical Information (OSTI) website – the link to which is located on the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room”.

For CAU 568, Area 3 Plutonium Dispersion Sites, this approved CAIP is currently available on the OSTI website. The CAIP contains information about the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process, types and extent of contamination and physical features of the assigned Corrective Action Sites. Offerors should also reference the approved Corrective Action Decision Document (CADD), Corrective Action Plan (CAP), and Closure Report (CR) for CAU 366 for examples of those documents in reference to CAU 568. The approved CADD, CAP and CR for CAU 366 are available on the OSTI website.

49. Reference: Request for Proposal Reading Room

Question: The reading room contains the summary document titled, "Recommended Underground Test Area Activity Reference Documents," which has proven very helpful in ensuring a level playing field among all potential bidders. To level the playing field for the Soil PWS activities, we request that you provide a similar document containing titles and OSTI reference numbers for the Soil CAUs included in the PWS.

Answer: The relevant Soils documents are easily accessed in OSTI by searching for a CAU number. The UGTA documents are not found as easily which is why the additional reference information was provided. All pertinent information has already been provided in the RFP and the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room."

50. **Question:** We believe the documents requested above (question 47, 48, and 49) are critical to the development of a competitive proposal. Therefore, we request that the due date for the proposal be extended from March 14, 2014 to March 28, 2014.

Answer: The technical documents being requested in the referenced questions have been available to the public since the establishment of the acquisition's electronic "Reading Room" and the NNSA is not currently considering an extension at this time. The proposal due date remains unchanged.

51. Reference: PWS section 3.2.4, Radioactive Waste Acceptance Support

Section 3.2.4.4 entitled "Waste Acceptance Support" of the Performance Work Statement lists activities that include "develop and maintain the NNSSWAC and RWAP Procedures" and "establish and implement a document control process".

Question 51(a): What organization has been performing records management and document control for the RWAP group (including the RWAP Implementation Plan and Instructions/Procedures)?

Answer 51(a): Current organizational responsibilities are not relevant to this solicitation.

Question 51(b): Will the new EPS contractor perform all document control for the RWAP group or will the NNSA/NFO RWAP group and the NSTec RWAP segment each provide document control for their respective organizations?

Answer 51(b): The EPS contractor will perform all RWAP-related document control responsibilities.

Question 51(c): Other than maintaining the NNS WAC, RWAP Implementation Plan and Instructions and providing records management for records generated from the RWAP Instructions, are there any additional RWAP related document control or record management duties that the EPS contractor will be required to implement? If there are additional duties / responsibilities, please list.

Answer 51(c): All RWAP-related duties have been identified in PWS section 3.2.4., Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program.

52. Reference: NNS-L-2000 (b) (1): page 10. "Proposal files are to be formatted in the following applications: Word 2007 or lower and Excel 2007 or lower for the Volume III."

Question: For all text files, regardless of volume, it is requested that we be able to submit the text portions (including graphics) in searchable PDF format since the searchable PDF format provides the ability to rapidly and easily find information in the same format as the printed material, while avoiding the format and layout problems inherent in using MS Word. MS Word applies individual default settings to a document when it is opened that can change (1) the format, (2) layout, and (3) location of information. It is possible for information to become hidden or roll to subsequent pages. As a result, the MS Word version of a document frequently looks different from the printed version of the document.

In addition, PDFs provide ease in searching information presented in graphics. The PDF search feature will take a person to the exact word and makes it easy to locate the information for which you are searching. It also prevents inadvertent document changes that can occur when reviewing a document – further ensuring that the document reviewed electronically matches the printed version.

The Adobe PDF search feature is included in the version of Adobe presently available to download free from the internet.

Answer: The Government requirement for MS Word will not change for the body of the Offeror's proposal. MS Word facilitates checking proposals for compliance with the formatting requirements of the RFP and contains a satisfactory search function. Since the RFP requires both electronic and hard copies of the proposal, any apparent discrepancies between the electronic and hard copies should be readily discernible. All attachments/enclosures that are existing pdf-type documents, e.g., required financial statements, may be submitted in pdf format. Similarly, any of the Government provided RFP forms in pdf format should be submitted in that same format. Provision NNS-L-2000 will be amended in the RFP to clarify this concern.

53. Reference: NNS-L-2002(b) (1) (iv) Staffing Plan Summary

Question: Is our proposed L-8 COCS labor category description required in this section if it differs from the one in the RFP? If so, please confirm that it is outside of the page count.

Answer: Some confusion regarding page count exclusions has arisen due to the RFP containing a "Staffing Plan Summary" section (NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(iv)) and an RFP attachment L-7 with the same name. All requirements contained in NNS-L-2002, Section (b)(1)(iv), are excluded from the page count, to include the completed Attachment L-7, completed Attachment L-8, the COCS crosswalk,

and COCS subcategory descriptions and delineations. Offerors are required to select the COCS categories that most closely match their proposed labor categories and should not materially change the RFP provided COCS descriptions/definitions. Consistent with NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(iv), however, Offerors, “may propose labor subcategories to represent the appropriate levels of experience” as long as they ensure the subcategories are “defined and differentiated.” Provision NNS-L-2002 will be amended in the RFP to clarify this distinction.

54. Reference: NNS-L-2002(b) (1) (iv) Staffing Plan Summary

Question: Is the crosswalk between company labor categories and proposed COCS labor categories required in this section? If so, please confirm that it is outside of the page count.

Answer: Yes, and it is not included in the page count. See answer to question #53 above.

55. **Question:** The SF33 and SF30s are provided in the solicitation in PDF format. Can we submit these signed forms in PDF format with our proposal?

Answer: See answer to question #52 above.

56. **Question:** There are certain documents requested that are available only in PDF format, i.e. financial statements, Reps and Certs from SAM, etc. Can these documents be submitted as PDF files?

Answer: See answer to question #52 above.

57. **Question:** As we understand, the solicitation requires all documents to be submitted in either Word or Excel formats. Since Volume I and Volume III require forms that are in Excel and Word files and some items that are only available as PDF, in the electronic version, should Volume I and Volume III be submitted in PDF?

Answer: See answer to question #52 above.

58. **Question:** For the Program Integration scope, the incumbent is responsible for the information systems area, including, computers, network, databases, help desk to the contractor staff, programming for updates in EMIS and other software. The incumbent maintains over 150 PCs and laptops, 20+ physical servers, 40+ virtual servers, 20+ network devices, 2 firewalls, 100+ software licenses-agreements-upgrades annually for users, cybersecurity, etc. Shall we assume that these requirements will continue in the new EPS contract?

Answer: The requirement to maintain computer-related equipment (PCs, laptops, servers, network devices, firewalls, licenses, cybersecurity, etc.) will continue in the new EPS contract; however, the numbers and specifics will be determined by the new contractor. Also, see the response to question #32 in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers.

59. **Question:** Can Attachment L-11, BOE Log, include a description of the scope of the element being estimated in a narrative form?

Answer: Yes, but such narrative should be clearly tied to an element of the PWS.

60. **Question:** Can the WBS hierarchy proceed as follows: CAU followed by Work Activity?

Example - In the current PWS the heading for UGTA are shown as follows:

- 3.2.2 Underground Test Area (UGTA)
- 3.2.2.1 UGTA Field Activities
- 3.2.2.1.1 Well Drilling Support
- 3.2.2.1.2 Well Development and Testing

Then after the discussion of Well Development and Testing is a list of UGTA-related activities and milestones.

Answer: Offerors are expected to submit proposals that deliver the best value to the Government based on the scope identified in the PWS. The PWS numbering hierarchy is a function of that document designating different sections and sub-sections, and is not intended to be a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS). The Nevada Field Office WBS hierarchy is identified in the WBS Scope Statement and the Environmental Program Services (EPS) Contract Baseline Schedule (FY 2015 – FY 2019) for reference. These documents can be found in the acquisition’s electronic “Reading Room.”

61. **Question:** Can we order the WBS such that the next level under UGTA are the 4 CAUs plus UGTA Support (5 elements), then under the CAUs are field activities, analytical activities and reporting activities?

- Proposed
- 3.2.2 Underground Test Area (UGTA)
- 3.2.2.1 CAU
- 3.2.2.1.1 Field Activities
- 3.2.2.1.2 Analytical Activities
- 3.2.2.1.3 Reporting Activities

Answer: See answer to question #60.