

N62473-15-R-0811
RADMAC II
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS #3
10 JULY 2015

1. Pre-bid site visit, June 30 - Please post or provide the attendee list for the meeting.

RESPONSE: The list of attendees will be posted to NECO/FEDBIZOPS.

2. Please provide as-built drawings that identify the location of the sanitary and storm drains within Buildings 211 and 253, or if drawings are not available, please provide the length, depth and diameter of drains that are to be excavated so that all contractors are working from the same information.

RESPONSE: All of the available as-built drawings can be found at the Care Taker Office in Treasure Island at 1 Ave of the Palms, Suite 161, San Francisco, CA 94130-1807. Please call Glen Nelson for an appointment at 510-224-0566.

3. Are as-built drawings available for Buildings 211 and 253 that indicate the thickness of concrete of the floor/foundation for each building?

RESPONSE: All of the available as-built drawings can be found at the Care Taker Office in Treasure Island at 1 Ave of the Palms, Suite 161, San Francisco, CA 94130-1807. Please call Glen Nelson for an appointment at 510-224-0566.

4. The Internal Draft Characterization Survey Results for Building 211 stated that four Survey Units (143, 144, 153, and 154) were eliminated from TetraTech EC's survey due to safety concerns with degraded structural columns, but that TetraTech EC recommended including that work in a future contract. Have the safety concerns been resolved and are those survey units part of the SOW for this task order?

RESPONSE: The safety concerns have not been addressed and will not be part of this solicitation. A modification or separate Task Order will be written to address these areas.

5. There are 24x8 pallets of consolidated debris (several on each floor). Is the contractor responsible for removing that material under the TO and if so, has the material been cleared for release?

RESPONSE: If the material is not listed in the Internal Draft Characterization Survey Results for Buildings 211 and 253, the material does not need to be characterized or remediated.

6. Since coordination efforts with other contractors will be on an as-needed basis, please provide information as to where and work is planned or scheduled to occur within or in the vicinity of Buildings 211 and 253 over the next 24 months.

RESPONSE: Planned work that will be performed within the areas near Buildings 211 and 253 is construction of a basewide cap on Parcel C and the SVE system within the building. The Parcel C cap is scheduled to be completed by October 2015. The SVE system is scheduled to be operated until July 2016.

7. The solicitation indicates that the Contractor shall have access to RSY 3 located in Parcel E. Will additional RSYs be made available if requested?

RESPONSE: The base has very limited space. If the base has the available space to provide additional RSYs, then it will be allowed, however, RSYs will not be placed on previously remediated areas. Currently, space is not available to place any additional RSYs.

8. Are as-built drawings available for overhead air ventilation system for Building 253? If not, please provide the length and width of all ductwork to be removed from each of floor within Building 253.

RESPONSE: All of the available as-built drawings can be found at the Care Taker Office in Treasure Island at 1 Ave of the Palms, Suite 161, San Francisco, CA 94130-1807. Please call Glen Nelson for an appointment at 510-224-0566. Additional electronic files of building 253 and 211 will be posted on AMRDEC, but not all files are available electronically.

9. Should we assume that all debris on the general floor footprint that is not attached be considered clean and doesn't require free release?

RESPONSE: Yes.

10. The characterization report indicated that brick surface in survey unit 615 is recommended for removal by Tetrattech EC. Is removal of the entire top deck required?

RESPONSE: The offeror should propose the best option to obtain free-release of the area.

11. There is an SVE treatment system on the ground floor. Is there any activity associated with that system under this TO?

RESPONSE: If the Internal Draft Report for the characterization of B211 and B253 does not identify any areas near the SVE system, then no remediation will need to be performed on this solicitation.

12. Section H, H10 ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (pg. 44 of 127): 5252.209-9300 (c) requires a statement describing all relevant facts concerning any past, present, or currently planned interest relating to the work. Is there a time limit on past interests for the Organizational Conflicts of Interest Clause found in Section H10?

RESPONSE: No time limit.

13. Section L, FACTOR 7: PRICE OF PROPOSED TASK ORDER 0001, Tab 7E: Responsibility Determination Matters (pg. 114 of 127): Can an offeror submit a bank reference letter in lieu of the Financial Questionnaire form (Attachment J-6)?

RESPONSE: No, all offeror's shall use Attachment J-6, Financial Questionnaire.

14. Price Proposal. The Solicitation does not include any requirements for submission of an IDIQ labor rate schedule with the proposal. In addition to the Price Proposal for PTO 0001, should an IDIQ labor rate schedule be developed by the offeror and submitted with the price proposal?

RESPONSE: There are no requirements for IDIQ labor rates. The PTO 0001 price proposal should be submitted in an Excel Spreadsheet, reference RFP Attachment J-4.

15. Planning Documents (Work Element #3). Section 2.3.3 of the PWS requires that we revise the Action Memorandum with the focus being revision of the release criteria set forth in Table 1. Is it the intent of the Navy to have the contractor revise the current accepted release criteria set forth in Table 1?

RESPONSE: Yes, if the contractor has ample justification that the release criteria can be changed, the AM can be revised with a more suitable criteria.

16. During the site walk, it was noted that there was debris stacked in the middle of the larger rooms on most floors of the buildings. The characterization report and PWS infers that any debris, equipment, etc. still in the building has been surveyed and can be released without additional surveys. Is the debris and remaining materials within the buildings that are not segregated with rad rope releasable without additional surveys?

RESPONSE: If any material is not roped off or not noted in the draft characterization report as being contaminated will not need to be remediated in this solicitation.

17. Reference to L3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, para 5) Proposal Submission Requirements; to properly and adequately respond to the requirements for Factor 4, and ensure that the content of Tab E—PTO 0001 Technical Approach Breakdown, and the Tab F – PTO 0001 Performance Milestone Schedule are legible and clear, can the Navy please exclude from the 15 page limit of Factor 4 the Tab E—PTO 0001 Technical Approach Breakdown, and the Tab F – PTO 0001 Performance Milestone Schedule?

RESPONSE: Factor 4, Tabs 4E PTO 0001 Technical Approach Breakdown and Tab 4F – PTO 0001 Performance Milestone Schedule will be excluded from the 15 Page count. This change will be made via Amendment to the solicitation.

18. Reference to L3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, para 5) Proposal Submission Requirements; is it possible to use an 11x17 size sheet for Tab F – PTO 0001 Performance Milestone Schedule?

a. If yes, will an 11x17 size sheet count as one page or two pages toward the page limitation?

RESPONSE: No, 11 x 17 page size is not acceptable.

19. In RFP L3 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, para. 3.b) Sub-Factor 6.B is listed as containing Tabs 6G, 6H, and 6I. However, in para 5) submission requirements, there is also a requirement for Tab 6J – SB Company Commitments. Is the Offeror required to provide the Tab 6J information?

RESPONSE: Yes, firms shall address the requirements for Tab 6J.

20. Can the Navy clarify if the Offeror shall abide by the release criteria for the various radionuclides for this PTO 001 - particularly Thorium, defined in the Internal Draft Characterization Survey Results for Building 211 and 253 reports provided?

RESPONSE: The release criteria will need to be followed according to the Action Memorandum. However, the contractor will have the opportunity to revise the criteria to more current standards.

21. Can the Navy provide documentation from CDPH indicating concurrence to such levels?

RESPONSE: The Navy has received release letters to the criteria listed in the Action Memorandum.

22. Can the Navy describe the CDPH process required during survey unit sampling (duplicates) in order to accommodate these protocols into our proposal?

RESPONSE: CDPH requires the contractor to follow any written work plan for this project. It is up to the contractor to provide a work plan that is justifiable and approved by the Navy and the regulators.

23. Can the Navy define the survey process expected to free-release the ventilation system and the roof? There appears to be a discrepancy in the description of the site survey and remediation process for the roof and ventilation system.

RESPONSE: Any items that are not in the internal draft report as being contaminated do not require remediation. Therefore, if the roof or ventilation systems are not in the report, it is not the responsibility of the contractor to remediate those areas.

24. Reference to Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; can the initial/ preliminary survey data obtained for the Seed Project be used for RASO approval for backfill?

RESPONSE: No. Any area that is excavated and requires backfill will need to have final sampling results to prove that no contamination remains.

25. Can the Navy identify the requirement for exterior radiological screening of the building(s)? I.e. is the Offeror responsible for the free release of the entire building exterior or just for the areas where there is exterior piping?

RESPONSE: The offeror is responsible to obtain free-release for any area that is mentioned in the internal draft characterization report.

26. Is the NWTP Phase V Radiological Investigation for Building 253 survey data (either the 2003 and 2004 surveys) available for Offeror to review? We believe that this data is critical for scoping and costing this PTO.

RESPONSE: No. This data is not considered to be valid since it was taken with different technology and with different standards.

27. Reference to Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; have all the exterior SS/SD pipes in the vicinity of Buildings 211 and 253 been removed to within 15 feet from the Building 211 and 253 perimeters? Please provide an accounting summary of piping removed, as well as any remaining piping that will be addressed under PTO 001.

RESPONSE: Yes, all piping around buildings 253/211 have already been remediated.

28. Reference to Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; can concrete that has been screened as Rad-free be reused and/or recycled offsite?

RESPONSE: Yes, as long as it is approved by the regulators. Uncontaminated concrete has been successfully reused/recycled on other projects.

29. Reference to Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; at what point will responsibility be transferred to the basewide Rad disposal contractor? Is it when the basewide Rad disposal contractor has picked up the Offeror-loaded waste bins for disposal?

RESPONSE: Yes

30. Reference to Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; can the Navy specify if there will be any investigation or remediation actions taking place by others in the immediate vicinity of Building 211 and 253 during the period of performance of this PTO 001? If so, please provide the data for both buildings.

RESPONSE: Planned work that will be performed within the areas near Buildings 211 and 253 is construction of a basewide cap on Parcel C and the SVE system within the building. The Parcel C cap is scheduled to be completed by October 2015. The SVE system is scheduled to be operated until July 2016.

31. In the Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; para 2.4.1.2, it states; *“The contractor shall have access to the radiological screening yard (RSY) 3 located in parcel E.”*

a. Will the Offeror be responsible for management and maintenance of the RSY#3 during the project (eg, air monitoring, storm water management, and/or waste water collection and treatment)?

b. Is the base-wide Rad disposal contractor responsible for characterization, profiling/ disposal (if necessary) of any surface water runoff from RSY #3?

RESPONSE: a. Yes

b. No, the offeror is responsible for the characterization and profiling. The base-wide contractor is responsible for the disposal. Section 2.4.1.2 of the PWS states, “The Contractor under this PWS and their licensing requirements is responsible for material handling, screening, characterization and management of excavated peripheral soil, overburden soils, and sewer and storm drain piping within the controlled radiological work area.”

32. Reference to the Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS; can the Navy clarify that the Offeror’s responsible for any SD/SS removal and related radiological remediation ends at the 15-foot distance from the exterior footprints of Buildings 211 and 253?

RESPONSE: The offeror is only responsible for the SS/SD lines within the buildings footprints and 15 feet from the foundations.

33. Reference to the Seed Project PTO 001; are either Building 253 or 211 within IRP sites?

- a. Is the Offeror responsible to sample for analytical suite relevant to the IRP contamination in soil or is that the responsibility of the Parcel C TPH and CERCLA contractors? What are the requirements for coordination? If the Offeror is required to sample, what are minimum analytical suites required for sampling for Buildings 253 and 211?
- b. If no radiological contamination is discovered in soil from a trench, but CERCLA contamination is detected in that soil, is the responsibility for that waste transferred to the Parcel C TPH and CERCLA contractors for handling and disposal, or is the Offeror responsible for that waste?
- c. Is the Offeror responsible for assessing potential leaching threat to groundwater from soil contamination (and potential need for soil remediation), or is this the responsibility of the Parcel C TPH and CERCLA contractors?
- d. Recognizing that VOCs have been attributed to the soil/ groundwater adjacent to the buildings, has worker exposure to vapor intrusion ever been assessed for the buildings? Is it the Offeror’s responsibility to “chase” this contamination if encountered?
- e. Are the Parcel C TPH and CERCLA contractors responsible for petroleum contamination found within the soil related to the former USTs and/or the adjacent former fueling station (or if collocated with CERCLA contamination), or is the Offeror responsible for this?

RESPONSE:

- a. Yes, Buildings 253 and 211 are located within IR 28. Before any soil is disposed of, it must also be sampled for the COCs listed in the Parcel C ROD. TPH does not need to be sampled for. Coordination efforts can be arranged at time of award.
- b. Non-rad contaminated soil disposal will be the responsibility of the offeror if found within the footprint of the rad-impacted area as mentioned in Section 2.4.1.2 of the PWS, “The Contractor under this PWS and their licensing requirements is responsible for material handling, screening, characterization and management of excavated peripheral soil, overburden soils, and sewer and storm drain piping within the controlled radiological work area. “

- c. The offeror is not responsible to determine any leaching threat of any non-radiological contamination under this solicitation.
- d. No, vapor intrusion samples have not been taken in the building. The offeror is only responsible for obtaining free-release status for radiological contamination.
- e. Currently, there are no active TPH sites near building 253 or 211. The offeror is only responsible to obtain a free -release status for radiological contamination.

34. The Seed Project PWS states NAVFAC SW will provide the “Basewide Radiological Archaeological Monitoring and Discovery Plan, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco County, California (AMDP) (King 2012); however this document was not included on the data CD or the ARMDEC web site. Please provide a copy of this document.

RESPONSE: A copy of this document was up-loaded to AMERDEC web site on 6 July 2015.

35. Section L, Tab 7B asks for completion of CLINs 0001 and 0002 of Section B. CLIN 0002 is clear as our price for the PTO, however CLIN 0001 shows \$240,000,000 over the 5 year period. How should we complete CLIN 0001?

RESPONSE: Completion of CLIN 0001 is not required since the resulting contracts will result in an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity contract with a Not-to-exceed amount of \$240M. Offerors are required to complete CLIN 0002 which is the total price for accomplishing PTO 0001.

36. Will the submittal of license numbers for NRC and CDPH radioactive materials licenses be sufficient for the proposal?

RESPONSE: No, see Section L, Clause L3 for specifics.

37. Can key personnel hold more than one key position?

RESPONSE: No.

38. Is the Clause 52.211-12 LIQUIDATED DAMAGES--CONSTRUCTION (SEP 2000) intended to apply to every CTO ordered under the contract or on a task order by task order basis?

RESPONSE: This clause will be applicable to those task orders determined to be construction for which the Task Order Contracting Officer includes the Construction Wage Rate Requirements (formerly Davis Bacon Act).

39. Prior projects of this nature have not included Liquidated Damages. Would you consider eliminating the Liquidated Damages clause shown page 57?

RESPONSE: No, it is applicable to this procurement.

40. Prior projects of this nature have not included Liquidated Damages. Could you provide the basis for including Liquidated Damages?

RESPONSE: See response to Questions 38, 39 above, and refer to the FAR Clause 52.211.12.

41. Is it possible to modify the NAVFAC Project Data Sheet form (Exhibit A) slightly to remove the instructions at the top and bottom of page 1, the parenthetical instructions, and reformat the form as long as we keep the same order as provided? We believe this will help the reader in reviewing and provide more space to discuss the projects.

RESPONSE: Yes, minor modification of the form as stated will be allowed.

42. Tab 7B of the Price Proposal requires completion of CLINs 0001 and 0002 in Section B of the Solicitation. Can you confirm that the offeror should enter \$240M for CLIN 0001 or what basis should be used to establish a price for this CLIN?

RESPONSE: No price should be entered on CLIN 0001.

43. Given the amount of information required in both Factors 3 and 4, we request the Government exclude resumes from the page count for both factors, or alternately, increase the page count for each factor from 15 to 20 pages.”

RESPONSE: The page count remains as stated in the solicitation. Please see response to Question 18 in the Q&A #2 dated 2 July 2015.

44. What level of detail is required to support the costs in Factor 7?

- a. Is it sufficient to provide a detailed breakout of cost by work element and cost category (e.g., labor, ODCs, subcontractors, indirect rates, fee, etc.)?
- b. If not, what additional cost/pricing backup is required?

RESPONSE: a. Yes, detailed breakout by work element to include all costs associated with the total price. b. N/A.

45. To further clarify for Question/Response #19, can offerors use the allowed larger-sized paper (8.5 x14) in other sections of the proposal, outside of the organization chart in Factor 3? For example, the organization chart in Factor 4?

RESPONSE: All pages of the proposal shall be 8.5” x 11”. Only the Organizational Charts in Factor’s 3 and 4 may be 8.5” x 14”.

46. The Section M evaluation criteria for Factor 1: Past Performance includes the following statement:

The basis of evaluation will focus on the offerer's past performance in performing relevant contracts and/or task orders for work of similar size, scope and complexity to that described in Section C – Performance Work Statement of the solicitation.

Based on this criteria, is there a relevancy hierarchy for the contracts and/or task orders as related to client type and geography? If so:

- a. Will relevant radiological scope be ranked higher than other types of work, or will some other scope factor be rated higher? If some other factor, please explain.

- b. For geographical evaluations, will work in the NAVFAC SW area of responsibility be rated higher than work outside this region or will some other geographic evaluation exist? If some other criteria, please explain.
- c. For client evaluations, will working for a DoD client be rated higher than other federal agencies and/or commercial clients or will some other client hierarchy exist? If some other criteria, please explain.

RESPONSE: No. The evaluation of past performance is based how well the offeror has performed on previous Contracts/task orders for work that is relevant to the work described in Section C – Performance Work Statement in size, scope and complexity. See Section M, Clause M4.

47. Page 120 of 127 of the RFP – Is a Bid Guarantee required to support the seed project or the entire proposal?

RESPONSE: A Bid Guarantee is required in the penal sum of 20% of the PTO 0001 price.

48. Is a Performance Bond required for the seed project? Is a Payment Bond required for the seed project?

RESPONSE: Yes, a Performance and Payment Bond will be required for PTO 0001 from the firm that is awarded PTO 0001. Performance and Payment Bonds will be submitted 15 days after contract award.

49. The Attachment J3 Seed Project PWS, Para 2, identifies 6 Work Elements. However, Attachment J4 Sample Price Proposal PTO 001 lists 7 elements (separating Work Element 1 as Project Management and Work Elements 2 as Project Meetings, with all other Work Elements bumped over by one number). Can the Navy clarify which list of Work Elements is correct, and provide an updated Attachment J3 PWS and/ or Attachment J4 document to reflect this definition?

RESPONSE: Per page 113 of the RFP, “Attachment J4 is a sample format, firms may make changes.” To ensure that all firms are proposing consistently, Attachment J4 will be revised to include Project Management and Project Meetings as WE 1, and all other work elements to correspond to the PTO 0001 PWS.

50. RFP page 103 of 127 refers to Tab 7B - Section B, CLINs 0001 and 0002. CLIN 0001 appears to reflect the total value of the IDIQ. Does the Navy intend to request a cost for CLIN 0001 or is this in error?

RESPONSE: No, please see response to Question #42 above.

51. Page 103 of 127 of RFP lists “Tab 7D – Bid Guarantee, Performance and Payment Bonds or alternative payment.” Can the Navy clarify what is required to be submitted in Tab 7D?

- a. Is a Bid bond required for the Seed project?
- b. If yes, what portions of the project need to be bonded (i.e., what Work Elements or sub elements)?
- c. Are Performance and Payment bonds required for the Seed Project?
 - a. If yes, what portion of the work applies to the payment and performance bond – i.e. what part (Work Elements) is considered construction?

RESPONSE: a. A Bid Guarantee is required.
b. The Bid Guarantee shall be at least 20% of the PTO 0001 total.
c. The performance and payment bond shall be submitted 15 days after task order award for 100% of the total cost of the PTO 0001.

52. Reference Attachment E Base Period and Option Year Subcontracting Goals: Attachment I contains columns for the Base Period, Option Period 1 and Option Period 2. The table appears to be missing columns for Option Years 3 and 4. Please provide a revised Attachment 1.

RESPONSE: Attachment E, Attachment 1, be updated to include Option Years.