

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 3 (January 23, 2004 – January 27, 2004)**

12. Section C, SOW (Paducah): A number of reference documents are listed in Section C and else where in the RFP. We have not been successful in accessing these documents at the Oak Ridge Information Center or Paducah Environmental Information Center. These documents are critical to our proposal effort. Please make these documents available on the web (preferably) or the site library.

Documents include:

- BJC/PAD-517 Site Treatment Plan
- File No. DWM-30039-042 Site Treatment Plan Agreed Order Dated 9/10/97
- DOE/OR/07-2008&D2 Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan for the North/South Diversion Ditch
- DOE/OR/07-1948&D2 Record of Decision for Sections 1 and 2
- DOE/OR/07-2008&D2 Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan for the North/South Diversion Ditch
- Surge Basin Design for the North/South Diversion Ditch
- DOE/OR/07-1921&D2 Certified for Construction Design Drawings and Technical Specifications Package for the Six-Phase Heating Treatability Study at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant
- DOE/OR/07-1857/V1 and V2 Waste Area 6 Investigation
- DEE/OR/07-1944&D2 QC Plan for 6-phase Heating
- 6-phase Heating Draft Treatability Study

Answer: The documents listed have been posted to the RFP Web page other than the Surge Basin Design for the North/South Diversion Ditch and the 6-phase Heating Draft Treatability Study. These documents are being further evaluated for posting to the Remediation RFP Web Site.

13. Section C.1.1.1.2 Source Control (Paducah): states that the offeror will “design, construct, maintain... the source term removal system consistent with the results of the treatability study.” Given that several contractors bidding this job participated in the six phase demonstration / treatability study, will DOE please provide the draft treatability study for reference? (we understand the final is not complete yet.)

Answer: This document is being evaluated for posting to the Remediation RFP Web Site.

14. DOE/OR/07-1910&D2 RI Plan for GW Operable Unit UCRS near C-720, C-747-C and C-746-D Section L.17(b) V: Past Performance—Does DOE want to have three past performance questionnaires submitted for each entity of the joint venture, LLC and its major subcontractors, or does DOE just want a total of three past performance questionnaires submitted for the entire group of companies proposing?

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 3 (January 23, 2004 – January 27, 2004)**

Answer: There should be three references (past performance questionnaires) submitted for each member and/or major subcontractor for past performance. This will be clarified in an RFP amendment.

15. Section L.17(b)I: requires the offerors to discuss a technical approach for addressing all SOW elements in addition to the five listed for expanded discussion on the Paducah proposal. In order to address each of the nine SOW elements (over 50 sub-elements), would DOE consider providing 40 additional pages to provide this discussion?

Answer: Changes to the page limits are not planned at this time. The stated page limits are intended to facilitate concise and succinct proposals without repetitive or superfluous information. Offerors are advised that an RFP amendment will be issued that excludes the Provision L.17.(b)I "...integrated schedule of the Portsmouth or Paducah Site to achieve completion of the SOW by September 30, 2009..." from the 40 page limitation. Offerors shall provide the schedule on no more than twenty (20) pages (twenty 8 ½" x 11" pages or ten 11" x 17" pages). Offerors are instructed to clearly designate the schedule pages, so that they are easily distinguishable from other attachment exhibits and the remainder of the pages.

16. L.17(b)I: requires the integrated project schedule to be included in this section, which will require 6-10 pages. Would DOE please exclude the integrated project schedule from the page count in the technical volume and allow a D or E size schedule fold out (rather than multiple 11x17 pages)?

Answer: Offerors are advised that an RFP amendment will be issued that excludes the Provision L.17.(b)I "...integrated schedule of the Portsmouth or Paducah Site to achieve completion of the SOW by September 30, 2009..." from the 40 page limitation. Offerors shall provide the schedule on no more than twenty (20) pages (twenty 8 ½" x 11" pages or ten 11" x 17" pages). Offerors are instructed to clearly designate the schedule pages, so that they are easily distinguishable from other attachment exhibits and the remainder of the pages.

17. Appendix J, List of Deliverables (Paducah), 14. Transition Plan: references contract clause B.1.9. Clause B.1.9 does not exist in the RFP. Please clarify.

Answer: The Clause B.1.9.reference in Section J, Attachments 4.1 and 4.2 is incorrect. Please disregard the reference, however, the Transition Plan is still a deliverable requirement. Amendment will be issued.

18. Can a current USEC employee participate in the MEPP if hired by the new contractor?

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 3 (January 23, 2004 – January 27, 2004)**

Answer: An individual, including an employee of USEC, may participate in the Multiple Employer Pension Plan (MEPP), if the person is currently permitted by the terms and conditions of the MEPP to become a participant in the MEPP. The solicitation language is not changing the terms and conditions of the plan regarding the rights of individuals under the MEPP who have the right to participate in the MEPP. However, it is also not the intent of the DOE to authorize in this solicitation the changing of the MEPPs terms and conditions to authorize participation of persons other than those currently permitted to participate in accordance with the MEPP's terms and conditions.

19. Section C, SOW (Paducah): A number of reference documents are listed in Section C and else where in the RFP. We have not been successful in accessing these documents at the Oak Ridge Information Center or Paducah Environmental Information Center. These documents are critical to our proposal effort. Please make these documents available on the web (preferably) or the site library. Documents include:

- a. DOE/OR/07-1965&D2 Action Memorandum for Scrap Metal Disposition
- DOE/OR/07-1880&D2 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for Scrap Metal Disposition
- DOE/OR/07-2013&D2 Removal Action Work Plan for Scrap Metal Disposition
- Contract number: 23900-SC-RM268F Scrap Metal Removal and Disposition Contract
- DOE/OR/07-2002&D1Rev1 Action Memorandum for C-410
- DOE/OR/07-1952&D2 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for C-410
- DOE/OR/07-2012&D2 Removal Action Work Plan for C-410
- Site Survey # MCN-01 C-410 Cultural Resources Assessment
- Agreement No.: ORO-2182 Memorandum of Agreement between DOE and ToxCo, dated July 16, 2002
- NA C-410 3-D Photography, dated October 2001

Answer: The documents listed have been posted to the Remediation RFP Web Site other than the “Contract number: 23900-SC-RM268F Scrap Metal Removal and Disposition Contract” and the “Agreement No.: ORO-2182 Memorandum of Agreement between DOE and ToxCo, dated July 16, 2002.” These documents are being further evaluated for posting to the Remediation RFP Web Site. The NA C-410 3-D Photography, dated October 2001 is designated as Official Use Only (OUO) information and requires controlled distribution. Instructions on how to request this document and other OUO documents will be posted on the Remediation RFP Web Site.

20. What are the assumed conditions of C-410/420 at transition with respect to the safety and work authorization documentation, volume of equipment remaining, and on-going support from BJC provided subcontractors?

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 3 (January 23, 2004 – January 27, 2004)**

Answer: The Removal Action Work Plan and the Action Memorandum have been posted to the Web Site. Additional safety and work authorizations are contained in a Safety Basis Document(s) consistent with a Hazard Category 2 Nuclear Facility, which shall be accepted and updated as necessary upon contract award. For the purpose of proposal preparation offerors should use the information provided in the RFP, including the estimated waste volumes, building sq. footage, and numbers of fluorine cells to prepare their proposals. Offerors should assume that no support will be provided from BJC subcontractors unless negotiated directly with the parties involved and should refer to Section H.16 of the RFP for additional information related to assignment/assumption of subcontracts.

21. L.17.I The offeror shall describe its technical approach to all SOW activities for the proposed site(s). In particular, the offeror shall address.....Question Is DOE asking us to describe our technical approach to all SOW activities inclusive of C.1.9 Project Support?

Answer: The DOE is instructing offerors to describe its technical approach to all SOW activities for the proposed site(s), which includes C.1.9 Project Support. Offerors are reminded that “in particular, the offeror shall provide in more detail...” regarding the sections listed in L.17(b)I.

22. C.1.3.2.2 e) [Paducah] Disposition all material associated with the D&D of the facilities identified in Exhibit C.1.3.2.a, site restoration, and submittal of a final Remedial Action Report that is sufficient in quality such that the DOE and the can approve it, and assist in obtaining regulatory approval. Question Who besides DOE approves the RAR?

Answer: The regulators. An amendment will be issued to correct this typographical error.

23. In general, the page count is highly constrained. As a point of comparison, DOE-RL recently issued their RFP for deactivation, decontamination and decommissioning of the FFTF, also a total small business set aside under NAICS 562910, with a budget profile in the range of \$350-400M and a similarly complex nuclear waste management and D/D scope of work. DOE-RL allows 150 pages to address Volume II (technical approach.) (a)Would the government consider increasing page limits for Volume II, Technical from 60 to 100? (b) In addition, would the government consider counting 11x17 sheets as one page instead of two as does DOE –RL in the FFTF RFP as long as the larger sheets are used only for “schedules and exhibits”?

Answer: a) Changes to the page limits are not planned at this time. The stated page limits are intended to facilitate concise and succinct proposals without repetitive or superfluous information. Offerors are advised that an RFP amendment will be issued that excludes the Provision L.17.(b)I “...integrated

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 3 (January 23, 2004 – January 27, 2004)**

schedule of the Portsmouth or Paducah Site to achieve completion of the SOW by September 30, 2009...” from the 40 page limitation. Offerors shall provide the schedule on no more than twenty (20) pages (twenty 8 ½” x 11” pages or ten 11” x 17” pages). Offerors are instructed to clearly designate the schedule pages, so that they are easily distinguishable from other attachment exhibits and the remainder of the pages. b) No.

24. The Offerors can best demonstrate that they possess the sufficient resources/skill mix to manage and execute the scope of work by presenting the qualifications of more than just 3 key personnel in the proposal. Small business offerors should be required to demonstrate that they possess and can deliver the necessary skills to supplement on site personnel to accomplish accelerated closure which entails a management team greater than 3 FTEs. Will DOE increase the number of key personnel from 3 to 6?

Answer: No. For the purpose of proposal evaluation, the DOE has specified that 3 personnel shall be identified as Key Personnel. This is not meant to constrain Offerors and as such, Offerors may have “management teams” to use the terminology used in the question, with as many personnel as they desire.

25. Would DOE consider changing the definition of major subcontractor to being allotted \$2.5M or more of scope per year? At the current \$5M criteria, this amounts to greater than 10% in some years. This change would allow presentation of the capabilities of other niche subcontractors that the offeror feels are important in assisting them in the achievement of project objectives.

Answer: No. For purposes of proposal evaluation, the Government has selected the \$5M threshold for major subcontractors for which past performance will be evaluated.