

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

**NOTE: The answer to question #95 was revised on 3/08/04.**

46. What facilities and how much furniture will be available at Portsmouth and Paducah for the contractor?

Answer: The remediation contractor(s) will be provided furniture at Paducah for approximately 345 personnel and at Portsmouth, furniture for approximately 272 personnel.

47. Section C.1.4.3.2.c) Construction of the sedimentation basins *MAY* occur. How should we bid this work?

Answer: The offerors are advised that for the purposes of proposal preparation, they should include construction of the two sedimentation basins in their proposal.

48. H.17.f. What is the Russian Transparency program?

Answer: In 1993 representatives of the United States of America and the Russian Federation executed an agreement providing for the disposition of highly enriched uranium (HEU) extracted from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. The HEU is blended with low enriched uranium (LEU) to form a LEU material suitable to fuel commercial power reactors. The process of transferring the HEU from the weapons program to reactor fuel including the protocols for ensuring compliance with this international agreement (i.e. verification) is referred to as the Highly Enriched Uranium Transparency Implementation Program (Transparency Program). DOE National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is the federal agency through which the Transparency Program is implemented. USEC is the executive agent for the U.S., and Techsnabexport (Tennex) is the executive agent for the Russian Federation. USEC markets Transparency Program LEU to its commercial power reactor customers. Following the 2002 USEC decision to move their product shipping and receiving operation to Paducah, the operations of the Transparency Program were shifted from Portsmouth to Paducah. Reference Web Site: [http://www.nti.org/e\\_research/official\\_docs/doe/mega\\_to\\_mega.pdf](http://www.nti.org/e_research/official_docs/doe/mega_to_mega.pdf) for additional information.

49. Regarding Paducah TCE DNAPL: a. Have the fine grained layers, suspected of retaining the TCE, been characterized with surface geophysics? b. Has this been effective?

Answer: It has not been fully characterized. However, in December 2002 the LBNL tested high-frequency seismic tomographic imaging to map changes in the distribution of dense nonaqueous phase liquid (DNAPL), trichloroethylene (TCE), in the water saturated zone below the C-400 release site. The changes were to have been recorded before and after remediation utilizing Six-Phase Heating Data was obtained through the middle and lower Regional Gravel Aquifer (RGA), specifically from the 85 ft to the bottom of the wells at 111 ft. Another data set was collected

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

between one pair of wells at the Permeable Treatment Zone site west of the plant, where DNAPL is absent, but has the same lithological sequence as the C-400 site. Depth of data acquisition was greater than the well separation, providing an adequate aspect ratio for tomographic imaging. The post-remediation monitoring is currently being scoped with LBNL. Should this technology prove successful in detecting TCE migration into the remediation cell through post-remediation monitoring, the technology could then be considered a tool for extensive 3D characterization of the plume to support scale up and engineering design of the actual remediation effort.

50. Section H 16: If the Contractor can develop methods and processes that improve performance, can subcontracts that are "inherited" be terminated for convenience, and services performed by the Contractor?

Answer: DOE approval (after contract award) would be required prior to termination for convenience of the assigned subcontracts. If approved, the termination costs would be included as a part of the total allowable costs for fee calculation purposes, as well as any other costs that may result such as personnel retraining or the shipment and establishment of new site storage area(s) for nuclear materials. Offerors are advised that proposals should not be based upon terminating the contracts for convenience.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

51. There was a question answered under the Infrastructure RFP (#215) regarding who performs network and computer repair for BJC, DOE and their subcontractors. Essentially by the way the question was answered it separates the Remediation computer repair, which often goes hand in hand with desk top support, from the other desk top and LAN support that is to be provided to all by the Infrastructure subcontractor. By not having the repair scope as part of Infrastructure for servicing the Remediation subcontractor and others on site it will most likely duplicate efforts on these tasks or create labor issues.

Answer: Computer repair will be included in the Infrastructure RFP scope of work. An amendment to the Infrastructure solicitation will formalize the change.

52. Will we [have the] authority to approve the safety envelope for non-nuclear facilities?

Answer: The question is unclear as to what is meant by "safety envelope" however, approval authority for safety authorization documents for the Portsmouth and Paducah sites will reside with the DOE Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office (PPPO).

53. [Portsmouth] Has DOE identified any buyers for HEU?

Answer: For the purposes of proposal preparation, offerors are to use the information as provided in the RFP. No additional HEU information will be provided.

54. [Portsmouth] Does DOE have detailed material description for the HEU?

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

Answer: For the purposes of proposal preparation, offerors are to use the information as provided in the RFP. No additional HEU information will be provided.

55. [Portsmouth] C.2-16 of 32 – C.2.6.2 Work to be performed (b): Words appear to be missing in the last sentence...the DOE and the regulators...and actively assist...

Answer: You are correct. This has been corrected in Amendment 0001 to the RFP.

56. Regarding Section C 1.2.1 Scrap Metal. The section states that the contractor shall perform all activities to store, characterize, process, package and ship all scrap metal identified in Table C.1.2.1. Additionally, the contractor shall install gravel and re-seed within the scrap yard, and submit the Project Completion Report.

It is further stated in C.1.2.1.1 that a fixed rate subcontract for this (with the exception of the nickel) is currently in place for this work, which is effective through June 30, 2006. Attachment J-6 indicated that the contractor must assume the above referenced subcontract.

Several questions arise as a result of the above:

- a. Does the anticipated funding provided in Sections B include the cost of the disposition of scrap metal? If so, what are anticipated costs for each fiscal year of this contract?

Answer: a. Yes. The information will be posted to the Web Site when available.

- b. If the contractor must assume this contract, can we obtain a copy of the Terms and Conditions, the scope, the subcontractor's fixed rates and the safety record of the subcontractor?

Answer: b. Information relating to the subcontract such as the terms and conditions and general cost information will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available.

- c. Does the scope of the subcontract also include the placement of the gravel and the re-seeding and the submission of the Project Completion Report?

Answer: The subcontract includes placement of gravel and other erosion controls, and submission of an interim and final Removal Action Report to demonstrate compliance with CERCLA.

57. Please clarify the apparent discrepancy between paragraphs C.1.2.3 and C.1.2.3.2i regarding disposition of waste specifically generated by remediation activities. C.1.2.3 states "...and all wastes NOT specifically generated by remediation activities

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

...", while C.1.2.3.2.i states "... and ALL wastes generated by remediation activities..."

Answer: You are correct. Amendment 0001 was issued which corrects this inconsistency. In Section C.1.2.3. the word "not" was removed from the sentence.

58. Volume II, Section V, Past Performance, Subsection (1): Are copies of the actual Past Performance Questionnaires to be included in the submittal, or does the DOE prefer a tabular listing indicating to whom the Past Performance Questionnaires were sent?

Answer: No Past Performance Questionnaires are to be included in any proposal. The DOE also does not want a listing of who was sent a Past Performance Questionnaire. The only information to be included in the Past Performance section of the proposal is the information specified in Provision L.17(b)V(3) and (4). The Past Performance Questionnaire and Transmittal Letter (Section L, Attachment 1) shall be provided to three references for contracts similar in type, scope, complexity or risk completed or in progress during the past three years for the offeror as well as joint venture members, LLCs, and any major subcontractors (over \$5M contract value in any one year). The entities used as references (not the offeror) are to mail the completed, original Past Performance Questionnaires and the Transmittal Letter directly to the SEB at the address provided in L.19. Amendment 0001 was issued clarifying these instructions.

59. One of the answers to the second group of questions that were posted on 1/23/04 is a bit confusing.

The original question reads: "In Section J, Attachment 6 under Subcontracts Awarded as Radiation Control Technicians (Subcontract Number 23900-BA-EH007U), will the contractor(s) be the sole provider for health physics support services (labor and instrumentation) as it relates to the Portsmouth/Paducah Scopes of Work?"

The answer states that the Remediation Contractor has the sole responsibility for providing Radiological Control Technicians and health physics services but then it states that the purpose for providing the subcontract information was to identify the contracts that are to be assumed by the new contractor. However, Subcontract Number 23900-BA-EH007U is one of the subcontracts identified as "must assume." Please clarify.

Answer: There are only three subcontracts that are required to be assumed as indicated by the "YES" in the far left hand column (of Section J, Attachment 6) titled "CONTRACTOR SHALL ASSUME." Subcontract number 23900-BA-EH007U is not one of the three required to be assumed. Not all of the subcontracts currently in place under BJC are required to be assumed or maintained by the Remediation contractor(s). However the remediation contractor has the responsibility in

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

accordance with the terms and conditions of the solicitation to provide Radiological Control Technicians and health physics services.

60. We assume that the potential contractors should include the cost of disposal of waste in our target costs. If this assumption is correct, then the potential contractors need copies of the disposal contract with Envirocare of Utah that is applicable to this site, the NTS cost rate that we should use in our costing and also the contract with Alaron for repackaging of waste. b. Is the cost of disposal considered part of the entire waste budget which the potential contractors can use or add to as required?

Answer: a. The cost of waste disposition (meaning waste life cycle costs that are more than just disposal) shall be part of the Target Cost. The DOE may have waste disposal contract(s) that may be used by the contractor(s), although the contractors are not required to use them. There is no guarantee that these DOE contracts will be available for use throughout the term of the contract(s). The contractor has the option to pursue the most economical waste disposal alternative. DOE waste contract(s) will be posted to the Remediation Web Site based upon availability. b. It is not clear what it being asked in this question.

61. There are two clauses numbered I.127. The first, on page I-171, is not listed on the table of contents for section I. Is this an oversight, and the DEAR clause 970.5204-1 is indeed intended to be part of this contract?

Deleted: .

Answer: You are correct. This has been corrected in Amendment 0001 to the RFP.

62. Is contractor support for Citizens Advisory Board activities to be included in cost estimates?

Answer: Yes. The Infrastructure contractor(s) will coordinate this activity, however, the Remediation Contractor(s) as stated in RFP Sections C.1.9.4 and C.2.7.4 shall provide support for this activity.

63. Section C1.1.1.1, page C.1-5 of 45, first paragraph, last sentence which reads “The final design for the source removal systems, along with the performance standard, shall be based on the results of the Treatability Study” refers to the results of the 6-Phase Heating Treatability Study conducted at SWMU 11. This document is not listed in Exhibit C.1.0.3 Milestones/Schedule/Reference Documents as being available for bidders. When and where will DOE make this document available?

Answer: The Treatability Study (not yet approved by the regulator(s)) has been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

64. Section C.1.1.2.1, page C.1-5 of 45, Plume Containment, General Information: This section references a “preliminary study on the viability of utilizing natural attenuation as a final remedy.” Please identify a complete reference for this report, state where and when the report will be made available, and identify all other reports,

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

documents, letters, or other information pertinent to determining the viability of natural attenuation as a final remedy for contaminated groundwater at PDGP.

Answer: The document titled "Evaluation of Natural Attenuation Process for Trichloroethylene and Technetium-99" contains the requested information and has been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

65. The RFP requires us to novate the Weskem contract for scrap metal disposition. Please provide us with the cost, by fiscal year, that we should assume for the purpose of developing our cost estimate. Question: Can DOE provide an electronic copy of the X-701B SWMU Decision Document, dated December 8, 2003?

Answer: The scrap metal subcontract cost information will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available. The X-701B SWMU document has been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

66. Regarding DUF6 cylinder management, there is a discrepancy in the Milestone Date for Transition. In Table C.1.5 of Exhibit C.1.0.3, page C.1-31 of 45 of the RFP, Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinder Management Milestones/Schedule, transition to UDS is listed with a transition date of 3/05. However, in Section J, Attachment 5.1, page J-Attachment 5.1 - 2 of 5, PA-0011, NM Stabilization and Disposition - Paducah Cylinder Management - says "...Management of the UF6 cylinders will continue until October 2006 when it will be turned over to the DUF6 operator." Please advise which date is correct.

Answer: The date discrepancy has been corrected in Amendment 0001 to the RFP.

67. Are there any safeguard issues within the SOW that requires keeping track of inventories? Has safeguards been terminated for any ongoing projects?

Answer: Yes. There are safeguards issues in several areas of the RFP that may include activities such as inventories. Safeguards have not been terminated for any ongoing projects.

68. What is DOE's current position on the complex-wide moratorium on recycling of metals?

Answer: The moratorium on recycling is still in effect and the Remediation RFP does not change the moratorium.

69. If adequate confidence could be shown in the successful decontamination of certain scrap would DOE consider lifting the recycling moratorium on a case-by-case basis?

Answer: Proposals should not be based upon the speculation that DOE may lift the recycling moratorium.

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

70. Reference is made to Section C.1.2.2.2a & c- Work to be Performed- Should the cited reference- Characterization/Remediation Plan (BJC/PAD-186/R4) be corrected to Characterization/Remediation Plan (./R5)? The ~.R5" control number is given in Appendix E of the Paducah Agreed Order (October 2, 2003).

Answer: No. The R4 document is a more comprehensive plan, and the R5 document (which was used in the Agreed Order) is a revision to only a portion of the R4 document. In other words, the applicable sections in the R4 document should be replaced by the updated sections of the R5 document. The R4 document and the R5 document (as a part of the Agreed Order) have been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

71. The documents that were recently posted on the PPPO web site are too large to download. We are getting time-outs prior to successful downloads. We have tried to download from several different locations nationwide with no success. Looks like it may be a server problem on your end or maybe the files are just too large. Can you 1) break the PDFs into smaller files or 2) make them available on CD?

Answer: We have checked our server and have not seen any problems. The Web Site identifies the need for high speed internet access to download files due to the large size. Check to ensure that you have high speed internet access. Also, if the user has more than one application open at a time, this can significantly impact the download capability. Please try opening files using high speed internet access with only the web site open and close all other applications. If you continue to have problems, please contact us for further instructions. Additionally, some of the largest files are being divided into smaller sections and re-posted to the Remediation Web Site to make downloading easier.

72. If it is the intent of DOE to have the infrastructure contractor supply help desk and desk top support for the remediation contractor, would it not be more effective to include the computer repair also? The desk top support and computer repair work so closely together.

Answer: The computer "help desk", desk top support and computer repair are responsibilities of the Infrastructure contractor. An amendment to the Infrastructure solicitation will be issued to clarify the responsibilities.

73. C.1.2.3.2:

- (b) Based on the current waste forecasts, expansion of the C-746-U landfill may be needed during this time period.
- (f) The Agreed Order issued by KY in October 2003 requires DOE to submit revisions to Part A of the permit to include identification of additional DMSAs identified as storing characteristic hazardous waste or listed hazardous waste in excess of contained in levels without a permit during characterization of DMSAs. Additionally, the current RCRA Part B permit for Paducah requires notification to KY within 15 days of identification of any new SWMU (this is broader than just

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

DMSA activities. As the RFP is currently written, the RCRA Part B permit requirement is not clearly articulated. Failure to implement it in accordance with the permit may result in NOVs being issued by KY.

Answer: (b) Expansion of the C-746-U landfill, if determined to be necessary after contract award, will be processed through the standard contract mechanisms. (f) Compliance with the RCRA Permit and the Agreed Order are requirements of the RFP. It was not our intent to re-state every requirement contained in the RCRA Permit.

74. C.1.4.1.2: The culvert plugging, surge basin construction, ditch excavation, and material disposal scope for the NSDD Section 2 will be completed prior to the Remediation Contractor assuming the work. Ditch excavation and material disposal scope for Section 1 will be conducted this summer and may be completed prior to the Remediation Contractor assuming the work. Development of the RA report will be underway and transitioned to the new contractor.

Answer: Section C.1.4.1.2(c) Construction of the surge basin was deleted from the SOW by Amendment 0001 to the RFP. The remaining scope was retained.

75. C.1.2.1: There is a completion date of 12/05 reflected in the approved RA Work Plan for the Scrap Metal. This has the potential to be considered a regulatory due date.

Answer: The Weskem contract (23900-SC-RM268F) reflects the commitment dates identified within the RAWP. The Exhibit C.1.0.3 Milestones/Schedule dates for “C.1.2.1 Scrap Metal” will be modified in an amendment to be consistent with the RAWP dates.

76. Section J Table of Submittals: Annual updates and reports of Safety Basis Documents are not included in the list of required submittals.

Answer: Since this is a requirement of 10 CFR 830, which is cited in Section J, Attachments 1.1 and 1.2, the requirement is addressed.

77. H17.e: Currently USEC provides laundry services since this is a historical and traditional service provided by PACE, the laundry facility is leased to USEC, and rigorous radiological controls are necessary for shipment of dirty laundry to off-site facilities. Consider providing this as a Government Furnished Service through direct agreement between DOE and USEC.

Answer: Under this solicitation/contract(s), it is the offeror's responsibility to obtain laundry services to support performance of the statement of work and it is their decision regarding how to perform/obtain these services. It will not be a GFSI.

78. Section J.3.1: Some of the equipment identified appears to be equipment that is being utilized by USEC (i.e., material located in C-310, C-360, C-400).

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

Answer: The equipment listed in Section J, Attachment 3.1 is DOE-owned equipment available for the remediation contractor's use.

79. Section J.4.1: Deliverable 133 – Due dates are 2/28, 5/30, 8/30, and 11/30.

Answer: Correct. The dates were revised in Amendment 0001.

80. B.2 page 3of10 B.2.6.2 (c) reference to B.1.7 should probably be B.2.7.

Answer: Agree. The correction was made in Amendment 0001 to the RFP.

81. B.2 page 10of10; B.2.8 third paragraph should probably define where the PPPO is (i.e. Portsmouth, Lexington, both) the Infrastructure RFP states no subcontractor office or presence required at the Lexington office.

Answer: Agree. A clarification for Sections B.1.8 and B.2.8 was made in Amendment 0001 to the RFP.

82. The scopes of work need to identify what work is required to be performed by PACE represented employees.

Answer: The purpose of the statements of work are to identify the work to be performed by the successful offeror. The successful offeror is responsible for accomplishment of the statements of work.

83. C.2 page 5of 32; C.2.1.2.1 there are only 1761 tons left to process. This is scheduled to be complete by 9/30/04 if funding is provided.

Answer: Your comment has been considered. The quantity of 2,000 tons as stated in the RFP will remain unchanged for the purpose of proposal preparation.

84. C.2 page 12 of 32; Under the DUF6 Cylinder Mgmt SOW the SAR is referenced but no reference is made to the new DOE approved Hazard Analysis, DSA, TSR and SER. These will replace the SAR before the new contracts are awarded. There should be specific requirements to operate the yards in compliance with the DOE approved Hazard Analysis, DSA, TSR and SER.

Answer: The Remediation SOWs address maintenance of safety analysis and safety basis documents in Sections C.1.9.3(c) and C.2.7.3(c).

85. C.2 page 17 of 32; SOW C.2.7.3 ES&H (c) There is only one paragraph that discusses Safety Basis documents. It also needs to reference DOE Order 425.1A since Radiological and Other Industrial Facilities are not covered by 10CFR830 Subpart B which is referenced. 10CFR830 Subpart B only applies to Cat 2&3 Nuclear Facilities. PORTS has several Radiological and Other Industrial Facilities.

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

There should be specific requirements to operate all facilities in compliance with the approved Safety Analysis and Safety Basis documents. It talks about maintaining the Safety Basis documents but does not mention operations in compliance with the Safety Basis. This is key as the facilities must be operated in compliance as well as the documents being updated.

Answer: The DOE Order 425.1C Startup and Restart of Nuclear Facilities is included in Section J, Attachments 2.1 and 2.2. It is an understood expectation of the Department that maintenance of safety basis documents includes implementation of the requirements and operation within the requirements of the documents.

86. C.2 page 23 of 32; Documents; The current SAR is referenced but current TSR, SER are not and the recently approved Cylinder Yard Hazard Analysis, DSA, TSR and SER are not listed in the solicitation.

Answer: The Remediation SOWs address maintenance of safety analysis and safety basis documents in Sections C.1.9.3(c) and C.2.7.3(c).

87. Section J Table of Submittals-Safety Basis Documents annual updates and reports are not included in the list of required submittals.

Answer: The deliverables/reports for nuclear facilities are provided in 10 CFR 830. The higher level regulation, which includes all of the requirements is referenced rather than each of the lower level requirements which may be subject to change.

88. Having a transition date in mid-month and mid-week is difficult. Can the proposed transition date be changed to coincide with the beginning of a calendar month and/or Monday?

Answer: The transition date stated is for the purpose of proposal preparation only. The actual transition date may be different.

89. J-Attachment 6; Subcontracts for Novation; Option Period of Performance; Will DOE extend any subcontract that is near expiration or that will expire during transition or within the first 90 days of Contract Performance if the contractor requests its availability?

Answer: No. The successful contractor may make arrangements with BJC and other parties involved to extend its subcontracts. DOE does not guarantee that the subcontracts listed in Section J, Attachment 6, will be available, unless identified for assumption.

90. J-Attachment 6 –4of4; Subcontracts for Novation; ICPT Agreement, subcontract #23900-BA-SO711F; 23900-BA-SO485F; 23900-BA-SO482F; 23900-BA-SO479F; 23900-BA-SO710F; 23900-BA-SO478F; 23900-BA-SO733F; 23900-BA-SO712F;

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

23900-BA-SO811F. Would DOE provide the scope of work for these subcontracts, who is the subcontractor and what is the rate structure?

Answer: There are only three subcontracts that the RFP requires the successful offeror(s) to accept assignment of. The scope of work for the three subcontracts, along with other information available, will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available. Information about other subcontracts may be made available by BJC during the transition period.

91. L-17 of 21; L.18(j) Transition Cost; For the purposes of cost proposal preparation the offeror shall assume a 45 calendar day transition period. Is the cost of transition included in the FY04 funding restrictions? If there is any delay that causes transition to be performed partially or entirely in FY05, is the cost of transition included in the FY05 funding restrictions?

Answer: Transition costs are included in the Remediation RFP anticipated funding for FY04. Offerors are to prepare their proposals on the basis of an anticipated award date in FY04.

92. According to the 2003 Site Management Plan (SMP), the 2004 SMP was to be available in November, 2003. Where can we find the 2004 SMP?

Answer: A draft version of the 2004 SMP will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available. Offerors are reminded that this is a draft document and may be subject to change.

93. Section C.1.9.3(k) – Since USEC is the operator of the two USTs at the gas station (ID No's C-751E and C-751W), what is the division of responsibilities between the ERS contractor and USEC with respect to the monitoring, maintenance, and cleanup of these USTs?

Answer: USEC is responsible for all activities related to the USTs at the gas station.

94. [Paducah] The RFP requires us to novate the Weskem contract for scrap metal disposition. Please provide us with the cost, by fiscal year, that we should assume for the purpose of developing our cost estimate.

Answer: The contract cost by fiscal year will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available.

95. [Paducah] After reviewing the SOW, Section C, and Reference Documents it is unclear whether the disposition of Classified Scrap Materials and Nickel Ingots is or is not included in the Scope of the Weskem Scrap Metal Contract. Please clarify.

~~Answer: Disposition of the classified material and nickel ingots is part of the scope of the Remediation RFP. Disposition of the classified material is currently within the~~

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

~~scope of the WESKEM subcontract. Disposition of the nickel ingots, is not, included in the scope of the Weskem contract. The manner and method for disposing of the nickel ingots is to be determined by the offeror.~~

(revised 03/08/04) Answer: Disposition of the classified material and nickel ingots are part of the scope of the Remediation RFP. Disposition of the classified material and nickel ingots is NOT within scope of the Weskem subcontract. Relocation of the nickel ingots is an option of the Weskem subcontract.

**Deleted:** Disposition of the classified material and nickel ingots is part of the scope of the Remediation RFP. Disposition of the classified material is currently within scope of the WESKEM subcontract. Disposition of the nickel ingots, is not, included in the scope of the Weskem contract. The manner and method for disposing of the nickel ingots is to be determined by the offeror

96. [Paducah] Is the funding for waste disposal included in the overall funding for the project? (i.e., \$377) Who developed this budget and how is it administered.

Answer: Yes, the funding for waste disposal is included in the overall funding for the RFP.

97. [Paducah] What is the State of KY's role regarding DMSA "Characterization Reports"? Are the reports submitted for information only, or must the State review and approve the report before the materials can be shipped?

Answer: The reports are submitted for information only.

98. We are having trouble downloading some of the large reference documents on your website, especially any documents which are over 100 MB in size. Our company and the other companies on our team have T-1 connectivity which is high speed access, but the download of just one large document takes several hours and "times out" before the download is successful. Can these documents be split into smaller sized files? Here are a few examples of the large files we are referring to:

05. C-746 S&T Landfills Remedial Investigation Scoping Package DOE/OR/07-2027&D1 103mb -- Posted 01/05/2004

43. C-746-S&T Landfills Remedial Investigation Scoping Package-DOE/OR/07-2027&D0 301.1mb -- Posted 01/28/2004

56. Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for Site-Wide Sediment Controls at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, Kentucky-DOE/OR/07-1958&D1/R1 298.7mb -- Posted 02/03/2004

30. Cultural Resource Survey and National Register Assessment, C-410 Complex, Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, McCracken County, Kentucky 152.6mb -- Posted 01/26/2004

Answer: Refer offeror to question and answer above. The larger files will be divided into smaller sections to enable offerors to open and download the information.

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)  
Remediation RFP – Group 5 (February 5, 2004 – February 9, 2004)**

99. Section H.16: requires offerors to accept assignment of existing subcontracts and agreements as identified in Section J, Attachment 6. (a) Are offerors permitted to terminate these contracts for convenience if they are able to provide a more cost-effective alternative? (b) Can you please provide a copy of the estimate to complete at time of project transition and the scrap metal subcontract.

Answer: a) DOE approval (after contract award) would be required prior to termination for convenience of the assigned subcontracts. If approved, the termination costs would be included as a part of the total allowable costs for fee calculation purposes, as well as any other costs that may result such as personnel retraining or the shipment and establishment of new site storage area(s) for nuclear materials. Offerors are advised that proposals should not be based upon terminating the contracts for convenience b) An estimate to complete will not be provided.. Pricing information will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available. For the purpose of proposal preparation, offers are advised to use quantities of scrap metal provided in the RFP.

100. [Paducah] How many FTEs and what labor category, by year, should we assume for the Level of Effort Activity - Support to DOE for DMSA litigation?

Answer: This is not a level of effort contract. The offerors are to estimate the requirements. Currently, less than 1 FTE supports this requirement.