

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)
Remediation RFP – Group 8**

191. Page C.2-5 of 32; C.2.1.2 Scrap Metal (X-747H); Scope not covered in any PBS. We note differences between a number of activities specified in the Statement of Work that we cannot find anywhere in the provided PBS. Please clarify.

Answer: The PO-0013 Solid Waste Stabilization and Disposition includes scrap metal as a part of legacy waste. Offerors are reminded that the WBS structure in the existing baseline is different than that in the Remediation RFP scope of work.

192. Page C.2-10 of 32; C.2.2.2c) Storage Operations and Maintenance; Scope not included in PBS PO-0013. We note differences between a number of activities specified in the Statement of Work that we cannot find anywhere in the provided PBS. Please clarify.

Answer: The PO-0013 Solid Waste Stabilization and Disposition includes the RFP activities as necessary to disposition all legacy waste and newly generated waste. Offerors are reminded that the WBS structure in the existing baseline is different than that in the Remediation RFP scope of work.

193. C.2 page 7 of 32; C.2.1.4.1 The PTI for the X-627 has been received and construction is underway (BJC subcontract #23900-SC-SM272F). The actual construction should be complete by August of 04. The scope in C.2.1.4.2 needs to reflect construction should be complete, however the contractors will most likely still need to complete tie ins to USEC utilities, test the new facility and demolish the X-622T.

Answer: The design work for X-627 is complete. The RFP Section C.2.1.4.2.a) 2) will be revised by amendment to remove “design” and “construct” from the scope of work. The SOW will be clarified to specify completion of utility tie-ins.

194. C.2 page 10 of 32; C.2.2.1 references an estimated 10 acres of storage space. USEC is taking over a portion of the X-7725 for Lead Cascade. This equates to approximately 2.3 acres of the RCRA Storage space will then be removed from the permit and leased to USEC.

Answer: For the purpose of proposal preparation, the estimated 10 acres as stated in the RFP Section C.2.2.1 should be used.

195. Will USEC employees working for Wastren be considered Grandfathered employees? If not, why would they receive lower benefits than any other 1st or 2nd tier subcontractor?

Answer: Section H.18 of the solicitation has been amended to clarify that incumbent employees includes USEC leased employees. Therefore, an USEC employee that is grandfathered will be treated the same as a grandfathered employee of BJC and/or of the first and second tier subcontractors in accordance with the terms of the solicitation. The clause was also amended to clarify that an employee who qualifies as a grandfathered employee under the BJC MEPP shall not lose such rights as a result of the transition in contractors.

Since each USEC employee’s individual circumstances are unique and there are different factors under the terms of the plan that affect eligibility for participation in the BJC MEPP, it is possible that not all USEC employees leased to Wastren will be grandfathered under the solicitation and/or the terms of the BJC MEPP documents. However, if a USEC employee currently has the right under the terms and conditions of the BJC MEPP to become a participant, it was the intent of

Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO) Remediation RFP – Group 8

DOE that such eligibility rights be maintained to the extent permissible by law and by the terms and conditions of the plan. The BJC MEPP documents and other benefits information have been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

196. DOE's response to Group 7 questions; Question/Answer #187; indicates that the contractor will be required to obtain an EPA ID number for RCRA hazardous waste generation and/or TSCA material. Further, the RFP states that the contractor will be responsible for signing RCRA manifests and LDR notifications as well as becoming a co-permittee on the facility RCRA Part B permit (also reiterated in response to Question #34). We understand DOE's desire to provide accountability for work performance and are willing to be responsible and accountable for performing our SOW. However, the questions/answers to date regarding this subject have created several follow-up questions critical to small businesses and 3rd party liability concerns. We would appreciate full and descriptive responses that clearly defines DOE's position and intent related to the transfer of liability to the contractor as related to this subject. 1) (a) As EPA ID numbers are facility specific and not company specific, is the intent of having the contractor obtain an EPA ID number to replace the generator ID number(s) which are already held by DOE for the Paducah facility? (b) Will the contractor be obtaining the EPA ID number on behalf of DOE given DOE is the facility owner? 2) (a) Will DOE sign as the generator on manifests or LDR notifications, thereby maintaining generator liability? (b) Or will DOE, via the contract, be asking the contractor to sign manifests/LDR notifications "on behalf of DOE" or "as an agent of DOE"? (c) Or is DOE asking the contractor to sign manifests and LDR notifications as the generator as defined by RCRA, and thereby transferring full hazardous waste generator liability to the contractor? 3) Is it DOE's intent (via contract requirements to obtain EPA ID numbers, sign manifests, LDR notifications, etc.) to transfer generator liability for AEA, RCRA, CERCLA, TSCA, and other regulated waste material to the contractor? 4) Does DOE recognize that the waste, once disposed at the receiving facility, remains DOE's waste - with all the future liability and responsibility normally associated with DOE's generator status under RCRA, TSCA, CERCLA, AEA, and other federal statutes?

Answer: Offerors are to comply with the terms and conditions of the RFP or contract regarding permits and licenses (see RFP clause H.14). The contractor shall not sign on behalf of DOE or as an agent of DOE unless it is determined to be appropriate by the Contracting Officer or required by statute or regulation. The contractor shall sign in it's own name in accordance with Section H.14. Liability shall be determined in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract and all applicable regulatory and statutory authorities.

197. Page C.2-7 of 32; C.2.1.4.2.a)1): "Complete the design, construct, and operate the X-624 facility upgrade." Will DOE provide the performance objectives that this design must achieve?

Answer: The design for the X-624 is complete. The RFP Section C.2.1.4.2.a) 1) will be revised by amendment to remove "design" from the scope of work. The design documents will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available.

198. Page C.2-7 of 32; C.2.1.4.2.a)2): "Complete the design, construct, and operate the X-627 Ground water Treatment." In the paragraph above (C.2.1.4.1) the RFP states the design plan is complete. Please specify what actions are required to "complete the design". If additional design action is necessary, please provide the performance objectives that this design must achieve?

Answer: The design work for X-627 is complete. The RFP Section C.2.1.4.2.a) 2) will be revised by amendment to remove "design" and "construct" from the scope of work. The SOW will be clarified to specify completion of utility tie-ins.

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)
Remediation RFP – Group 8**

199. Page C.2-14 of 32; C.2.4.2.b): “GCEP b) Disposition stored wastes and materials in the GCEP facilities and materials generated by the GCEP Disassembly Contractor to other locations on site or disposition to an off-site disposal facility.” a. We presume the stored wastes referred to in this requirement are included in Exhibit 2.2.2, is this correct? b. Would DOE please provide the quantities of materials currently in storage and projected to be generated by the GCEP Disassembly Contractor? c. Would DOE provide the anticipated start and stop dates of Disassembly Contractor’s work and may we presume linear production of materials for us to disposition from the work?

Answer: a. Yes, the stored wastes are identified in Exhibit 2.2.2. b. Information will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available. The projected volume of waste from the GCEP equipment cleanout is estimated at 284,864 cubic feet. c. The GCEP Disassembly Contractor has started preliminary planning work. The GCEP Disassembly Contractor’s equipment clean out work is anticipated to end March 31, 2006.

200. [Portsmouth] Is the GCEP disassembly contractor responsible for waste characterization and certification?

Answer: The GCEP Disassembly contractor is responsible for characterization and packaging of waste. The Remediation contractor will provide waste certification verification and disposition.

201. [Portsmouth] What is the projected volume of waste from GCEP equipment cleanout?

Answer: The estimated volume of waste from the GCEP equipment cleanout is 284,864 cubic feet.

202. The RFP does not include a list of surveillance requirements driven by the TSRs. Will DOE please provide this information for estimating purposes?

Answer: The Paducah and Portsmouth Safety Basis documents and the TSR surveillance requirements are being posted on the Remediation Web Site as they become available.

203. [Portsmouth] Will DOE provide a forecast of the wastes to be generated by the GCEP Disassembly Contractor for estimating purposes? If there are other newly generated waste streams for which the ER Contractor will be responsible, will forecasts be provided?

Answer: The projected volume of waste from the GCEP equipment cleanout is estimated at 284,864 cubic feet. If additional information on newly generated waste streams becomes available, it will be posted to the Remediation Web Site. In addition, please see the answer to question 199.

204. The Portsmouth Lifecycle Baseline Schedule (LBS) indicates that the following documents have been generated regarding the Portsmouth Inactive Facilities Removal project: a. Facility Utilization Survey (September 2003); b. Inactive Facilities Removal Execution Plan (August 2003); c. Engineering Evaluation / Cost Analysis (November/December 2003). These documents form the foundation for the Portsmouth IFR project, and offerors need to fully understand their status and progress. We have been unable to find any of these documents in the Environmental Information Center/Public Reading Room. Will DOE please make these documents available on the SEB Web Page?

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)
Remediation RFP – Group 8**

Answer: These documents are referenced as projected accomplishments for FY03 and FY04 in the BJC Life Cycle Baseline and have not been developed to date. Therefore, the documents are not available.

205. C.2 page 9 of 32; C.2.1.5.2 There are 771 groundwater wells on site and 20 offsite that are monitored/maintained. 83 of these are in the process of being abandoned. Approximately 450 wells are monitored on a regular basis (includes water levels and or sampling). There are approximately another 30 onsite and 4 offsite that are planned to install in the next 12 months.

Answer: An amendment will be issued to revise the number of wells.

206. [Portsmouth] Please provide copies of EMEF-HEU-110, Rev.1.

Answer: The document will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available.

207. RFP Amendment 0002, pg 4, para 8, changed the schedule for Paducah Scrap Metal Removal to disposition all scrap no later than 6/05. This does not agree with the spending plan posted in reference documents for "Subcontracts required to be assumed" or the redacted subcontract list in the RFP. It is also not clear if this agrees with the posted Scrap Metal Removal Project SOW posted in the reference documents. The BJC SOW says the base subcontractor scope is 39,000 tons and nickel ingot removal is optional. Please clear up the scope and schedule for the required subcontract and what scrap metal scope (from RFP tables C.1.2.1a and b) will remain after the required subcontract is completed.

Answer: The dates provided in amendment 0002 are correct and consistent with the Removal Action Work Plan (RAWP) for scrap metal, which has been posted to the Remediation Web Site. The terminology in the above question is not entirely accurate. The BJC Statement of Work provides for the characterization and removal of at least 39,000 tons of scrap metal and miscellaneous materials. "Optional work" is relocating approximately 6,875 nickel ingots (9,700 tons). The subcontract also provides "This task or statement of work is subject to change or modification as a result of the public comment and final regulator approval process for the CERCLA activity that this task or statement of work is intended to support. Any change or modification will be addressed in accordance with the provisions of the Subcontract and may include, but not be limited to, a directed change or partial termination of the task or Subcontract Work." The document referenced in the question above as "the spending plan" is a BJC estimated cost profile based upon the subcontract currently as written. It is recognized that the BJC estimated cost profile does not meet the requirement of the Removal Action Work Plan schedule for accomplishment of work. Offerors should propose costs in accordance with their approach to accomplish the work while remaining within the anticipated funding profile as provided in the RFP Section B.1.2. Offerors are reminded that the subcontract for scrap metal does not address the complete scope of work as stated in the RFP for scrap metal disposition.

For the purpose of proposal preparation, offerors are to propose based upon complying with the CERCLA milestones and the requirements of the RFP. Offerors should propose their costs for the scrap metal subcontract within the following parameters: volume of material is estimated at 39,000 tons (which excludes the classified scrap metal and nickel ingots); a revised estimated cost profile will be posted to the Remediation Web Site when available. If the subcontract is modified or partially terminated prior to submission of proposals, this information will be posted to the Remediation Web Site.

208. [Paducah] On 2/19 DOE provided a reference document (Cost data for DOE directed

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)
Remediation RFP – Group 8**

subcontracts for assumption which indicated funding levels for the scrap metal subcontract that extended through FY07. Subsequently, in Amendment 0002, DOE established a milestone for completion of the scrap metal project by 6/05. Please provide new funding levels by year that the Offeror should assume for the DOE directed scrap metal subcontract.

Answer: Please see the answer to question 207.

209. Amendment 0002, Item 8, modified the scrap disposition milestones to require disposition of all scrap no later than 6/05 with submittal of Project Completion Report no later than 12/05, and Item 32 encouraged the use of “Cost Data for the DOE Directed Subcontracts for Assumption” as posted on the Remediation website. Please clarify what scope of work is associated with the \$5.1 million in FY06 and the \$1 million in FY07, as shown in the Cost Data for DOE Directed Subcontracts for Assumption, since if the milestones are met there should be only one-quarter in FY06 of remaining scope associated with completion of the Project Completion Report.

Answer: See answer to question 207.

210. The directed scrap metal contract scope, as posted, (1) does not include scrap disposal; (2) does not include yard C-746-D, Classified Excess Metal Yard; and (3) the scope of work associated with C-746-H4, Nickel Ingot Storage (on-site relocation), does not include packaging, transportation and off-site disposal. Is this work currently in progress? Should disposal costs be estimated for all the scrap listed in Table C.1.2.1b?

Answer: 1) The scrap metal subcontract does not include the costs of disposal at the disposal site such as NTS or Envirocare. 2) The scrap metal activities associated with the C-746-D are not included in the subcontract scope of work, however are part of this RFP scope of work. 3) The relocation of the nickel ingots is “optional work” in the scrap metal subcontract, however, disposition is not included. The scope of work for this RFP includes disposition (which could be recycling). There is no work currently being performed to relocate or disposition the nickel. However, work on the scrap metal contract is currently being performed. 4) Yes. Disposal costs should be estimated for all the scrap listed in Table C.1.2.1b.

211. [Paducah] Given the addition of completion milestones for Scrap Metal Removal in Amendment 2, and the funding profile for the subcontract required to be assumed by the Offeror - the timelines of the milestones and the subcontract funding by FY do not align.

Answer: See answer to question 207.

212. [Paducah] Given this acceleration of the subcontract SOW (which the Offeror is required to assume from BJC), what will be the new FY05 funding profile to accommodate this acceleration?

Answer: See answer to question 207.

213. Reference: Section C.1.2.2.2. This section infers that there is an existing contract in place to process and dispose of the classified scrap metal. Is this “existing contract” to process and dispose of the classified scrap metal under the Paducah Scrap Metal Removal and Disposal Contract? If it is, which amendment was this to the existing contract since the original contract only included characterization through disposition of the general scrap materials and an option to transfer the nickel ingots to a pole barn building that was to be constructed by BJC?

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)
Remediation RFP – Group 8**

Answer: The section referenced (C.1.2.2.2) in the question does not address scrap metal. However, if the question is regarding Section C.1.2.1, there is no existing subcontract to dispose of classified scrap metal. The RFP wording in Section C.1.2.1.1 will be clarified in an amendment.

214. Reference: Section C.1.2.1.1. “an estimated 54,000 tons of scrap metal at various locations at the Paducah Site” Reference: Table C.1.2.1b, lists 49,527 tons of scrap materials. (a) Is it correct to assume that “scrap metal” and “scrap materials” are synonymous terms? (b) If not, how much additional material is non-scrap metal (e.g., wood, plastic, etc)? (c) Is the difference of 4,473 tons between the table and the text the amount of material that has been dispositioned? (d) If so, what mass quantity has been disposed of onsite? (e) If not, what is the reasoning for the difference?

Answer: a) The term scrap metal and scrap material are synonymous as used in this Section of the RFP. b) N/A. c) The 54,000 tons is the estimate in the Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis posted on the Remediation Web Site. The difference between the 54,000 tons and the RFP Table C.1.2.1.b values is the amount of scrap metal that has been dispositioned (4,500 tons). d) This part of the question is not clear. However, some portion of the 4,500 tons has been disposed of on-site. Also the estimated quantities in Table C.1.2.1.b identified as MLLW, RCRA and TSCA waste are included in the total estimated quantity (49,500 tons) of the nickel ingots, general scrap materials, and classified materials.

215. In the original RFP that resulted in the Paducah Scrap Metal Removal and Disposal Contract, the instructions to offerors required the quantity RCRA, TSCA, and Mixed waste quantities shall be assumed not to exceed 0.05% each of the total scrap. Hence, the “estimated” quantities were essentially guesses at that time. Are the quantities of MLLW, RCRA, and TSCA quantities based on actual characterization or are they basically guesses? For example, anecdotal information suggests that there has been significantly more MLLW/RCRA waste found than originally anticipated.

Answers: The Department interprets your question as pertaining to the RFP issued by BJC, and the Department will not comment on an RFP issued by BJC.

216. [Paducah] A question was submitted on 2/26/04 re: the scrap metal milestones established in Amendment #0002 (posted 2/23/2004) for 6/05 and 12/05. The reference document on the web "Cost Data for the DOE directed subcontracts for assumption" (posted 2/19/2004) shows a significant amount of funding in FY06/FY07. Per the SOW for scrap metal subcontract (posted in reference documents on 2/20/2004), this is a significant acceleration of work particularly in relation to the FY05 funding profile (Attachment J-5.1). It is imperative that we be provided the new funding profile for the subcontract and/or the FY05 site funding target to reflect this directed acceleration as it could significantly affect other site activities. * (a) When will this information be provided? * (b) Or should the milestone dates be June 2006 and December 2006 to more closely align with the existing subcontract terms? * (c) Given the acceleration of the existing scrap metal subcontract (per the provided funding profile) and period of performance noted in Attachment J-6, please provide the new terms and conditions, work execution approach (i.e., working multiple yards concurrently, daily waste volume shipments, additional volume reduction techniques, etc.) and the subcontractor's detailed schedule to support this acceleration. We need this information to accurately estimate and schedule both support activities and other site activity SOWs. * (d) Please provide an update to Table C.1.2.1a (we need a further breakdown of table C.1.2.1b) to show the remaining tons to be removed and dispositioned after site responsibility assumption date of 10/1/04. This information is need for

**Questions Generated from the Portsmouth and Paducah Project Office (PPPO)
Remediation RFP – Group 8**

each scrap storage yard/area shown in Table C.1.2.1a and not the summary level currently provided in Table C.1.2.1b. * (e) There are confusing and conflicting statements related to the term "disposition". It is clear from the scrap metal subcontract that disposition for at least 39,000 tons is included within the scope. DOE's answer to Question #95 also states that classified scrap disposition is included in the WESKEM subcontract. Question #137's response would indicate that the Offeror is responsible for disposition. We understand that 'disposition' performance is within the Remediation contractor's SOW. However, does the term "disposition", as used in the WESKEM subcontract and DOE answers to questions, include the cost of disposal? Without understanding the volume/tonnage of material that remains after 10/1/04, and whether or not disposition includes disposal fees - an accurate reflection of the situation in our cost estimate cannot be assured. Please provide the volume/tons, where offsite disposal costs if any, that should be included in the Offeror's cost estimate. * (f) What other scope and/or support is being provided and paid for by BJC and/or other BJC subcontractors to accomplish total execution of this scrap removal project (RPP rad con, NCS, NDA, etc.)?

Answer: a) See the answer to question 207. b) The offeror shall comply with the RFP and its amendments. See the answer to question 207. c) See the answer to question 207 above. The offerors should propose their work activities and costs consistent with the RFP. d) Offerors should prepare their proposals using the quantities provided in Table C.1.2.1.b. e) In the answer to question #95 the word "not" was inadvertently omitted. This will be corrected. The disposal costs should be based upon the quantities in the RFP Table C.1.2.1.b. The disposal cost is based upon different elements including but not limited to, the offerors approach, the disposal site/facility, the characterization, and the Waste Acceptance Criteria. e) The Remediation contractor is responsible for completion of all of the scope of work in the RFP and BJC will not be providing any support. Offerors are reminded that the subcontract for scrap metal is only a portion of the work to be performed under the RFP and offerors should propose their own approach to accomplishing the RFP scope of work.

217. [Paducah] It is our understanding that the Scrap Metal RAWP requires removal of all scrap listed in RFP Table C.1.2.1a by 6/05. However your response to Question #165 has funding for Scrap Metal in Fy 06 and FY07. Please explain the inconsistency. Which is correct?

Answer: See the answer to question 207.