

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #3  
N62473-15-R-0813**

1. QUESTION: Section L, Factor 2: Technical Approach (PTO0001) (p. 118 of 129)

The RFP is asking for a technical approach breakdown adequately addressing the following two (2) elements:

- 1) The proposal by tasks, level of effort, and resources, which demonstrates your understanding and analysis of the project work requirements.
- 2) The labor mix, man hours, material, and equipment for prime and any proposed subcontractors.

The technical approach breakdown shall be submitted in an Excel Spreadsheet.

We do not understand the difference between the two elements. They seem to be asking for the same thing. Would the government please provide additional clarification on what it is looking for?

**RESPONSE: The first is a narrative, the second is an excel spreadsheet with the actual breakdown in numbers without costs.**

2. QUESTION: Section L, Factor 2: Technical Approach (PTO0001) (p. 118 of 129)

If an Offeror or a team subcontractor has worked at Target Areas S-4-1 and S-4-3 at Camp Billy Machen, would the Government consider that a potential conflict of interest?

**RESPONSE: There is no conflict of interest issues associated with PTO 0001.**

3. QUESTION: Pricing, Section B, Item No 0002- Planned Task Order 0001

Are offerors required to provide backup for the « Amount » presented for the services at Camp Billy Machen ?

**RESPONSE: A price breakdown (backup) is not required. Section B requests only a lump sum total.**

4. QUESTION: Section L, L2

How quickly will the Navy respond to questions received on the due date of 5 June 2015? The proposal is due 7 working days after the deadline for questions. This timeframe does not allow adequate time for the Navy to respond to questions and the contractors to revise their proposal in response. We respectfully request an extension to the due date to allow the offerors a minimum of 10 working days after receipt of responses to questions.

**RESPONSE: The proposal due date remains unchanged. Offerors are encouraged to submit RFI's as soon as possible to allow prompt Government responses.**

5. QUESTION: Exhibit C, Project Data Sheet

Please confirm offerors may delete the text on Exhibit C in the Description of Work Performed cell.

**RESPONSE: The text box titled "Description of Work Performed" maybe deleted for your Project Data Sheet submission. Offerors are reminded to ensure they are in compliance with the requirements as stated in the text.**

6. QUESTION: Section L, Factor 2: Technical Approach (PTO0001), Tab B, Technical Approach

Breakdown. We respectfully request the EXCEL Spreadsheet containing the Technical Approach breakdown be excluded from the page count in order to give the offerors adequate pages to present their technical approach.

**RESPONSE: The page count remains unchanged.**

7. QUESTION: Safety Instructions – Page Limitations, Section L, Factor 3: Safety, Tab C  
We respectfully request that the page limitation for the Technical Approach to Safety be increased.

**RESPONSE: The page count remains unchanged.**

8. QUESTION: Section L, Factor 4: Management Approach, Tab A  
Thank you for excluding the Organizational Chart from the page limitation. We also respectfully request the page count for Tab A be increased. The Navy is requesting a lot of information under sections a, b, c, and d and it impossible for the offerors to sufficiently address all the requirements in 5 pages.

**RESPONSE: The page count remains unchanged.**

9. QUESTION: Section M, Factor 6: Pricing  
Given that the evaluation criteria is Best Value and the technical factors combined are significantly more important than price, please explain why the Navy would compare the offerors prices to other price proposals received. It would seem reasonable that ensure that our price is appropriate for our approach; however, our approach and resources may be significantly different from other offerors and by comparing the offerors prices to each other the Navy may be comparing apples to oranges.

**RESPONSE: Factor 6 remains unchanged. The allowance is only one of many techniques the Government may use to ensure a fair and reasonable price as stated in Section M, and is consistent with FAR Part 15.**

10. QUESTION: Additional information on the use of Range S-4-1, PWS for PTO 0001  
Knowing that this is an active range and nobody can ever guarantee what material might have found its way on to the range, to the best of the Navy's knowledge was this range used strictly for demolitions training (i.e. breaching charges, cratering charges, flex-linear ) and not used for training of modified weapons systems, where anti-tank rockets are used as controlled mines under a demolition training event?

**RESPONSE: To the best of the Navy's knowledge the range was used strictly for demolitions training and not used for training of modified weapons systems.**

11. QUESTION: PWS for PTO0001  
Does the range track the number and types of munitions fired down range during the training activities since the last clearance, and will these quantities be available to the contractors? This would be useful in determining a dud rate for munitions that may be encountered during the clearance of the range.

**RESPONSE: The information is not known.**

12. QUESTION: PWS for PTO0001  
Does the training team supervising the employment of the anti-tank weapons systems account for all fired weapons as having impacted and detonated and those that did not detonate? If so can this information be provided to the contractors? This information can be utilized in the determination of the density of live anti-tank munitions that may be encountered and need to be demolished.

**RESPONSE: This information is not known.**

13. QUESTION: PWS for PTO 0001, 4.3.3  
It is unclear how the contractor is to handle radioactive waste if found on the range. One section of the PWS provides the standard for performing radioactive evaluations, including taking readings when loaded and prior to transportation. In other areas the PWS states that if radiation is detected, the debris is to remain in place. If LLRW is found during the the conduct of PTO0001 what is the contractor's responsibility? Handling, transportation, and disposal of LLRW could have a significant impact on the

schedule and cost of the project. Is there a certain amount of material we should assume is radioactive? If more radioactive material than anticipated is found how is it to be handled by the contractor?

**RESPONSE: Radioactive materials are NOT to be removed or moved, they are to be documented and this information provided to the government. The purpose of scanning is to document that shipments of scrap metal do not contain any radioactive materials.**

14. QUESTION: Performance Work Statement for PTO0001, Work Element 3 – Field Work, 4.3.1 During the site visit a question was asked about “sifting through the berms to remove debris”, this was answered with the berms were not to be sifted and were not part of the removal. Does this also include the surface debris spread over the berms? If so, will this also include objects protruding from the berms which are larger than four inches? Once a contractor starts to pull debris from the berms at what point does the contractor stop? Once the removal of surface debris begins, you will most certainly continue to expose new debris.

**RESPONSE: Berms are not part of this project.**

15. QUESTION: Performance Work Statement for PTO0001, Work Element 3 – Field Work, 4.3.1 During the site visit the contractors were informed that a surface clearance had to be completed over the entire S-4-3 range area, and that sub-surface clearance only needed to be conducted where the contractor may deem necessary for the placement of targets. If an object is protruding from the ground which is larger than four inches does the object need to be pulled from the ground during the surface sweep?

**RESPONSE: If an object is protruding from the ground which is larger than four inches the object does need to be removed.**

16. QUESTION: Performance Work Statement for PTO0001, Work Element 3 – Field Work, 4.3.1 Overhead imagery indicates a large pile of debris south-south west of the demolition range which appears to be range debris. Is this an area included in the scope of PTO0001?

**RESPONSE: The S-4-1 Debris Clean Up drawing is hereby revised and attached. The drawing submitted with Amendment 01 is hereby removed as a reference.**

17. QUESTION: Performance Work Statement for PTO 0001 Though to date the PWS for PTO0001 has not changed, the Navy informed the contractors that the materials present at Camp David may also be included in the sample task order as an option. We feel this should be included in the RFP as a third work effort and not an option. We are presuming that future Task Orders under the contract will include processing a greater deal of munitions debris than is found on the two ranges currently in PTO001. Including the munitions debris at Camp David in the work effort would allow the Navy to determine the ability of the contractors to demilitarize munitions, such as full size BDUs and sub-scale BDUs including the BDU-33 and Mk 106.

**RESPONSE: The material currently at Camp David will not be part of this scope of work.**

18. QUESTION: Section C – Description and Specifications May the contractor stage roll-offs or other containers temporarily at the ranges while clearance activities are ongoing?

**RESPONSE: The contractor may stage roll-offs or other containers temporarily at S-4-1 but NOT at S-4-3.**

19. QUESTION: Performance Work Statement – PWS, Paragraphs 3.2 Range Related Debris and 4.3.3 Residue Removal and Disposition

All range related debris shall be inspected for the presence of Low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) prior to being moved from the range. Any suspected LLRW material including, but not limited to, dials, gauges, parts of military vehicles that are known or suspected of containing LLRW SHALL NOT BE MOVED.” While Page 76 Para 4.3.3 sub para 2. 2nd bullet states “ • GPS coordinates where object/target(s) may have been transported and deposited while awaiting removal of the radioactive material, or if relocated to another position on the range, that new location,” and page 76-77 Paragraph 4.3.3 sub paragraph 2, the 6th bullet states that “Applicable dates when items were moved, etc.”

Can the government verify that LLRW positive items shall not be moved, transported, nor deposited anywhere different than its original position on the site? Also, can the government verify that we are not to perform the removal of the radioactive material?

**RESPONSE: The contractor shall not perform removal of LLRW.**