

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1   6
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08-Apr-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC EXWC CODE ACQ / NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY 1100 23RD AVE BLDG 1100 PORT HUENEME CA 93043-4301	CODE N39430	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) <b>See Item 6</b>		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N39430-15-T-1647	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 25-Mar-2015	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)  The purpose of this amendment is to: 1) Provide Government responses to offeror questions; and 2) Remove and Replace Section C				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL:	EMAIL:	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED  08-Apr-2015

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

## SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

Q&A 3

Question #1: Section 1.0 of the PWS describes the Site Summary profile that the Navy will prepare for each of the 38 sites. Can you please help us understand the total or average length of each Site Summary (i.e. 1 page, 5 pages, 50 pages)?

Answer #1: Each Site Summary will be approximately 30 pages in length.

Question #2: For each of the 38 sites, can you help us understand how many operable units (OUs) are in the average site? In the context of this initiative, site is generally defined as a CERCLA area of concern or how the Navy designated an individual area of concern/site for financial tracking purposes.

- a. What is the minimum number of OUs?
- b. What is the maximum number of OUs?

Answer #2: The minimum number of operable units is 35. The maximum number of operable units is 38.

Question #3: For each of the 38 sites, can you help us understand how many different technologies or treatment systems have been implemented?

Answer #3: The number of technologies or treatment systems range from one to several at each site. Several in-situ sites have had various pilot studies and full scale in-situ technologies. The purpose of the Navy prepared site summaries is to compile this information in a concise format for the contractor to review.

Question #4: In Section 2.0, Task 1 of the PWS, the second paragraph says that the teleconference call (item 1b) will take place prior to the face-to-face meeting (item 1c). However, In Table 1 (page 5 of the solicitation), item 1b is listed as 1.5 months after NTP, whereas item 1c is listed as 1 month after NTP. Please clarify if the schedule in Table 1 is correct?

Answer #4: In Table 1, Task 1b Approximate Time from Notice to Proceed should be 0.5 months. Section C has been updated to reflect this change.

Question #5: May we receive the 38 sites NAVFAQ HQ has identified with soil and groundwater challenges?

Answer #5: No. This information will be made available to the selected contractor(s) after contract award.

Question #6: Can you provide details/definition of what is considered site Summaries from the Navy Teams?

Answer #6: The site summaries include information such as, site information, stakeholders, chemicals of concern, risk assessment, remediation technologies, long-term monitoring, response complete strategy, main challenges, preliminary recommendations, etc.

Question #7: Can you provide an example of a site an actual summary that the project would be based on?

Answer #7: No. The site summaries are under development.

Question #8: Would the contract officer consider an extension to April 27th, 2015 to allow our team to provide a

best value proposal to the Navy EXWC / NAVFAC.

Answer #8: No. The proposal deadline will remain unchanged, 16 April 2015 at or before 2:00pm (PDT).

## SECTION C - DESCRIPTIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The following have been modified:

### PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT

#### **PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS)**

#### **Innovative Technologies and Methods for Improved Risk Reduction at Legacy Sites**

This Contract is to provide the Navy with a report on appropriate innovations and advancements in the environmental industry that would allow the Navy to achieve improved risk reduction at legacy impacted sites across the U.S. The contractor will review past history and current status at up to 38 sites across the U.S. and submit a report on their findings and recommendations to the Navy.

### **SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION**

Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Engineering and Expeditionary Warfare Center (EXWC) is assisting NAVFAC Headquarters (HQ) in reviewing the Navy's legacy impacted sites that have particularly challenging and persistent technical, regulatory, and administrative issues. NAVFAC HQ has identified up to 38 sites with soil and groundwater impacts where innovative technologies and innovative methods could be used to improve the Navy's approach towards treating soil and groundwater in a more timely and cost effective fashion. This PWS solicits expert review and a technical report from contractors with industry-leading subject matter experts (SMEs), who have a demonstrated background in the use of state-of-the-art and innovative techniques for treating impacted sites. For diversity of scientific judgments, the Navy expects to acquire a findings and recommendations report separately from each of two contractors.

The Navy will conduct an initial review of the selected sites and create a Site Summary profile. The Site Summary, along with available site documents (i.e., Remedial Investigation, Record of Decision, Remedial Design, Remedial Action, long-term monitoring reports), will be posted to a shared website for retrieval.

Each SME that the contractors use to develop the findings and recommendations report will have an educational background that includes a doctorate in environmental engineering or one of the environmental sciences (e.g., geology, biology, limnology, or chemistry) and at least 20 years of experience in soil and groundwater cleanup projects. Each SME should demonstrate his/her knowledge and expertise through technical publications (particularly books and journal articles), patents, university affiliations, invited presentations at events organized by major U.S. professional organizations like the National Ground Water Association (NGWA), invited presentations at major Department of Defense (DoD) organizations involved in innovative technologies (such as, Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable and Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program / Environmental Security Technology Certification Program), invited participation on workshops and expert panels organized by leading national and regional organizations, and leadership experience in numerous groundwater treatment projects. Each contractor will submit a summary report prepared by the SME to NAVFAC EXWC on his/her findings and recommendations. This report will be incorporated by EXWC into a broader optimization guidance that EXWC will prepare for NAVFAC HQ. NAVFAC EXWC expects to select up to two contractors for this project.

### **SECTION 2.0 – PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS**

NAVFAC EXWC is assisting NAVFAC HQ with reviewing up to 38 sites with soil and groundwater impacts to identify opportunities to optimize the portfolio of sites from a response complete date, cost-to-complete, exit

strategy, and/or risk reduction perspective. Many of these sites have pump-and-treat systems (ex-situ treatment) that have been operational for many years to extract and treat impacted groundwater. Other sites may have implemented in-situ treatment (e.g., bioremediation or monitored natural attenuation [MNA]) to mitigate soil and groundwater impacts. Based on similar expert reviews and numerous Tiger Teams that the Navy has conducted in the past to identify new technologies and improvements for legacy impacted sites, the Navy estimates that each SME will provide up to 200 hours of expert review, presentation, and report writing support for this task.

#### Task 1: Site Summaries Review and PowerPoint® Presentation

Each SME will critically review the site history, the geologic setting, the human health and ecological risk profiles, and regulatory framework of the sites and assist Navy reviewers in identifying innovative ways of reducing risk, accelerating site cleanup, and reducing long-term cleanup costs. The site background for 38 higher priority sites that contains relevant site information would be prepared in summary form by the Navy staff members on the optimization project and presented to the SMEs for review. Navy staff members will also provide preliminary recommendations for improvement. Each SME will review the site summaries and work with Navy staff to identify potential points of improvements in the Navy's cleanup approach at individual sites and sites as a group (for example all pump-and-treat sites or all MNA sites).

A teleconference call followed by a face-to-face meeting (up to 2 days of face time) in Washington D.C. between Navy staff members and the SMEs will be held to discuss the site summaries and preliminary recommendations and this will be an opportunity for the SMEs to obtain more information and clarification from the Navy team. A second a face-to-face meeting (up to 2 days of face time) among the same participants will be held in Washington D.C. after the SMEs have analyzed the Navy site summaries and preliminary recommendations. In the second meeting, the SMEs will be asked to present (in PowerPoint®) their own individual recommendations that may add to or revise the Navy team's preliminary recommendations. The contractor will post findings and recommendations summaries to the established project website for Navy members to retrieve.

#### Task 2: Draft and Final Recommendations Reports

The Navy team will use the SMEs' recommendations to prepare a draft report for review by the individual Navy site managers and other Navy stakeholders. The SMEs and Navy team members will discuss the feedback from the Navy site managers and stakeholders in a conference call. Then, each SME will prepare a brief draft-final written report of their final conclusions and recommendations and present it to the Navy team in a conference call. The contractor will post their conclusion and recommendations to the established project SharePoint® website for Navy members to retrieve. The report will provide informed suggestions on a path forward for individual sites and/or sites as a group, where common issues and themes can be identified (e.g., pump-and-treat sites or MNA sites or bioremediation sites). Based on comments from the Navy team, each SME will revise and submit a final report.

#### Optional Task 3: In-Depth Evaluation of Portfolio Optimization Alternatives

The Navy anticipates that initial the finding and recommendations provided by the SMEs may need further input to guide implementation at Installation Restoration Program (IRP) site(s). The Navy requests pricing of an option for additional support to conduct in-depth evaluation of selected IRP site optimization finding and recommendations. This effort will advance the findings and recommendations deliverable (Task 2) with regard to the implementation issues identified with the initial group of 38 IRP sites or as the optimization findings and recommendations may apply to other IRP sites in the Navy's IRP portfolio. The SME will provide a draft and final Supplemental Finding and Recommendations report. The SME will attend a face-to-face meeting (up to 2 days of face time) in Washington D.C. between Navy staff members and the SMEs will be held to discuss the draft-final Supplemental Findings and Recommendations report. The Navy expects the face-to-face meeting to occur 45 days after submittal of the Draft-Final Report. The Navy estimates the submittal of the Final Supplemental Findings and Recommendations report to occur 45 days after the face-to-face meeting. Based on similar review projects conducted in the past, the Navy estimates that this Option will involve 200 hours of each SME's time and the associated travel.

### **SECTION 3.0 – DELIVERABLES AND SCHEDULE**

Each SME will submit the following deliverables:

1. PowerPoint® presentation with findings and recommendations describing improvements in the site

- restoration approach at the Navy sites reviewed
2. Brief draft-final report with conclusions and recommendations
  3. Brief final report with conclusions and recommendations.

The schedule for these activities is as shown in Table 1. The base period Notice to Proceed is expected to occur on or about 1 May 2015.

**Table 1. Schedule of Tasks**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Approximate Time from Notice to Proceed</b>
1a	Each SME receives site summaries from Navy teams	0.5 month
1b	Conference call with Navy team to discuss site summaries	0.5 month
1c	Meeting in Washington DC to discuss site summaries	1 month
1d	Meeting in Washington DC to discuss SME's recommendations (presented in PowerPoint® and posted to project shared website)	3 months
2a	Each SME provides a draft-final report with recommendations (posted to project shared website)	4 months
2b	Conference call to discuss feedback from Navy site managers and stakeholders	5 months
2c	Each SME provides a final report with recommendations (posted to project shared website)	6 months
Option 3	In-Depth Evaluation of Portfolio Optimization Alternatives	TBD (If Exercised)
Option 3a	Draft-Final Supplemental Findings and Recommendations (posted to project shared website)	TBD at time Option is exercised
Option 3b	Meeting in Washington DC to discuss SME's recommendations (presented in PowerPoint® and posted to project shared website)	TBD at time Option is exercised
Option 3c	Final Supplemental Findings and Recommendations (posted to project shared website)	TBD at time Option is exercised

#### **SECTION 4.0 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

Kyle Kirchner, NAVFAC EXWC Project Manager

Phone: (805) 982-6081

FAX: (805) 982-4304

Email: [kyle.kirchner@navy.mil](mailto:kyle.kirchner@navy.mil)

Elizabeth Corder, NAVFAC EXWC ACQ Contracting Officer

Phone: (805) 982-4012

FAX: (805) 982-4540

Email: [elizabeth.corder@navy.mil](mailto:elizabeth.corder@navy.mil)

Geralyn Castro, NAVFAC EXWC ACQ Contract Specialist

Phone: (805) 982-5605

FAX: (805) 982-4540

Email: [geralyn.castro@navy.mil](mailto:geralyn.castro@navy.mil)

#### **SECTION 5.0 – PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE**

The period of performance (POP) for this contract shall be for a base period of eight (8) months from the date of contract award, plus one (1) option period of six (6) months and is subject to the availability of Government funds. The option period (Optional Task 3) may extend the POP or run in concurrence, in whole or part, with the base POP. The option period may be exercised when determined by the Government to be in its best interest and in accordance with applicable acquisition regulations and policies.

In accordance with FAR 52.217-9 Option to Extend the Term of the Contract (Mar 2000), the Government may extend the term of the Contract by written notice to the Contractor prior to contract expiration provided that the Government gives the Contractor a preliminary written notice of its intent to extend at least 30 days before the contract expires. The preliminary notice does not commit the Government to an extension. If the Government exercises this option, the extended contract shall be considered to include this option clause.

(End of Summary of Changes)