

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

218. Can the contractor lose all fee to result in zero fee?

Answer: As stated in Section B, Clauses B.1.4 and B.2.4, the minimum fee will be 2% of target cost. There are certain circumstances that may result in total fee of less than 2% of target cost. While all of the circumstances that may result in loss of fee cannot be listed here, some examples include: Section B, Clauses B.1.7 and B.2.7 “Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives...” in order for the contractor to be eligible to earn all available fee under this contract, the contractor must meet the minimum requirements of the clauses regarding ESH&Q, safeguarding of restricted data and classified information, project and cost performance.

219. I am looking for a copy of the following reference documents listed in Section C of the Paducah Remediation RFP-C.1.2.2: DMSAs Milestones/Schedule:

Existing Characterization Report of all Priority "A, B, and C" DMSAs, including DMSA C-400-05
Existing Sample Analysis Plan for Priority C DMSAs
Existing Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) Assessment Report(s)
Existing RCRA Part A Hazardous Waste Permit

Answer: All of the documents are posted on the Remediation Web Site. As a clarification, the “Existing Sample Analysis Plan for Priority C DMSAs” is not specific only to Priority C DMSAs rather it is applicable to all DMSAs.

220. What specific activities are funded for the incumbent contractor to continue during the transition to the new remediation contractor for each site?

Answer: The incumbent contractor will be responsible for day to day activities until the new contractor(s) assume its responsibilities in accordance with the terms of its remediation contract. The anticipated funding profile for FY04 may be reduced depending upon the award date of the contract. However, the funding for the costs incurred by BJC are not part of the target cost of this contract.

221. Section L.17.a states that no cost information shall be included in the Technical Proposal. The last paragraph in Section L.17.b.I instructs the offeror to present an integrated schedule to achieve completion of the SOW within the annual funding limitations specified in Section B.2.2 and Section J Attachment 5.1 and 5.2. Can offerors provide estimated cost information in this section to demonstrate that the SOW can be achieved within the specified funding limitations?

Answer: No cost information is to be provided in the technical proposal. Offerors are to present their planned/scheduled work that the offeror has determined to be within the funding limitations without the specific dollar information. The cost proposal will be used to determine whether the offeror’s proposal remained within the specified funding limitations. The SEB during the technical evaluation of this criteria will be provided only information regarding whether the offeror complied with the

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

funding limitations and funding restrictions set forth in the solicitation, not the costs.

222. Section B.2.2 and Section J Attachment 5.2: When DOE originally announced the procurement, the anticipated contract value for the Portsmouth site was approximately \$450 million over 5 years. The RFP states that the anticipated funding profile for the Portsmouth site is \$273 million over 5 years. What statement of work reductions account for this significant reduction in cost? If not SOW reductions, what has caused the significant reduction in cost?

Answer: The original procurement announcement was prior to the development of a detailed Statement of Work, estimate, and decision on the Government Furnished Services and Items (GFSI).

223. The following documents were referenced in the Paducah/Portsmouth ER RFP but are not located on the web site under reference documents as of 2/3/04. To aid in our review, could you please post these documents to the web site. 1) Basis for Interim Operation for C-410, Document No. unknown [not specifically referenced in RFP Section C.1.3] 2) Auditable Safety Analysis or Equivalent for C-340, Document No. unknown {not specifically referenced in RFP Section C.1.3}. 3) Memorandum of Agreement between DOE and ToxCo, July 16, 2002

Answer: 1) The C-410 Basis for Interim Operation is included in the DSA which has been posted to the Remediation Web Site. 2) The TSRs have been posted to the Remediation Web Site. 3) The memorandum for ToxCo has been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

224. Waste Disposition: Will C-761-U Landfill have the capacity to accept scrap metal and DMSA material that is clean to within authorized limits?

Answer: We are not sure of your question, as there is no C-761-U Landfill. If you mean the C-746-U landfill, it has adequate capacity to accept scrap metal and DMSA material meeting the WAC.

225. Paducah Reference Document #49, Kentucky Division of Waste Management (KDWM) Hazardous Waste Management Permit-KY8-890-008-982, does not include Volume Two -Attachments I through IX. These attachments include the details associated with how compliance with the established KDWM Permit Conditions found in Volume One are achieved. These details are essential for our baseline effort. Please post Volume Two and associated Attachments.

Answer: Volume Two, which is Official Use Only (OUO) information, is available by following the instructions posted to the Remediation Web Site.

226. Is a second (or lower) tier "Team Subcontractor" which is expected to perform over \$5 million in any one given year, considered a "major subcontractor" and required to provide the information requested in Sections L.18(d); L.18(f); L.18(g); L.18(n); L.18(o);

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

L.18(p); L.18(q); and L.18(s)? In response to section L.18(t)(1) and L.18(t)(2), is the offeror required to provide separately the personnel cost from the second (or lower) tier "Team Subcontractor" or should these costs be included in the personnel cost of the first tier subcontractor?

Answer: Yes, all subcontractors who perform in any one given year over \$5 million are considered "major subcontractors" and shall provide the requested information. Amendment 0002 revised the L.18(b) instructions to exclude those contracts identified as "Contractor Shall Assume" in Section J, Attachment 6. The personnel costs of the second tier subcontractors shall be provided separately.

227. Exhibit C.1.0.3, Milestones, Item C.1.5, DUF6 Cylinder Management, specifies 3/05 as the milestone for "Transition to UDS." Section J-Attachment 5.2, PBS Narrative PO-0011 NM Stabilization and Disposition -- Portsmouth Uranium Facilities Management, 5th sentence states "Management of DUF6 cylinders will continue until 10/05, when turnover to the DUF6 conversion facility operator occurs." Will DOE please clarify which date is to be used as the milestone for transitioning DUF6 cylinder management responsibility to UDS?

Answer: The date discrepancy will be corrected by an amendment to the RFP to remove the reference to October 2005 from the PBS description.

228. Amendment 1 of the RFP has identified the following additional requirements to be addressed. We request an increased page count for the Technical Approach, Integration, and Schedule Section from 40 to 50 pages to allow the adequate responses to these requests.

Answer: The page counts were revised in amendment 0001 of the RFP.

229. B.2.4 Incentive Structure (Portsmouth). How will DOE handle the payment of cost savings activities identified during the execution of the contract that are not part of the proposal and would not be considered as part of the overall 12% "Maximum Fee of the Target Cost"?

Answer: All cost savings achieved during contract performance regardless of whether they were included as a part of the proposal, will be considered as a part of the cost share ratio calculation in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

230. B.2.5 Cost Excluded From The Incentive Fee Calculation (Portsmouth). In regards to the Energy Employees Occupational Injury Compensation Program Act funded by the Office of Environment, Safety and Health, should we include the cost to cover this in our target costs? If the contractors need to include this cost would you please give the total amount to be incorporated into the estimates for the target costs?

Answer: The costs associated with contractor's activities pertaining to the EEOICPA

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

are not included in total allowable cost for the purposes of fee calculation under the clause entitled Incentive Fee. This means these costs are not included as part of the target costs for fee purposes. The costs associated with EEOICPA are funded separately and must be tracked separately; but are allowable costs under the contract.

231. B.2.8 Authorization of Transition Cost Under the Contract (Portsmouth). - Are Transition Costs subject to any PBS restrictions by Fiscal Year or PBS that has to be balanced. If so what are these restrictions? Are transition cost funded separately and if so what is the funding source and should we create a separate WBS element to break out the transition cost?

Answer: PBS restrictions are identified in Section J, Attachment 5.2. The PBSs are written at a high level to cover a broad scope of activities. The activities in this solicitation are funded activities and are included in the PBSs. The offeror should structure their proposal to include all of the work scope into the existing PBS structure. Transition costs are not separately funded. A separate WBS element for transition will be added in an amendment to the solicitation.

232. L. 6 (b) Requirements for Cost Or Pricing Data Or Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data - Can financial statements and any other company data/information required in Volume III be submitted in PDF (vs. Excel and MS Word) to provide a document format that is more reproducible and stable for the wide variety of data requested?

Answer: Information provided in response to L.18(r) is excluded from the L.6(b) requirement (i.e., the information shall be provided in its hardcopy format only). This is being clarified in an amendment.

233. L.17(b)I. TECHNICAL APPROACH, INTEGRATION AND SCHEDULE. Amendment 1 states “Offerors shall provide the integrated schedule on no more than twenty (20) pages.....”. May the written narrative description and legends associated with the schedule be included within the allotted 20 pages?

Answer: Yes. However, it was DOE’s intent to provide a significant increase in the schedule page limit to allow offerors to provide a schedule (i.e., critical path, logic ties, start and end dates, key milestones, legend) with enough detailed activities to demonstrate sufficient integration and to convey their technical approach.

234. GIS support services are a requirement of the contract. The draft Risk Based End State (RBES) Vision document reference the Portsmouth geographical information system (GIS) as a key component used in the development of the document. Assuming the continued use of GIS is an important tool for the overall project, will the contractor have full access and use of the existing GIS system as government furnished property? Further, will DOE permit the successful offeror the ability to assume the contract currently in place to continue support of the GIS system? If the GIS support contract is available to the successful bidder, please post the relevant information for pricing purposes.

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

Answer: The GIS system has been added to the Section H.17 GFSI in amendment 0002. The contractor may elect to perform the work or assume the existing subcontracts through negotiating with the current subcontractors. Such costs will be included in the target cost.

235. Will DOE need direct, real time access to the offeror's project controls system, or will the offeror only be required to feed electronic data into the IPABS?

Answer: DOE does need timely access to project control information. The offeror may provide the information in the form of project control reports, real time access to the project control system, or by any other means that provides timely access.

236. How much furniture is available to the Remediation contractor?

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

237. Does remediation contractor have responsibilities for communication capabilities, telephone systems, T-1 data lines, computer LAN for its activities? Reference is made to Section F.2 of the Infrastructure RFP.

Answer: The responsibilities for computer/radio/telephones and the provision of computer network/support as GFSI in Section H.17 Table, paragraph f., were added in Amendment 0002.

238. Does remediation contractor have responsibilities to establish and maintain capabilities to access DOE systems and databases? (Section F.3 of the Infrastructure RFP)

Answer: Yes.

239. Does remediation contractor have responsibilities for computing and telecommunications system for their own uses? (Section F.4 of the Infrastructure RFP)

Answer: The responsibilities for computer/radio/telephones and the provision of computer network/support as GFSI in Section H.17 Table, paragraph f., were added in Amendment 0002.

240. The infrastructure contractor RFP indicates that the infrastructure contractor will provide certified lab testing services related to drug testing for the overall site. (Section J.1) The infrastructure contractor RFP further states that the infrastructure shall provide certified analytical lab services to analyze sample it takes including dosimetry and bioassay in support of its work. (Section M.4) The bioassay lab services are not mentioned in the remediation contractor RFP. Do we assume bioassay lab services are

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

required for remediation contractor activities?

Answer: Consistent with Sections C.1.9.3.g and C.2.7.3.g. and 10 CFR 835, a radiological protection program including bioassay lab services is required for remediation contractor activities.

241. We assume we are responsible to provide emergency and routine medical services. Can we assume that these medical services can be acquired from either USEC or an outside contractor?

Answer: Consistent with Sections C.1.9.3.g and C.2.7.3.g. the Remediation contractor is responsible to ensure that access to health programs/ambulatory care is provided. The Remediation contractor is responsible for providing these services and the contractor selects its own method for acquiring these services, whether through its own arrangements or agreements with USEC or an outside provider. An emergency medical technician is provided as GFSI in Section H.17 Table paragraph e, from USEC as a first responder.

242. B.1.8 – makes statement re: transition team being in place at the PPPO (assumed to be Lexington) – or should this be interpreted as transition being in place at the site of performance?

Answer: This language was clarified in amendment 0001.

243. C.1.2.2.2 (f) – can we get a copy of the referenced letter (11/21/03, Murphie to Hatton)

Answer: The letter has been posted to the Remediation Web Site.

244. C.1.9.3 (c) – is the remediation contractor to assume the DSA and SB maintenance is to be only for those facilities listed as the responsibility of the remediation contractor or are there other “non-leased” facilities that will be our responsibility?...use of the word “all”, and “as applicable” seem in conflict

Answer: The Remediation contractor is responsible to maintain, update and implement the safety basis documents for all facilities they have been assigned responsibility for (see Section J Attachment 8.1), that would require such documents. This includes documented safety analysis or safety basis (as applicable) or other types of safety envelope documents.

245. For subcontracts that the offering entity is not planning to assume from BJC or others, will the termination costs be incurred by BJC since it never becomes our subcontract?

Answer: Other than for the 3 subcontracts identified as “Contractor Shall Assume,” the termination costs, if any, will not be the responsibility of the Remediation

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

contractor(s).

246. Has DOE established as part of the GFSI w/ the Infrastructure Contractor that the classification program must support schedules/milestones set by the remediation contractor?

Answer: No. However, each contractor is required to cooperate with other site contractors pursuant to the clauses contained within the respective contracts. The offerors are reminded that the ultimate responsibility for meeting schedule is the Remediation contractor(s) and they should factor in adequate lead times to ensure their schedule is reasonable, realistic and can be maintained.

247. For the listed subcontracts noted in Section J, Attachment 6 – several of the subcontracts are multiple site subcontracts currently managed by BJC. We understand that taking on assignment of existing subcontractors is at the discretion of the offeror. However, for these multi-site subcontractors – is DOE’s intent that BJC continue to manage for the remediation contractor and we purchase the service or is the intent that we take over the existing T&C’s and assign a new subcontract number under the existing subcontract structure?

Answer: It is DOE’s intent that the Remediation contractor(s) are responsible for completion of all the activities in the SOWs and may accomplish the work through either performing the work with its own employees, by subcontracting, or any other method (consistent with the Limitations on Subcontracting clause and small business regulations) and not rely on BJC for site management. Offerors are reminded that the subcontracts DOE has directed to be assumed are identified in Section J, Attachment 6 as “Contractor Shall Assume.”

248. Does DOE have any information as to the suitability and availability of on-site office space or should we pursue using the BJC Kevil office and assume the lease? If we are to assume the term of the lease, we need a copy of the current lease agreement.

Answer: On-site office space for the Remediation contractor has been identified in Section J, Attachments 8.1 and 8.2 as facilities assigned to the Remediation contractor. The Remediation contractor(s) may use the space within these facilities for personnel. The off-site Kevil space, is leased by BJC from Ballard County and it is not a DOE-owned or controlled facility. The determination of need for personnel space is the offeror’s responsibility and if determined to be necessary by the offeror(s), leasing of non-DOE off-site facilities is the contractor’s responsibility consistent with property regulations, terms and conditions of the contract, and all other applicable laws.

249. Is the offeror’s target fee included in the funding targets or does DOE have a separate pool for fee?

Answer: The offeror’s target fee is included in the anticipated funding profile

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

provided in Sections B.1.2 and B.2.2.

250. Are the funding profiles provided in the RFP escalated dollars? If not, what is the year basis of the dollars (current year 2002, current year 2003, current year 2004, etc.)?

Answer: The funding profiles are escalated. For escalation purposes the base year is 2003.

251. For DOE “provided” disposal mechanisms (NTS, DOE prime contract w/ Envirocare), please provide the current pay items by unit for each media, waste type, etc and the expiration date of any contracts.

Answer: The solicitation has not “provided” disposal mechanisms as GFSI. The Envirocare contract has been posted to the Remediation Web Site and contains rate information. The DOE does not guarantee availability of this contract during the term of the remediation contract. The current rate information for Low Level Waste (LLW) accepted at NTS is: \$7.00 per cubic foot for FY04, 05, and 06. The rate is \$9.00 per cubic foot for FY 07, 08, and 09. The DOE does not guarantee these rates during the term of the remediation contract. For further information on Envirocare and NTS can be found through links on the Remediation Web Site. The rates for other waste types/receiver sites must be obtained and furnished by the offeror.

252. For program support activities, given there is no discrete PBS for these programmatic activities – are we to assume that allocating these costs back to the provided PBSs is appropriate via the direct project related SOWs?

Answer: The PBSs are written at a high level to cover a broad scope of activities. The activities in the SOW for this solicitation are funded activities and are included in the PBSs. The offeror should structure their proposal to include all of the work scope into the existing PBS structure. Project Support may be distributed across multiple PBSs.

253. We can't get away from deferred maintenance and FIMS/CAIRS reporting and the energy management requirements; the actual programs seem better suited to Infrastructure with us supplying facility specific info to Infrastructure per their requirements/needs. Can this approach be assumed?

Answer: As instructed on the Section J, Attachments 4.1 and 4.2 the Remediation contractor’s responsibility for the FIMS data and the energy management/consumption data is to provide the pertinent information to others who will prepare the report. The CAIRS data reporting is the responsibility of the Remediation contractor(s).

254. For Infrastructure services provided as GFSI, for those requirements that relate directly to a milestone outlined in the RFP....or a schedule we prepare for a specific SOW element....can we assume that the other contractors/GFSI will work to our schedule

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

demands?

Answer: No. However, each contractor is required to cooperate with other site contractors pursuant to the clauses contained within the respective contracts. The offerors are reminded that the ultimate responsibility for meeting schedule is the Remediation contractor(s) and they should factor in adequate lead times to ensure their schedule is reasonable, realistic and can be maintained.

255. Since the Infrastructure contractor will have responsibility for the DOE Classification program, will the Remediation contractor be allowed to have selected personnel trained by either DOE or the Infrastructure contractor as Authorized Derivative Classifier-Technical Information Officer reviewers to expedite review of Remediation documentation?

Answer: The responsibility for the classification program is the Infrastructure contractor(s) and a mutually agreeable process between the Infrastructure and Remediation contractor(s) should be established to facilitate clear roles and responsibilities per Section H.19.

256. In Section J, Paducah Funding Restrictions, DOE has designated funding by PBS. DOE stated that funding can be shifted between PA-0013 and PA-0040, if requested by the contractor and approved by DOE. Does DOE expect that the bidders identify any requested funding shifts as part of their baseline that is submitted with the proposal?

Answer: DOE anticipates requests for PBS funding shifts to occur during the Remediation Baseline development and approval process (after contract award). Offerors shall adhere to the funding restrictions identified in Sections J, Attachments 5.1 and/or 5.2 for proposal preparation purposes. Offerors may also identify potential funding shifts with advantages and disadvantages within its proposal, recognizing that these shifts may or may not be approved and offerors acknowledge that it agrees to perform within the funding limitations if PBS shifts are not approved and demonstrates how it will perform within the funding limitations if PBS shifts are not approved.

257. [Paducah] Please provide cost/license fee information for the required permits as follows: (examples below).

License Agreement (7-01-0120) with plant area residents for access to adjacent parcel of land to sample MW-199. License Agreement will be renewed every five years.

Renew License Agreement (7-98-0175) with the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife for extraction wells and sampling activities. License Agreement will be renewed every five years.

KY8-890-008-982 Kentucky Division of Waste Management

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

Hazardous Waste Management Permit

KY0004049 Authorization to Discharge Under the Kentucky Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

Answer: The majority of the requested information is provided in a Table posted to the Remediation Web Site. In addition, the Kentucky Division of Waste Management Hazardous Waste Management Permit Part A is \$1,000 per change; the fee for Part B has been waived by the State. The fee information for the Authorization to Discharge Under the Kentucky Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit is \$3,200 for 5 years.

258. Section J, Attachment 5.1 – why are PBSs PA-0102 and PA-0103 included but there is no funding associated? For the SOWs in Section C (litigation support, CAB, etc.) relative to these PBSs, where should the contractor assume the funding is residing (the above noted PBSs, allocated to the other PBSs, or other)?

Answer: The activities under PA-0103 are not a part of the scope of work for the Remediation RFP. However, the Remediation Contractor shall *support* these activities, meaning answering questions, providing documents/data if necessary, preparing a presentation on its activities, and any other activities that are conducive to a successful/harmonious outcome for Community and Regulatory Support which was addressed in the answer to question #62. Potential offerors should include this level of support activities in their cost estimates. The responsibility to ensure the scope of work for PA-0103 is performed and *coordinated* belongs to the Infrastructure Contractor meaning the scope is part of their contract, which is why the answer for question #28 states PA-0102 and PA-0103 are not included in the Remediation Scope of Work at Paducah and should not be included in the cost estimates for the Remediation Contractor. BJC has the responsibility to administer the activities under PA-0102.

259. C.1.9.3, Item C: does the "as applicable" include or exclude the Infrastructure Contractor facilities?

Answer: The "as applicable" refers to the type of safety basis document. The Remediation contractor is responsible to maintain, update and implement the safety basis documents for all facilities they have been assigned responsibility for (in Section J, Attachment 8.1) that would require such documents. This includes documented safety analysis or safety basis (as applicable) or other types of safety envelope documents.

260. [Paducah] C.1.2.2: There is approximately 31K cubic feet left to characterize and report by 9/30/04, does DOE expect BJC to complete? If not, we need to know the status, anticipated progress at turnover date, and estimate to complete (cost/schedule) by the end of the FY. This holds true for other short term milestones (FY04) as this will impact the FY04 estimate as well as the transition costs.

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

Answer: The DOE believes that the question refers to the Priority A DMSAs and C-400-05 that require completion of characterization by 9/30/04. The characterization of C-400-05 has been completed and the Final Characterization Report is posted on the Remediation Web Site. For the purpose of proposal preparation, offerors should anticipate that the characterization of Priority A DMSAs will be complete by 9/30/04.

261. Item C.1.2.2.2.k, work to be performed under DOE Material Storage Areas, requires the Remediation contractor to “Provide technical and administrative support to DOE for DMSA litigation activities as required.” Could DOE provide more guidance regarding the expected scope of this activity?

Answer: The Remediation contractor will be required to provide technical and administrative support which includes, but is not limited to, providing technical data, providing comment, or providing documents as required for litigation regarding DMSA activities.

262. Section C.1.2.3 states, in part “This work scope shall be considered complete following the disposition of ... all waste not specifically generated by remediation activities that has been newly generated through 6/30/09,” but C.1.2.3.2.i “... all waste generated by remediation activities that has been, or will be, newly generated through 6/30/09.” There appears to be a typographical error in one of the statements. Please clarify which statement is correct.

Answer: The discrepancy was corrected in amendment 0001 of the RFP.

263. [Paducah] Section C.1.0.2a states "all major sources of groundwater contamination shall be remediated." Does this statement refer to all known sources of groundwater contamination (i.e. C-400, C-720, and SWMU 1) as defined in Section C 1.1.1.1?

Answer: No. The offeror is required to clean-up all major sources of groundwater contamination as stated in Section C.1.0.2.

264. [Paducah] In Section C.1.1.3.2e there is a requirement to develop SI/RA reports, however, there does not appear to be a requirement to conduct the site investigations as needed to prepare the CERCLA documents. Are the site investigation activities considered to be in the scope of the RFP or are those activities to be performed by others?

Answer: The requirement to perform the site investigations is in the scope of the RFP. The contractor(s) in order to develop the report as stated in Section C.1.1.3.2e, is required to perform the work and related investigation activities.

265. [Paducah] Preparation of all CERCLA decision documents presumes the site investigation (not just the work plans) have been completed. Is this reference to the SW Plume investigation or does it also refer to the Burial Grounds 12, 13, 14, and 15?

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

Answer: The development of the RI/FS Work Plan for the burial grounds, and not the performance of the RI/FS is the requirement in Section C.1.1.3.2d. The CERCLA decision document preparation in Section C.1.1.3.2g relates to the Southwest Plume.

266. [Paducah] Please clarify - does DOE anticipate a separate restoration to be conducted under C.1.4.2.2 d) as stated to "Plan, evaluate, and conduct the restoration of the area in accordance with the CERCLA Response Action decision documents." other than that covered by subsection e) of Section C.1.4.2.2?

Answer: No. Sections C.1.4.2.2d and C.1.4.2.2e are the same restoration activity. Section C.1.4.2.2e details the requirements of Section C.1.4.2.2d estimated as a result of the CERCLA documentation for restoration of the area(s).

267. [Paducah] Is maximum volume to be excavated based on in-situ or ex-situ volumes regarding C.1.4.2.2 e) to "Excavate, backfill to grade, and re-vegetate hot spots to be identified through the CERCLA process for the NSDD areas designated as Sections 3, 4 and 5. The total volume of material to be excavated is estimated not to exceed 13,000 cubic yards, an estimated 5 percent being LLW, an estimated 5 percent being RCRA waste, and the remainder being sanitary waste. Excavated clean fill material may be stockpiled on-site or re-used."

Answer: The volumes as stated in the RFP are based upon estimated in-situ volumes.

268. Reference: Section J, Attachment 6. This attachment states that we are to assume the Paducah Scrap Metal Removal and Disposal contract. Also, a statement at the Pre-Bid Conference held in Portsmouth, OH, inferred that the successful bidder to the Paducah Remediation contract would incur several REAs that have already been submitted or are in the process of being submitted. What is the cumulative value of the REAs? Could the technical basis that supports each REA be provided?

Answer: The Department is unaware of making such an inference. Offerors should propose upon the basis that there are and/or will be no Requests for Equitable Adjustments (REAs) or unresolved REAs at the time of assumption of the contract.

269. Reference: Table C.1.2.1b (a) For the classified materials, what is the distribution (%) of single, double, and triple converters for the 14,500 tons? (b) Can classified materials be shipped by rail?

Answer: a. For the purpose of proposal preparation, assume a distribution of converters for the 14,500 tons as follows: 48% triple, 48% double, 4% single. b. The classified material is currently being shipped on flat bed tractor trailer trucks. It is the responsibility of the offeror to determine a shipping mechanism that is compliant with the DOE security requirements as well as DOT shipping regulations and the terms and conditions of the solicitation.

270. [Paducah] C.1.9.3 (c) -Is the remediation contractor to assume DSA and SB

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

maintenance is to be only for those facilities listed as the responsibility of the remediation contractor or are there other "non-leased" facilities that will be our responsibility?....use of the word "all", and "as applicable" seem in conflict.

Answer: The Remediation contractor is responsible for updating and maintaining the Safety Basis and Documented Safety Analysis for all non-leased facilities that require this documentation. The facilities listed in Section C.1.9.3.(c) are the facilities that currently require this documentation, with the addition of C-340. However, if additional facilities require SB or DSA documentation, the contractor is responsible for the generation, implementation, maintenance and updates.

271. [Paducah] For program support activities (WBS 1.9.X), given there is no discrete PBS for these programmatic activities other than Safeguards & Security in 1.9.7 (PBS PA 0020) - are we to assume that allocating these costs back to the provided PBSs is appropriate via the direct project related SOWs (similar to what BJC does for programmatic activities)?

Answer: The PBSs are written at a high level to cover a broad scope of activities. The activities in the SOW for this solicitation are funded activities and are included in the PBSs. The offeror should structure their proposal to include all of the work scope into the existing PBS structure. Project Support may be distributed across multiple PBSs.

272. [Paducah] Given the seamless transition and continuity of operations requirements of the RFP, will DOE provide the Offeror's an estimated monthly cost for BJC to continue to provide access, connectivity, and use of existing systems - in particular business systems? These partially include PMCP, PALS, SmartQV, BPS, Oracle financial systems, etc. that are based in Oak Ridge. Even a '\$/user' or 'headcount tax' would be beneficial. BJC refers Offeror's to DOE for information on these matters.

Answer: There is no intent to provide continuing access, connectivity or use of existing systems other than as stated in the H.17 GFSI clause. During the transition period, BJC will transfer data and systems owned by DOE to the new contractor(s). Information on transferable databases will be posted to the Remediation Web Site as it becomes available. The procurement, human resources, and other internal systems and databases required, are to be provided by the Remediation contractor(s).

273. C.2.6 Onsite Disposal Cell Planning (Portsmouth). This work item is not included in any of the PBS described in J-Attachment 5.2. Which PBS does this belong to? Is the cost for this work in DOE's total funding limitation?

Answer: The PBSs are written at a high level to cover a broad scope of activities. The activities in the SOW for this solicitation are funded activities and are included in the PBSs. The offeror should structure their proposal to include all of the work scope into the existing PBS structure. The onsite disposal cell should be included in PO-0041.

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

274. Section J Attachment 5.2: Pages are missing from the Portsmouth life cycle baseline WBS Dictionaries posted on the RFP web site on January 14, 2004. For example:

PORTS Environmental Monitoring is missing pages 9 through 15 of 17, inclusive.

1.12.05.03.02.02 PORTS TSCA-LLW Waste is missing pages 6 through 8 of 9, inclusive.

1.12.05.60.02.04 HEU Program is missing page 6 of 9.

1.12.05.03.05.01 PORTS Storage Operations is missing pages 5 and 6 of 7.

1.12.05.01.01.01 PORTS Sitewide Assessments is missing pages 6 through 10 of 10, inclusive.

1.12.05.02.02.06 Cold Standby Technical Support is missing page 7 of 8.

1.12.05.05.01.01 PORTS BJC Safeguards and Security is missing pages 8 through 8 of 8, inclusive.

1.12.05.01.03.01 PORTS X-747H Scrap Metal Disposition is missing pages 5 and 6 of 7, inclusive.

1.12.05.03.05.02 PORTS S&M of Waste Operations Facilities is missing pages 5 through 8 of 8, inclusive.

1.12.05.01.02.02 PORTS Quadrant II Corrective Actions is missing pages 7 through 9 of 11, inclusive.

1.12.05.02.02.02 PORTS PCB Activities is missing pages 4 and 5 of 6, inclusive.

The above list is not inclusive -- almost every dictionary is missing pages. This missing information is critical to preparing a complete technical proposal, cost estimate and project schedule. Will DOE please provide the missing information?

Answer: Information considered commercial/proprietary has been redacted from the Life Cycle Baseline (LCB) for Portsmouth and Paducah which results in some “missing” pages. All available information related to the LCB that can be released has been posted on the PPPO Remediation Web Site. Offerors are reminded that the LCB has been posted as a source of information only, and that the work scope associated with the current LCB and the work scope of the PPPO Remediation RFP are different. Offerors are to propose their own approach.