

N62473-15-R-0811
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #2
2 JULY 2015

1. Section 1.0 General Requirements for Task Orders,
 - a. 2.2 License Requirements ... “The Prime Contractor shall have a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Service Provider License with a License Tracking System Program Code of 03219 and an equivalent California Agreement State Radioactive Material License that allows for the processing, storing at temporary job sites, packaging, and shipping radioactive materials incidental ...”

Question: The cost to acquire a specific California Agreement State Radioactive Material License can place an undue financial burden on small businesses requiring the upfront expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars. Given the potential expense required for a solicitation without any guarantee of an award, or use of a CA RML during task order performance, will the Government consider:

- i. Documentation stating that a small business has had a CA RML in the past or is currently eligible to receive one from the Competent Authority in CA
- ii. Documentation that the proper registration has been submitted to the State of CA with final payment of all fees to be completed after contract award
- iii. Government reimbursement of small business expenses for CA RML should the entity not be awarded a contract?

RESPONSE: No applies to i., ii., and iii above.

2. The RFP states: Clause H10 NFAS 5252.209-9300 Organizational Conflicts of Interest
 - a. “... IF the Contractor under this contract prepares or assists in preparing a statement of work, specifications and plans, the Contractor and its affiliates shall be ineligible to bid or participate, in any capacity, in any contractual effort which is based on such statement of work or specifications and plans as a prime contractor, subcontractor, consultant or in any similar capacity...” bodies away from the delivery order site or outside of normal working hours”

Question: Many large and small businesses that have supported NAVFAC-SW on projects at the Hunters Point Site are approaching small businesses without disclosing prior experience and contract activity at the site. Small businesses do not have access to information or resources to confirm whether said firms will be subject to OCI restrictions thereby disqualifying potential small business primes. Will the Government/NAVFAC-SW identify current, incumbent or past Prime Contractors, subcontractors and/or consultants that have participated in the development of any plans, statement of work, survey data and/or operations that may be excluded from participating in the resultant contract or the seed project?

RESPONSE: There are currently no firms that are excluded from participating in the resultant contract or seed project.

3. NAVFAC-SW provided access numerous significant and relevant files and survey information on 29, June 2015 (well over 1,000MB). These files require a thorough examination to fully ensure that a competent and compliant technical approach is developed for TO 0001, Building 253 and 211 Radiological Remediation and Support at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard

Question - Given the quantity and technical specificity of the documents included and the confidence in the accuracy of the information provided, is it possible to extend the proposal due date for **N62473-15-R-0811** from 23 July to 10 August 2015?

RESPONSE: The closing date set for receipt of proposals will remain as 23 July 2015.

4. We request clarification with regard to the removal of underground sewer and drain lines. Page 9 of 24 of the Seed Project Performance Work Statement states that removal may require removal out to approximately 15 feet and that removal will be “up to these former termination points”. Are all of the former termination points within 15 feet of the exterior edge of the buildings? If not what is the maximum distance from the exterior edge of the building for the furthest former termination point?

RESPONSE: The former termination points are approximately 10 feet from the building.

5. For the Seed Project, what is the areal extent of the building 211 and 253 project site that the contractor is to obtain radiological unrestricted release? Is it the footprint of the two buildings; the footprint of the two buildings plus the area extending 15 feet out from the exterior edge of each building; or if it is some other defined area, please provide details?

RESPONSE: The footprint of the two buildings plus any sanitary or sewer drain lines 10 feet from the building.

6. In response question #9 of N62473-15-R-0811 – RADMAC II QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #1, dated 29 June 2015, the statement is made that the schematics included in the two characterization reports are to be used to judge current building conditions. The schematics lack several items necessary to assess building conditions with regard to structural issues (column materials, size, load, etc.) and drain line configurations (length of each line, orientation, joints, tees, diameter, etc.). We request detailed building drawings and utility/structural plans/schematics be provided to prospective offerors.

RESPONSE: Schematics of the buildings can be obtained from the Care Takers Support Office in Treasure Island located at One Avenue of the Palms, Suite 161, San Francisco, CA. Some additional files on the buildings will be sent to all offerors by amerdec.

7. During the site walk, NAVFAC SW stated the Internal Draft Characterization Survey Results (IDCSR), Building 253 and 211, report should be treated as final for proposal purposes; however there may be some areas (e.g., ventilation system) that were not thoroughly characterized.
 - a. For proposal purposes, can we assume all of the information included in the IDCSR is complete and accurate, and the ventilation system is the only additional area requiring characterization?
 - b. If the ventilation system is not the only area of the building requiring additional characterization, what other areas, materials, or equipment require additional characterization?

RESPONSE: For the purposes of the proposal, the offeror is only responsible for the items in the report.

8. The Seed Project PWS, Section 2.4.2, states, “Based on Building 211 and 253 Radiological Characterization Reports, June 2015, the areas of known contamination shall be remediated.”, and later states, “Piping removal may need to be performed to obtain unrestricted free-release.” The Characterization Report for Building 253, Section 12, recommends removal of approximately

5900 linear feet of above ground drain lines. Based on this information, can we assume all above ground drain lines (e.g., sewer and storm water drains throughout the building) must be removed? If not, please provide more details on which drain lines and/or piping must be removed.

RESPONSE: Since all pipes are rad impacted, it is assumed that they may be contaminated. The previous projects removed the lines to obtain free-release. However, we are not directing the contractor on any methods on how to obtain free-release for this proposal.

9. The Seed Project PWS, Section 2.4.1.2, states to excavate and remove the sewer and storm drain lines as outlined by the planning documents under Section 2.4. In the Internal Draft Characterization Survey Results (IDCSR), Building 253 and 211, report, it states in Section 12 (page 12-2) removal of the "...sewer and storm drain lines – series of lines below the building slab." From this statement, can we assume all sewer and storm drain lines below the building 253 slab must be removed and disposed of as LLRW?

RESPONSE: See response above.

10. For the purpose of costing the Seed Project, is all M&E required for removal outlined in the Building 211 and 253 Characterization Survey Report?
- Can we assume all other M&E located throughout Building 211 and 253 have been characterized as non-radiological impacted and can remain in place?
 - If not, which M&E located in the buildings must be surveyed and documented for unrestricted radiological free-release?

RESPONSE: All M&E can remain in place in the buildings, unless is it specified in the report as being contaminated.

11. In Building 211, four survey units (143, 144, 153 and 154) were not surveyed due to structural safety concerns. Please clarify the scope of work required for these four survey units?

RESPONSE: Any survey units that were not surveyed due to structural safety concerns will not need to be remediated under this proposal.

12. The Seed Project PWS is clear that no additional funding will be provided to resolve the Navy's comments on the Building 211 and 253 radiological unrestricted release documentation.
- What has been the nominal number of review cycles by the Navy required to resolve all comments and what is the length of time required by the Navy for each review period?
 - After resolution of all of the Navy's comments what is the review process for obtaining approval by the regulatory agencies (US EPA, CDPH and California DTSC)?
 - How many review cycles with each agency are nominally required and what is the length of time required by each agency for each review period?
 - Are the agency reviews accomplished simultaneously or in series?
 - If in series, what is the order in which each agency reviews the documentation?

RESPONSE:

- The FFA review periods are 45 days for draft, 30 day for draft final and 15 day review periods for finals.

b. i. see response above; ii. Agency reviews are simultaneous. iii. N/A.

13. Must regulatory agency final approval of the Building 211 and 253 release reports be obtained within the 24 month duration stated in the Seed Project Performance Statement of Work?

RESPONSE: Yes.

14. When the roof of Building 253 was remediated in the 2001/2002 timeframe, was the roof totally decontaminated and determined to satisfy the unrestricted release criteria?

- a. If not, what was not accomplished – total remediation, Final Status Survey, or both? Please provide any available documentation of the extent of the survey and all results which preceded the remediation, the extent of the remediation performed, and the post remediation survey and all results. If available, please provide the pre and post remediation roof survey data in an executable electronic format.

RESPONSE: If the roof is not in the characterization report that is provided in with the proposal, then remediation is not required at this time.

15. When the roof of Building 253 was remediated in the 2001/2002 timeframe were all roof penetrations/vents/stacks surveyed and determined to be non-radiological impacted? If not, please provide a listing of which penetrations/vents/stacks must be addressed indicating each penetration's status.

RESPONSE: See the response above.

16. Upon award, can we access the buildings to perform non-invasive survey and inspection activities to support the planning process prior to final task order plan approvals? If yes, please provide the protocols for early building access.

RESPONSE: If awarded the planned task order 0001, access to the building will be allowed with advance coordination with the HPNS Facility Support Officer. Protocols will be discussed after contract award.

17. Is the Radiation Protection Plan a standalone document or should it be included as an addendum to the APP?

RESPONSE: The Radiation Protection Plan should be a standalone document.

18. Are the resumes requested in Factor 4, Tab 4b, included in the 15 page limit for Factor 4? If yes, can we cross reference the Tab 4b resumes to duplicate resumes located in Factor 3, Tab 3c?

RESPONSE: Yes, Resumes are included in the page limit. However, if the resumes have been previously submitted in Factor 3 Key Personnel, firms may cross reference the Tab 4b resumes to Factor 3.

19. On RFP page 104 of 127, we are limited to page size of 8.5" x 11", and the page size for Organizational Chart is limited to no larger than 8.5" x 14" with font size less than or greater than 10 point. Can the offeror use the 8.5" x 14" page size for both the Organizational Charts in Factors 3 and 4? Would the Navy consider the use of 11" x 17" fold outs in the proposal?

RESPONSE: The size limitation for the Organizational Charts for both Factors 3 and 4 should be no larger than 8.5” x 14”. 11” x 17” fold outs are not acceptable. The font size must be readable.

20. For Volume 1, Tab 6B – Narrative and Subcontracting Report for ISR, SF-294, we are required to include ISRs as applicable to our demonstrated projects under Factor 1, Past Performance. As ISRs are completed at the contract level, and our projects are at the task order level, the included ISRs may not equally represent the specific, highlighted task order. Is this acceptable to the Navy?

RESPONSE: Yes, the ISR should be submitted for the Contract that the task order was issued under.

21. Reference RFP Page 104 of 127: 4) Offeror(s) shall submit proposal copies as follows:
a. ...” The page size for Organizational Chart is limited to no larger than 8.5” x 14” with font size less than or greater than 10 point. If the font size for Organizational Chart is less than 10 point, it must be readable or the chart may be deemed unacceptable.

Question #1) May we use 11” x 17” for the organization chart to enable us to bind it into a 3-ring binder?

Question #2) Please confirm organization chart font is 10 point.

RESPONSE: Question #1, the size limit for Organizational Charts is 8.5” x 14”. Question #2, the font size for the organizational chart must be readable and is not restricted to 10 point.

22. Reference RFP Page 108 of 127: Tab 3D – Teaming and Partnering/Joint Venture Agreements:

Are Teaming Agreements and letters of commitment required for team members that are anticipated to do less than 20% of the contract value?

RESPONSE: Yes, not required for subcontractors performing less than 20%.

23. Page 104 of 127 4a, Page limits. The page size for the organization chart is presented as 8.5”x14. Typically NAVFAC SW has allowed the organization chart to be presented as an 11”x17 fold out. We are requesting that the 11” x17 be permitted for the organization chart.

RESPONSE: See response to Question #19 above.

24. Page 109 of 127, Factor 4: Technical Approach – Proposed Task Order 0001, Tab 4B Team Organization and Experience, Item 2 – Provide a resume for PTO 0001 Positions – There are 4 resumes required. The Project Manager and Site Radiation Safety Officer resumes will be included in Factor 3. We request that the second presentation of those two resumes not be included in the SF 330 page count.

RESPONSE: See response to Question #18 above.

25. Pages 104/105 of 127, Factor 1: Past Performance: Under (1), a project must have been completed within the past 5 yrs. Under (4), performance recognition documents are only

permitted for the past 3 yrs. We request that the performance recognition period be 5 yrs to match the project time frame.

RESPONSE: The Past Performance relevancy period is 3 years. No changes will be made to RFP.