#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
1	B.3 e	ICP Core Hybrid Fee Model, SM-5	B-7	The maximum fee date for the SM-5 milestone was changed to an earlier date (from 5/1/2020 to 3/1/2020) despite the fact that the Contract Effective Date (CED) has been delayed by two months. Due to ground conditions in the storage area, transfers will occur during the late spring and summer months. We recommend the SM-5 dates be changed to allow the summer period of 2020 be available to complete the transfer of the 3,336 bottles of EBRII SNF. We recommend DOE adjust the milestone to align to the delayed CED, i.e., from 5/1/2020 to 7/1/2020), rather than shorten the period of performance by 4 months as currently stated.	The max. fee date, target fee date, and min fee date will be adjusted in a future amendment to the RFP to reflect the following: Max Date: 6/30/2020 Target Date: 12/31/2020 Min Date: 5/31/2021	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
2	B.4 e.i	SM-7 NNPP PPF (RH-TRU Lot 10)	B-15	The Final RFP eliminates a year from the draft RFP schedule but keeps the same schedule fee milestone. This creates significant challenges given the time frames to obtain waste stream approval as reflected in the DOE provided RH-TRU Waste Stream Approval Process. The shipment of NNPP-PPF is assumed to be lower priority than the RH certified backlog and ISA RH waste. It is requested that DOE adjust the SM-7 completion milestone to allow more time to obtain waste stream approvals necessary to start shipments. Additionally, a similar payment approach used for other TRU waste streams is proposed for 80% payment for having certified waste ready to ship and 20% as it is shipped.	1. Additional time will not be allowed to obtain waste stream approvals. 2. The RFP will be amended for a similar payment approach used for other TRU waste milestones, i.e. 80% payment for having certified waste ready to ship and 20% payment as waste is shipped.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
3	C.3.2.01	EM Facility Infrastructure	C-11	Please clarify for cost purposes, if the operation and maintenance of the resin beds should be included in the PWS 3.2.01 INTEC Infrastructure or in PWS C.7.1.01 Spent Nuclear Fuel Management?	Operation and maintenance of the resin beds should be costed in C.7.1.01 Spent Nuclear Fuel Management. Attachment L-8 will be amended to reflect this cost assumption.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
4	C.3.2.03	Upgrade ECS	C-11	Completion of this upgrade project 1 year after CED is unrealistically agressive. We would request DOE revise the project completion date to be 2 years after CED.	The PWS will be modified to reflect a project completion date 2 years from CED.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
5	C.3.3	EM Facility Infrastructure - RSWF	C-12	Will all the equipment identified in the RSWF operating procedure RSWF-OI-001 rev 1 be supplied to the ICP Core Contract as government furnished equipment? If not, should the bidder assume new equipment will need to be acquired? Please put assumption to be used by bidders in Exhibit L-8.	Attachment L-8 will be amended to reflect the following assumptions: - The following equipment is needed to operate the RSWF and will be provided to the Contractor: (2) HFEF-5 Cask Positioning Rings. (1) HFEF-14 Cask Positioning Ring. (2) Remote Drill/Purge Machines. (2) H2SCAN Hydrogen Meters. (6) Cargo Containers with Cathodic Protection System Parts and Tools. (2) Toolboxes with Hand Tools. (2) Sony Handycams. (2) Sony Mini Video Recorders. (59) Steel 26" Shield Plugs. (4) 26" Liners. (34) 26" Unshielded Lids. (22) 16" Liners. (309) 16" Shield Plugs. (20) 16" Unshielded Lids. 26" diameter Boring Head RSWF Trailer #64 - Previous operations at the RSWF have also required the use of a crane and a forklift. The crane and forklift are currently owned by the INL contractor and will not be provided to the Contractor. The Contractor may provide their own crane and forklift if required by their technical approach, or they may make arrangements with the INL contractor to use the INL owned crane and forklift.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
6	C.3.3	EM Facility Infrastructure - RSWF	C-12	Given the hazardous category classification of the RSWF, will the system engineers, maintenance personnel, radiological technicians, facility operators, and facility manager be transferred to the ICP core contractor? If not, can bidders assume these individuals will be available from BEA to support RSWF operations in the first year of the contract as may be requested by the ICP Core Contractor? Trained personnel and operating equipment is required shortly after CED to meet the milestone schedules. Please put assumption for this in Exhibit L-8.	The ICP Core Contractor is responsible to provide trained personnel and equipment necessary to operate the RSWF. Personnel currently supporting RSWF operations will be retained by the INL contractor because they support other ongoing INL operations at MFC. The ICP Core Contractor may certainly acquire whatever services they need from the INL contractor, including the use of specific personnel and equipment, on terms mutually agreeable to both parties and documented in an interface agreement.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
7	C.3.3	EM Facility Infrastructure - RSWF	C-12	Please provide all the personnel training requirements for the operations and maintenance of the RSWF.	Training requirements for RSWF operations are captured in PDD-147 and PDD-162 which have posted to the Documents Library.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
8	C.3.3	EM Facility Infrastructure - RSWF	C-12	The funding profile for the ICP core contract has not been modified to reflect the additional work scope of operating and maintaining the RSWF. Should the bidders assume additional funding will be added to the funding profile to account for the additional scope?	No additional changes are anticipated to the Section L provided funding profile. The RFP states, "The Contractor shall operate and maintain the MFC-771 Radioactive Scrap and Waste Facility (RSWF) at the Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC) to conduct transfers as needed to support the PWS." As the principal operator, the ICP Core Contractor will have priority in planning, scheduling, and authorizing work that must be performed in the facility. The ICP Core Contractor shall negotiate an interface agreement with the INL contractor to best support all work that must occur within the facility.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
9	C.4.1 and C.4.3.03	INTEC Tank Farm Cap Remedial Action Reports	C-12 and C-14	Under C.4.3.03, the ICP Core Contractor is responsible to implement the 3-14 Tank Farm Soil and INTEC Groundwater Remedial Design, Remedial Action Work Plan. This plan identifies development of Pre-Final Inspection Report and Interim Remedial Action Reports for the capping activities at the tank farm. Section C.4.1 indicates that the DOE Construction/D&D Prime Contractor is responsible for construction of the cap. The deliverable for the RARs has been eliminated from Attachment J-2. Please clarify if the ICP Core Contractor is responsible for preparing these documents or if that responsibility belongs to the Construction/D&D Prime Contractor.	C.4.3.03 of the RFP will be amended to clarify the exception to the requirement to implment the RD/RA Work Plan will be that the DOE Construction/D&D contractor will be responsible to complete the Pre-Final Inspection Reports and the Interim Remedial Action Reports for the two phases of the interim Tank Farm cover.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
10	C.5.0	Anticipated Inventories of Consumables		In order to develop an accurate Basis of Estimate, please provide an assumption for the anticipated inventory of various packaging, containers, and PPE at contract effective date: BR-90 boxes Cake Boxes SDOPs (Six Drum Overpacks) SMOPs (Six Metal Pallet Overpacks) BRSOPs (Box Retrieval Soft Overpacks) SWBs (Standard Waste Boxes) TDOPs (Ten Drum Overpacks) 55 Gallon drums, lids and rings Drum Filters 83/85 Gallon Drums (new and re-usable), lids and rings Compaction Drums (Silvers) 100 Gallon Product Drums Macroencapsulation Containers Macroencapsulation Bags 55 Gallon Drum Slip Sheets Product Drum Slip Sheets Soil Sacks Shredder Boxes Any other misc. packages/containers PAPRs (Personal Air Purifying Respirators) Level B Suits Removable lid canisters 30-gallon drums 55 and 30-gallon lift bags	The ICP Core Contractor shall assume for cost proposal purposes that there is no available inventory of consumable materials (e.g. various packaging, containers, PPE, etc.) to be carried over from the incumbent contractors. The RFP will be amended to reflect this assumption in Attachment L-8.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
11	C.5.1.04	CH-TRU Characterization and Certification	C-21	Please clarify if Flammable Gas Analysis (FGA) services will be performed by CCP or transitioned to the new ICP Core Contractor. Will future FGA for transportation be a DOE provided service or does the Contractor need to assume they will pay these costs? Please add an appropriate assumption to Exhibit L-8 to address this question.	The PWS will be amended at Sections C.5.1.04 CH-TRU Characterization and Certification and C.5.1.07 CH-TRU Packaging and Transportation to clarify the CCP Contractor responsibilites.	Q&A Post #3 (4/16/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
12	C.5.1.04	CH-TRU Characterization and Certification	C-21	It is recommended the requirement for maintaining and operating the TRU Analytical Chemistry Laboratory be removed from this section as it duplicates the requirement in C.5.3.02 RH TRU Characterization and Certification.	The PWS will be amended to remove the requirement for maintaining and operating the TRU Analytical Chemistry Laboratory from C.5.1.04.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
13	C.5.1.07	CH-TRU Packaging and Transportation	C-22	Please provide a copy of the CCP Certified Packaging and Transport program referenced in the first paragraph of this section.	The PWS will be amended as follows: *"The Contractor shall utilize the services of the DOE CBFO CCP contractor to oversee the development of the CH-TRU waste assembly and certification of payloads and shipments in accordance with the DOE CBFO TRU Waste Transportation Plan (DOE/CBFO 98-3103 Rev 3, effective date 10/2012)."*	Q&A Post #3 (4/16/15)
14	C.5.3	RH-TRU Waste Disposition RH-TRU (Lots 1-9)	C-23	Exhibit C-9 does not reflect the status of the Lot 1-9 inventory at the CED. SM-3 provides only 3 months of processing time for maximum fee after the CED, therefore the assumed quantity of waste to be processed in that time frame is needed for estimating. Please provide bidders with an assumption in Exhibit L-8 concerning the RH-TRU Lots 1-9 inventory remaining to be processed as of June 1, 2016.	Exhibit C-9 will be amended to add the expected inventory on 6/1/2016.	Q&A Post #4 (4/22/15)
15	C.5.3.01	RH-TRU Retrieval	C-23	Please clarify if building CPP-659 should be considered available to support RH treatment throughout the contract duration as reflected in Section C.5.3.03. Please place assumption in Exhibit L-8.	An assumption is not needed in L-8 stating that the facility is available to support RH treatment throughout the contract period because the language in C.5.3.03 already states *"Existing treatment processes include but are not limited to: repackaging, size reduction, removal of WIPP prohibited waste characteristics (e.g. Sodium), and opening and sorting waste in order to address prohibited conditions that prevent disposal of the subject waste. These processes are currently performed in CPP-666 and CPP-659 at INTEC. All of these processes are available for the Contractor to use as appropriate."* The facilities are understood to be available to the Contractor and the technical approach will determine where treatment will occur.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
16	C.5.4.01	NNPP RH-TRU Retrieval	C-27	This work scope section appears to combine activities that should be performed under Retrieval (e.g., CPP-666 Fuel Storage Pool activities) with those that should be performed under Treatment (e.g., CPP-666 FDP hot cell activities). Hot cell cleaning and decontamination from sodium waste processing does not seem reasonable to charge to the NNPP. Please clarify the workscope intended to be performed in the retrieval PWS to support estimating and costing development.	The PWS is correct as is. The NNPP scope of work includes the hot cell cleaning from sodium waste processing.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
17	C.5.5.01 and Exhibit C-26	Waste Generator Services; Idaho Settlement Agreement U-233 Waste	C-28	The Contractor is required to include management and disposition of Exhibit C-26, *Idaho Settlement Agreement U-233 Waste* as part of Waste Generator Services. Since this is Idaho Settlement Agreement waste, it must be profiled and shipped to an appropriate disposal facility by 12/31/2018. Exhibit C-26 only includes a general waste description, WTS barcode, and container size. This information is insufficient to determine the appropriate disposition path and to determine if any additional treatment and/or characterization is required. Since U-233 is Special Nuclear Material, the gram quantities of U-233 in each container is required to determine disposition path and whether Type B quantities are present requiring cask shipments. Please supply the following information per drum: -The grams of U-233 in each container -The type and concentration of each radionuclide sufficient to determine if the waste is Class A, B or C - A more thorough description of the waste - Contact and 30 cm dose rate - Container weight - Identification if RTR or VE data exist - Identification if the container is DOT compliant for the waste type and class - Identification of any RCRA hazardous waste codes assigned. If information is unavailable, please provide assumptions in Exhibit L-8 bidders should use in developing a path forward and cost for waste packaging, transport and disposal.	More details from the Integrated Waste Tracking System Material Profile for U-233 will be posted to the ICP Core Documents Library which will provided additional available information.	Q&A Post #3 (4/16/15)
18	C.6.1	IWTU Operations and Turnover	C-31	Please define "loss of suction" for processing the SBW in the INTEC tanks. Is it when suction is lost on the existing steam jets or when suction is lost on the new steam jets to be installed consistent with the tank closure plan, RCRA Closure Plan DOE/ID-11273, Rev 4?	Loss of suction is defined as when suction is lost on the existing steam jets currently installed in the tanks—NOT on the "new" steam jets that will be installed as part of the RCRA closure. The PWS will modified to clarify this definition.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
19	C.6.3	Liquid Waste Facility Closure	C-32	In the first paragraph of the RFP Section C.6.3 Liquid Waste Facility Closure, it is stated in part, *Tanks WM-187, WM-188, WM-189, and WM-190; including the tank vaults, cooling coils, valve boxes, and ancillary piping) of the INTEC Tank Farm Facility in accordance with the RCRA Closure Plan* (DOE/ID-11273, Revision 4) or "current version." It is recommended, for bidding purposes, that DOE clarify (by adding an assumption to Exhibit L-8), that Revision 4 of this document should be used. (The bidder can not know what a future document revision may entail at the time of proposal preparation.)	Attachment L-8 will be modified to specify Rev 4.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
20	C.7.1.01	SNF Management	C-34	RFP states, "Fuel must be dried at the CPP-603 Drying Station before being placed in dry storage." The RFP affords the contractor the option to utilize available storage space in CPP-603, CPP-749, or CPP-2707 (C.7.1.05), we recommend the contractor be given latitude for the location of drying fuel, if logistically and economically justified. Please provide a clarification, in Exhibit L-8. Recommended language: "The placement and location of equipment to support fuel storage operations is at the discretion of the contractor with DOE concurrence."	PWS Section C.7.1.01 will be amended to clarify that placement and location of equipment to support fuel storage operations is at the discretion of the contractor with DOE concurrence.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
21	C.7.1.03	EBR-II SNF	C-35	The RFP states, "The Safety Basis for the RSWF currently precludes storing bottles of spent EBR-II driver fuel in the RSWF because of concerns over hydrogen generation." Review of the RSWF SAR, (which was added to the ICP Core Documents Library in February), indicates the hydrogen explosion event has been analyzed. Section 3.3.2.3.1.6 of the SAR states, " *The evaluation also concluded that damage to the HFEF-5 double can container from such pressures would be insufficient to result in the release of radioactive material* ". The RFP requirement seems to contradict the documented safety analysis. In light of the SAR, please clarify if the bidder can assume EBRII fuel can be containerized and stored in RSWF.	See RSWF operating procedure "RSWF-OI-003, Material Acceptance for Storage," which has been posted to Documents Library, that currently precludes storing containers with free liquids at the RSWF. The Offeror shall assume EBRII fuel can be containerized and stored in RSWF if it meets the requirements within the RSWF-OI-003, Material Acceptance for Storage procedure. PWS Section C.7.1.03 will be amended to eliminate the contradiciton.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
22	C.7.3	NNPP	C-37	The RFP states "The Contractor shall perform required maintenance in CPP-666 from GFY 2017 through GFY 2020. " Please clarify if the period for maintenance performance is less than the contract term. For costing and staffing purposes, please clarify which entity will be responsible for CPP-666 maintenance in GFY 2016 and GFY 2021.	The period for maintenance performance is not less than the contract term, but the funding will come from both DOE and NNPP in accordance with the Section L funding profile. For costing and staffing purposes, the Contractor shall be responsible for CPP-666 maintenance in GFY 2016 and GFY 2021 and the costs for the maintenance activities shall be priced accordingly under CLINs 00001 and 00002. The PWS and Attachment L-8 Cost Assumptions will be amended to further clarify how the maintenance activities for the FDP hot cell and fuel basin portions of CPP-666 will be apportioned. C.5.3 = maintenance of the FDP cell portion of CPP-666 for GFY 2016, GFY 2017 and GFY 2021 C.5.4 = maintenance of the FDP cell portion of CPP-666 for GFY 2018 - GFY 2020 C.7.1.01 = maintenance of the fuel basin portion of CPP-666 will depend on tech. approach (entire portion except as it funded by the NNPP) C.7.3 = maintenance of the fuel basin portion of CPP-666 for GFY 2016 - GFY 2018.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
23	C.7.3	NNPP	C-37	C.7.3 states that the Contractor shall receive approximately 13 Large Cell Casks from NRF in GFY 2016 to load and return the casks back to NRF. With only 4 months remaining in the GFY at the contract effective date, please provide an assumption for the number of casks and shipments the contractor will be responsible for processing in GFY2016, assuming a CED of June 1, 2016. This information is necessary such that a cost basis can be established. Please add assumption to Exhibit L-8.	Six LCCs are scheduled to be shipped during the time period of June 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016. The PWS C.7.3 will be amended to clarify this information.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
24	Exhibit C-8	Inventory of CH-TRU Waste	N/A	Tab "Processing Required," container 10380227 is listed as a 99,999 gallon custom over pack under IDC UN00B (Undefined Debris) with a gross weight of 7,447 lbs. Please provide more information (size, shape, configuration, handling) for this item and it's contents, as the volume appears to be unusually large.	The container volume for IDC UN00B was listed as 99,999 to flag it as a custom over pack. The custom over pack dimensions are 94" x 72.5" x 71", roughly 8' x 6' x 6'. The gross weight is 7447 lbs. The inner box, 10075537, has a weight of 6878 lbs. A previous repair to the inner box had failed and a custom over pack was required. From the RTR, the original box is plywood that has been re-packed due to previous damage. It appears from the RTR, there is dense material (possibly soil) in the middle of the inner box. There is dense material that has been placed on top of debris waste, packing the debris waste at the bottom of the inner box, with loose debris material added on top of the dense material.	Q&A Post #3 (4/16/15)
25	L.3	Question on Solicitation	L-4	The Cover Letter states April 7, 2015 is the last day to submit questions and L.3 states March 27, 2015. Considering the site visit is March 31 and April 1, 2015, we recommend DOE modify L.3 to reflect the April 7, 2015 date in the Cover Letter, be the last day for questions.	The RFP was amended to reflect April 7, 2015 as the due date for questions. See amendment #1.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
26	L.5(g)	Page Description	L-7	RFP states, *"Printing is to be double-sided."* Does DOE require 11x17 fold-out pages (e.g., Attachment L-7) printed double-side? We suggest exempting 11x17 pages from double sided printing to facilitate production and ease of reading or eliminating double-sided printing all together.	The RFP will be amended to exempt 11x17 pages from double sided printing.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
27	L.7(b)(2)	Factor 2: Technical and Management Approach	L-18	The first full paragraph on page L-18 states "The Offeror's technical approach description for the CH-TRU (C.5.1 and C.5.2), RH-TRU (C.5.3 and C.5.4), and CH M/LLW (C.5.5) waste programs shall include an accompanying waste process flow diagram(s) for the waste program identifying each step from retrieval/exhumation through disposal for the waste inventory identified in the following Section C Exhibits: C-8 through C-12; and C-14 through C-16, including waste anticipated to be generated during the contract period. For each waste program, the flow diagram shall detail the specific steps for how waste will be retrieved (both intact and breached boxes/drums), characterized, repackaged, processed, sorted and/or reduced (due to void space) to allow a full understanding of the Offeror's approach to meeting the WAC for disposition of each waste type." Please clarify if Exhibit C-26 should be added to the flow diagram for CH M/LLW (C.5.5) .	Yes, the waste inventory from Exhibit C-26 (U-233 Waste Located In Storage at INTEC) should be included in the waste process flow diagram(s). The RFP will be amended to include Exhibit C-26 in the Section L instructions language.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
28	L-8, 5.1.05	CH-TRU Treatment	Page 2	The first bullet states "Assume that treating debris waste in the treatment facility results in a volume reduction of 33%". Please clarify if this volume reduction number of 33% is to be used for bidding assumption <u>only</u>. Historically, it is our understanding that volume reductions of debris waste ranges from 65%-75%. Please clarify and adjust volume assumption as appropriate.	Attachment L-8 will be amended to reflect: "Assume that treating debris waste in the treatment facility results in a volume reduction to 33% of the original volume."	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
29	L-8, 5.5.03	Legacy Excess Radioactive/Hazardous Materials (Priced Option)	Page 4	The RFP states, the contractor is to "Assume option is exercised by 9/30/2019 and completed by 3/30/2021, " that .. some items are packaged in otherwise non-DOT shippable containers" and "Assume that there is no facility at MFC to perform repackaging." It is requested that DOE exercise this option not <u>later than 9/30/18</u> and extend the period of performance to the end of the contract in order to provide sufficient time to complete this PWS scope in light of the need to move to new treatment facilities, train personnel, secure equipment, develop SARs, and treat and package the waste.	Attachment L-8 will be amended for Offerors to assume that the option is exercised by 9/30/2018 and must be completed by the end of the contract period.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
30	L-8, 7.3	Cost assumptions	5	Assumption in Exhibit L-8 states: "Given the Contractor shall assume all options are exercised for purposes of the technical and cost proposal, the Contractor shall assume the Navy will therefore utilize the full capacity of CPP-666 for the 102 can repackaging effort in GFY 2018, 2019 and 2020, including the maintenance of the facilities." Clarification of this L-8 assumption is requested as several interpretations are possible: If the full capacity of CPP-666 is required for the 102 can repackaging, are other operations, such as SNF transfers of ATR and EBRII, precluded? Will the Navy assume the CPP-666 M&O function during this period? Will the Navy be responsible for the CPP-666 maintenance, either as the performing organization or as the source of funding? The period of performance is different than what is specified in Section C.7.3, which states that the ICP contractor is responsible for CPP-666 maintenance from GFY 2017 through GFY 2020. Please provide the assumptions to be made by bidders in Exhibit L-8 on this question.	Attachment L-8 was amended to move the assumption from C.7.3 to C.5.4. Also, see response to question #22.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
31	Section 5.3.05 Attachment L-8	RH-TRU Packaging and Transportation	3 of 7	Please clarify, Section 5.0 indicates two RH shipments a week will be available starting FY-2017 versus " a minimum of 1 shipment" as indicated in L-8. Which is the correct assumption to use for developing schedule and cost data?	For proposal preparation purposes two shipments per week is the correct assumption; Attachment L-8 will be amended to clarify.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
32	Section L, Attachment L-3	Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form	L-44	Item #21 states "Identify previous contracts (for the company identified in #2) where penalties were paid…" Given this requirement, should bidders identify penalties for contracts other than the project being submitted? If yes, the response would be the same for all projects submitted for a company. We suggest that DOE modify the language to only identify where penalties occurred on the specified past performance project, a separate listing of penalties for a company can be appended as DOE may request to secure requested information.	Potential Offerors should identify penalties for any previous contracts (for the company identified in #2), this may include both the contract/project being submitted and/or other contract/projects besides the contract/project being submitted. The RFP will be amended to increase the page limitation from 5 to 7 pages for Att. L-3 Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
33	Section L, Attachment L-3	Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form	L-44	Item #22 states: "Safety statistics: provide Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) and Total Recordable Case (TRC) rates and hours worked for the Entity (identified in #4) on the referenced contract by government fiscal year (FY) for FY 2010-2014. Also, provide DART and TRC rates and hours worked for the Entity (identified in #4) on a corporate basis by government FY for FY 2010-2014; statistics should be provided to the contracts referenced and not on an overall company basis." It is unclear what is being requested "on a corporate basis" when the last sentence states the statistic is to be provided for the "contract referenced and not on an overall company basis." If the request is for the contract referenced, Offerors would be providing the same information being asked for in the first part of Item #22. If it is on a corporate basis, it will be the same for all projects. Please clarify how DOE would like this data provided.	The RFP will be amended to delete the last sentence from item #22 on the Attachment L- 3 Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form as follows: "Safety statistics: provide Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) and Total Recordable Case (TRC) rates and hours worked for the Entity (identified in #4) on the referenced contract by government fiscal year (FY) for FY 2010-2014. ~~Also, provide DART and TRC rates and hours worked for the Entity (identified in #4) on a corporate basis by government FY for FY 2010-2014; statistics should be provided to the contracts referenced and not on an overall company basis.~~"	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
34	Not Specified	Unexploded Ordinance at Operable Unit 10-04		Neither Sections C nor L of the RFP specify cleanup of the unexploded ordinance at Operable Unit 10-04 as part of the ICP Core contract scope. Volume 5, page 134 of the DOE Congressional Budget Submittal for FY16 included "Implement the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Record of Decision for Waste Area Group 10 (Operable unit 10-04) unexploded ordinance" as part of a line item funding request for the Idaho site. Is the unexploded ordinance cleanup at OU 10-04 included in the ICP Core Contract scope?	Unexploded ordnance cleanup under Operable Unit (OU) 10-04, Phase IV, was completed early and documented in the final REMEDIAL ACTION REPORT FOR OPERABLE UNITS 6-05 AND 10-04, PHASE IV, which was posted to the CERCLA Administrative Record file (https://ar.inl.gov) on 01 August 2014. The document number is DOE/ID-11498. Phase IV was the final remedial action under the OUs 6-05 and 10-04 Record of Decision, and this report documents completion of the selected remedies (Phase I through IV) and transfers responsibility for managing, implementing, and reporting institutional controls, including for Unexploded Ordnance to the Idaho National Laboratory Institutional Controls/Operations and Management Plan and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act 5-year reviews. Implementation of the Site-Wide Institutional Controls, and Operations and Maintenance (IC & O&M) Plan (DOE/ID-11042) as well as the next five-year review are addressed in Section C.4.3.05, WAG 10 Balance of Site Remediation.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
35	Exhibit C-4	Title of Document	Exhibit C-4	Exhibit C-4 has the header and title labeled as C-5. Please verify that we have the correct C-4 exhibit.	Exhbit C-4 header will be updated to reflect Exhibit C-4 instead of C-5.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
36	Section C.4.3.05 and Section J, Attachment J-2	CERCLA 5 year review date	C p. 16 and Att. J-2 p. 3	Section C.4.3.05 lists the date for the 2020 CERCLA 5-year review as August 15, 2020 and Attachment J-2 list the date as July 16, 2020. Please clarify the date.	The RFP is correct as is. The deliverable in Attachment J-2 is to allow a 30-day period for DOE to review the draft document, in accordance with Section H.36(c)(2), and for any DOE comments to be resolved and the draft 5-year Review document to be revised and submitted to regulatory agencies by August 15, 2020 per Section C.4.3.05.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
37	Section J, Attachment J-2	Items 15 and 23	Att. J-2 p. 4 and 6	Items 15 and 23 on Attachment J-2 appear to reference the same deliverable. Please clarify.	The RFP will be amended to delete Item #15 on the deliverables list and update the title of Item #23 (now #22 since #15 is deleted) to reflect "Depleted Uranium Pucks Waste Disposal Path and Cost and schedule Estimate"	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
38	Section L.8 (g)	Proposed Target Fee	L.8 p. 24	Section L.8 (g) states that the Offerero shall propose up to a ten percent (7%) target fee. Please clarify the percentage.	L.8(g) will be changed to state target fee is 7% in a formal amendment to the RFP.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
39	Attachment L-7 Consolidated Direct Cost Schedules and Section C (C.5.5.02 and C.5.5.04)	Performance Work Statements	C29 - C30	It was noted that two PWS's were not included on the L-7 forms, C.5.5.02 and C.5.5.04. Will DOE revised these forms to include these PWSs or should the bidder modify the forms to add them?	For proposal preparation purposes, DOE does not anticipate any costs in the two PWS'; therefore, no cost worksheets are provided.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
40	Section L.5 and Section L.8	Definition of "Major or Critical Subcontractor".	L-5 and L26-27	In L.5 Proposal Preparation Instructions - General Information, in L.5.c it states "Definitions: For CLINs 00001-00005, the term major or critical subcontractor as used in this Section L is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is anticipated to perform work with a value of $100 million or more over the contract period". In L.8.(i)(1.) Offeror Proposed Cost - Joint Venture or Subcontractors over $50 million - The Offeror's cost proposal shall ... and require the Joint Venture Partners and Subcontractors over $50M to provide the detail requied in L.8(i)(ii) throught (x). Is the value of the subcontractor that is required to present a separate cost volume the $50 million as identied in L.8 or the $100 million as identified in L.5?	$50 million as identified in L.8.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
41	Section C.6.3 and B.3 (f) (iv)	Document Request		The following document is referenced in the RFP, but we have been unable to locate it in the Document Library: RCRA Closure Plan (DOE/ID-11273, Revision 4 or current version, "Idaho Hazardous Waste Management Act/Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Closure Plan for Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Tanks WM-187, WM-188, WM-189, and WM-190, and all Remaining Tank Farm Facility Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Piping", October 2012). Could you provide the document?	Requested document has been posted to the Documents Library.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
42	Section C.5.0	Assumed number of RH-TRU shipments that can be made to WIPP per week	C.5.0 p.C-19	In section C, Performance Scope of Work, For CH-TRU shipping, C-5.0, page C-19, 1st paragraph states that RH-TRU shipments is 2 per week however L-8 assumption for 5.3.05 state that there is minimum of one shipment per week for RH-TRU. What should be assumed for the number of shipments of RH-TRU that can be made to WIPP per week?	See response to question #31.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
43	Section C.5.8	ARP IX Design support needed in GFY2017	C.5.8 p. C-31	In section C, Performance Scope of Work, for C5.8, page C-31, states that ARP IX is anticipated to be turned over by October 1, 2017 however assumption for C.5.8 states design support occurs in GFY 2017. GFY 2017 runs from October 1, 2017 to March 31, 2018. Why is design support needed in GFY2017 if the ARP IX facility construction is completed on October 1, 2017?	GFY 2017 begins on October 1, 2016, and runs thorugh September 30, 2017. October 1, 2017, is the first day of GFY 2018. The RFP is correct as is.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
44	Section C, Exhibit 9	Will LANL-OSRP take lot 9b and if so by 12/31/18	Section C, Exhibit 9	Section C Exhibit 9, ISA and Non-ISA Inventory of RH-TRU Waste (Lot 1-9), tab Tier I Status indicates that lot 9 b will be dispositioned to LANL-OSRP. Section C requires Lots 1-9 to be shipped out of Idaho by December 31, 2018. Can you please confirm if LANL-OSRP will take lot 9b and if so by 12/31/18?	Per Exhibit C-9 to the PWS, LANL-OSRP is the assumed disposal path for Lot 9B by 12/31/2018.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
45	B.4.(e).i	SM7-NNPP PPF (RH-TRU)	B-15	The final RFP moved funding for the SM-7 milestone by 1 year. However the completion milestone did not change proportionately. This creates challenges for meeting the milestone since the contractor will be required to attain waste stream approval pursuant to DOE provided RH-TRU Waste Stream Approval Process. In addition, the shipment of the NNPP-PPF waste is assumed to be of a lower priority than the RH certified backlog and ISA RH waste. Accordingly, it makes the attainment of the milestone set forth in the RFP very difficult. It is recommended that DOE consider the following: 1. Adjust the SM-7 milestone to achieve minimum fee on the last day of the contract, (Note: Provides maximum time for shipping) 2. Add a fee approach similar to the other TRU waste milestones, (e.g. 80% fee payment for having the waste ready for shipment and 20% as it is shipped)	1. The milestone date will not be changed. 2. The RFP will be amended for a similar payment approach used for other TRU waste milestones, i.e. 80% payment for having certified waste ready to ship and 20% payment as waste is shipped.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
46	C.5.3.07	RH Waste LOT 11 Option Work	C-26	C.5.3.07 RH Waste LOT 11 Option Work (PRICED OPTION) in Section C there is no lower PWS level. In the L-6 spreadsheet there are multiple PWS's at the lower level. Please advise which one is correct.	PWS C.5.3.07 RH Lot 11 Option Work, states the contractor shall operate the RH Waste program in accordance with PWS C.5.3.01 through C.5.3.05. L-6 Cost Worksheets provide the Offeror worksheets corresponding with the activities to operate the RH Waste program similar to PWS C.5.3.01 through PWS C.5.3.05	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
47	C.5.3.8	RH Waste LOT 12 Option Work	C-26	C.5.3.08 RH Waste LOT 12 Option Work (PRICED OPTION) in Section C there is no lower PWS level. In the L-6 spreadsheet there are multiple PWS's at the lower level. Please advise which one is correct.	PWS C.5.3.08 RH Lot 12 Option Work, states the contractor shall operate the RH Waste program in accordance with PWS C.5.3.01 through C.5.3.05. L-6 Cost Worksheets provide the Offeror worksheets corresponding with the activities to operate the RH Waste program similar to PWS C.5.3.01 through PWS C.5.3.05	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
48	C.5.5.02	Special Requirements Wastes	C-30	C.5.5.02 Special Requirements Wastes is a scope of work identified in Section C but not identified in L-6. Do you want the bidder to show the lower level of detail in L-6? Should the bidder add a tab to C.5.5.02 in the L-6 report?	Under the L-8 Cost Assumptions, DOE provided the following assumptions: Assume no treatment or shipment of special requirements work is included in this PWS. There is no additional inventory for special requirement work. No cost worksheet is provided since for proposal preparation purposes no effort will be expended in this area.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
49	C.5.5.03	Legacy Excess Radioactive/Hazardous Materials	C-30	C.5.5.03 Legacy Excess Radioactive/Hazardous Materials (PRICED OPTION) in Section C there is no lower PWS level. In the L-6 spreadsheet there are multiple PWS's at the lower level. Please advise which one is correct.	L-6 Cost worksheets are provided in order for the Offerors to provide information broken into the stated work activities contained within the PWS (effectively providing information at one level lower than the PWS): Processing and disposing of this waste includes Retrieval, Characterization and Certification, Treatment, Storage and Movement, and Packaging and Transportation.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
50	C.8	Program Management Support Functions	C-37	In C.8.0 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT FUNCTIONS the lower level PWSs C.8.1, C.8.2 and C.8.3 are identified in Section C but are not identified as tabs on the L-6 form. Do you want the bidder to add the 24 additional tabs in the L-6 report?	No. DOE is only requiring the Offerors to propose at a rolled up PWS level C.8.1, C.8.2 and C.8.3. The lower levels are for PWS organization and are not intended to imply that cost estimates are to be provided at the lower level.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
51	L.8 (i)(vi)	Offeror Proposed Cost Escalation	L-28	Page L-7 States: "However, the proposed labor rates shall not be less than the DOE provided direct labor rates included within Attachment L-7 of this solicitation. The provided direct labor rates reflect paid rates at similar sites with similar work scope, as well as, the Wage Rate Requirements (Construction) (formerly known as the Davis-Bacon Act) and Service Contract Labor Standards (formerly known as the Service Contract Act) rates escalated to June 1, 2016." L-7 Spreadsheet States: "DOE Provided Labor Rates (Escalated to GFY 2016)" which would presumably be October 1, 2015. Which date is correct? Should the bidders apply 2.8% escalation beginning FY17 on October 1, 2016?	A change in the wording under cost instructions under L.8(i)(vi) will be made in the next amendment. The change will replace "June 1, 2016" with "GYF16 (October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016). Therefore, the Offerors application of esclation related to labor rates will start on October 1, 2016.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
52	L-6 Spreadsheet	Rollup	C-5	PWS C.1 has no defined scope of work yet it is identified in the L-6 spreadsheet. Do you want the bidder to treat C.1 in the spreadsheet as a rollup of all the identified PWSs?	Yes	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
53	L-6 Spreadsheet	Summary PWS		For Summary PWS levels that have an assigned scope of work (instead of just being a summary), is it acceptable to add .00 to the PWS numbering system? This has been the practice on past proposals and allows the collection of cost, schedule and scope for that PWS and still have a summary at that PWS.	There is no need to add .00 to the PWS numbering system since there are NO PWS levels that have an assigned scope of work (instead of being a summary) within the PWS.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
54	L-7 Spreadsheet	Taxes		Based on the L-7 spreadsheet, it appears that state and local taxes are requested by PWS and unit of measure for non-labor resources that are taxable. This differs significantly from previous proposals where total state and local taxes by fiscal year were a single line item. Is the intent to break out taxes by state and local taxes as described above by PWS and resource item?	It is acceptable to total state and local taxes at a PWS level and not by the unit of measure for non-labor resource. The provided BOEs shall contain the rationale and the computations of how state and local taxes were computed.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
55	H.22	Indirect Rate Ceiling	H-57	The note under H.22 "Indirect Rate Ceiling" calls out Section L.8 (h)(ix) instructions regarding indirect rates, but there is no such section in that location. It is actually referring to L.8 (i)(ix). Will DOE revise this callout?	Yes, Section H will be revised in a future amendment to the RFP to reflect L.8 (i)(ix).	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
56	C.7.1.01	Spent Nuclear Fuel Management	C-33	The first paragraph of this section discusses surveillance and monitoring of SNF at INTEC with no mention of the fuel listed in Exhibit C-18 (page 6, item 2 under NRC Licensed Facilities) at Fort St. Vrain in Colorado. RFP Section C.3.2.01 on page C-11 states, "The Contractor shall provide material and storage control for TMI-2 and Fort St. Vrain (FSV) spare parts that are currently located in Idaho." No other mention of FSV appears in the RFP. In previous site visits, DOE implied that the FSV SNF workscope would be included in the new ICP CORE contract. Is the surveillance and monitoring of the FSV fuel at FSV in Colorado included in the ICP work scope, or not?	No, the surveillance and monitoring of the FSV fuel at FSV in Colorado is not included in the ICP work scope. There is a separate procurement for the NRC Licensed Facilities.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
57	C.7.1.01	Spent Nuclear Fuel Management	C-34	In the fourth paragraph, CPP-749 is referred to as the Underground Fuel Storage Facility. On page 5 of Exhibit C-18, SNF Inventory and Plot Plans, a comment states that the underground storage facility name was changed to Outside Storage Facility. Other documents refer to CPP-749 as the Peach Bottom Storage Facility. What is the official name that we should reference regarding CPP-749?	CPP-749 is now considered to be the underground portion of the Outdoor Fuel Storage Facility.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15)
58	Exhibit C-23 (OUO)	MOU for NSNF Transfer and Disposition	7	This page provides a list of attachments, including Attachment 2, List of All Hardware to be Used and Assignment of Responsibility for Design, Provisioning, and Disposition. Will this attachment and/or all others be made available to contractors to facilitate development of technical approaches and cost estimates?	The Offerors shall assume for proposal preparation purposes that all necessary hardware will be provided as Government Furnished Equipment in order to perform the associated scope of work. Attachment L-8 will be amended to reflect this assumption.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
59	C.4.3.05, C.8.3.02, and C.8.3.03	Request for Clarification	C-15, 49, and 50	Please provide clarification for the redundant scope specifications indicated by underlined text: **C.4.3.05 WAG 10 Balance of Site Remediation** states: " The Contractor *shall prepare and submit to DOE the monthly report required by the FFA/CO Section 17.1 by the 15th day of each month* ." This section goes on to state:, "The Contractor shall *maintain all CERCLA records and maintain the environmental databases for all WAGs* . This includes, but is not limited to, the Institutional Control (IC) database; the Geographical Information System; the CERCLA Action Tracking System; the *Environmental Data Warehouse (EDW);* and *the Administrative Record and Information Repository* ." **C.8.3.02 Regulatory Interaction and Environmental Services** states: "The Contractor shall operate and maintain……the Environmental Data Warehouse, the Geographic Information System, and the CERCLA Administrative Record/Information Repository website." **C.8.3.03 Permits and Compliance Documents** states: "The Contractor shall be the lead on site-wide issues related to RCRA and the Idaho Hazardous Waste Management Act (HWMA) and implementing regulation; Federal Facilities Compliance Act (FFCA) Site Treatment Plan; and CERCLA under the FFA/CO. For those compliance areas, the Contractor shall complete and submit (after appropriate coordination with all involved Idaho Site entities) site-wide level regulatory reports, site-wide consent order and agreement tracking and closure information, and site-wide permit applications (including permitting operations for facilities included in the Site Treatment Plan). The Contractor shall maintain the CERCLA Administrative Record and Information Repository, and all CERCLA databases, including the site-wide environmental data warehouse, etc."	Sections C.8.3.02 and C.8.3.03 will be amended to remove requirement redundancies with other sections of the PWS.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
60	B.17(g)	Provisional Payment of Fee	B-25	In the discussion of the Contractor not meeting the requirements to retain provisionally paid fee, it mentions the Government may deduct "amounts it would otherwise authorize the Contractor to draw down under a Letter of Credit." This is the only place a Letter of Credit is used in the RFP as it relates to Contractor draw down. We could not find instructions for invoicing of costs under the contract. Can you confirm a government Letter of Credit is available to the Contractor for use for allowable costs on the contract and invoicing would only be for fee purposes?	Under the ICP Core contract the Contractor will not be authorized to utilize a letter of credit for allowable costs since the ICP Core contract is not set up as a M&O type contract.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
61	C.6.3	Liquid Waste Facility Closure	C-32	Liquid Waste Facility Closure sections for PEWE, LET&D, and NWCF closures reference two draft HWMA/RCRA Closure Plans (draft DOE/ID-11460, draft DOE/ID-11477). Both plans include descriptions of associated CERCLA removal actions (facility D&D) in addition to the closure of vessels, ancillary lines, and secondary containments. Is it the intent that the associated CERCLA D&D actions (complete facility removal) be included in the scope of work to be performed to satisfy this section of the RFP?	~~No. As stated in C.6.3 the only demolition that will be necessary is what is required to certify completion of RCRA closure.~~ Revised DOE Answer, Q&A Posting #2: Not necessarily. The intent is for the Contractor to RCRA close as many of the RCRA permitted units as possible without impacting other projects that may be using the buildings, such as RH-TRU operations in the NWCF. The two draft closure plans are provided for information. If the Contractor's technical approach is different than that specified in the draft RCRA Closure Plans, the Contractor may modify the Plans to accomodate their approach, obtain approval from the Idaho DEQ, and then implement their Plan. DOE recognizes that partial or complete building demolition may be necessary for the Contractor to implement their technical approach.	Q&A Post #1 (4/7/15); REVISED Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
62	C.3.2.02	Updgrade of the Emergency Communication System	C-11	Is a project plan or design specification available to provide details of the emergency communication system upgrades (e.g., extent of inadequate speaker coverage, reliability requirements, safety classification)?	Preliminary design drawings for the Emergency Communication System upgrade have been posted in the Documents Library. The drawings are for information only and the contractor is not obligated to follow the technical approach suggested by the drawings.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
63	Section C.7.3	Naval fuels shipment expectations for FY 2016	C-37	The RFP states that "The Contractor shall receive Large Cell Casks from NRF on the INL Site and load and ship the casks back to NRF (approximately 13 shipments in Government Fiscal Year 2016…)". Please clarify whether this means the full fiscal year 2016 or just the months once the contract begins.	See response to question # 23.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
64	Section L, Attachment L-8, PWS 4.1 reference, and Section J, Attachment J-2	Inclusion of the INTEC Tank Farm Remedial Action Report in the ICP Core contract scope	Attachment L-8, page 1	RFP Section J, Attachment J-2 does not include the INTEC Tank Farm Remedial Action Report as a required deliverable; however, RFP Section L, Attachment L-8 under PWS 4.1 references "developing/submitting remedial action reports". Please clarify if the preparation and submittal of the INTEC Tank Farm Remedial Action Report is included in the ICP Core contract scope or if it will be the responsibility of the D&D/construction contractor? Further, if required, please clarify the number of draft and final reports required?	C.4.3.03 of the RFP will be amended to clarify the exception to the requirement to implment the RD/RA Work Plan will be that the DOE Construction/D&D contractor will be responsible to complete the two Pre-Final Inspection Reports and the two Interim Remedial Action Reports for the two phases of the interim Tank Farm cover (low-permeability barrier).	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
65	Section C.4.3.06	Additional information requested for C.4.3.06 Additional Groundwater Monitoring Wells CFA Landfill (PRICED OPTION)	C-17	• Please identify the three monitoring wells to be abandoned under the ICP Core contract and provide the well construction details (e.g., logs) showing the well depth, casing, grout intervals, screen intervals, downhole equipment, and surface completion • Please provide monitoring well design specifications (i.e., borehole dimensions, casing size and type, depth, grout, screen interval and construction, downhole and surface completion, and material specifications) and regulatory framework/requirements?	Attachment L-8, in reference to C.4.3.06, will be amended to state; "Assume that all three wells to be constructed and all three wells to be abandoned are consistent with the Well Completion Diagrams included in the Reference Library for CFA wells, that the wells shall be abondoned consistent state of Idaho regulations for well abandonment, and that the new wells will be constructed under CERCLA."	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
66	Section C.4.3.07	Addition information requested for C.4.3.07 Additional Groundwater Monitoring Wells – TAN Groundwater Remediation (PRICED OPTION)	C-17	Please provide monitoring well design specifications (i.e., borehole dimensions, casing size and type, depth, grout, screen interval and construction, downhole and surface completion, and material specifications) and regulatory framework/requirements?	Attachment L-8, in reference to C.4.3.07, will be amended to state; "Assume that all three wells to be constructed are consistent with the *Well Completion Report Test Area North, Well Construction 2003 Operable Unit 1-07B (April 2004)* , included in the Reference Library and that the wells will be constructed under CERCLA."	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
67	B.9(d)	Fee Payments	B-18	Subparagraph (d) of Clause B.9 Fee Payments now provides in part:“ If the Contractor meets the 12/31/2018 TRU waste Idaho Settlement Agreement milestone for certification and shipment of the ISA CH and RH TRU waste … out of the state of Idaho by December 31, 2018, then the fee associated with SM-2, SM-3, AM-1, AM-4, and PI-1 becomes earned fee at the maximum rate and is no longer subject to the fee ‘claw back’ per B.6 (b). If DOE does not provide adequate shipping assets to ship the waste out of the state of Idaho by 12/31/18, but all of the waste has been certified and is ready to ship by this date, then the 80% of available fee associated with certification will become earned fee at the maximum fee rate … [and] the remaining 20% of available fee associated with shipping ISA CH and RH TRU waste will become earned fee at the maximum fee rate as the waste is shipped per the shipping schedule established by the receiving repository during the remainder of the contract period.” The second part of this new subparagraph describes the impact when shipping is delayed as a result of DOE failure to provide adequate shipping assets, and its language regarding earned fee is slightly different than the first part of the clause: (1) Please confirm whether the payment of 80% of the available fee at the maximum rate is to be made as soon as all of the required waste is certified and ready for shipment. (2) Please confirm whether a payment of 80% of the available fee at the maximum rate made pursuant to this provision is subject to ‘claw back’ per Clause B.6 (b). (3) Please confirm whether a subsequent payment of the remaining fee to be made as the waste is shipped is subject to ‘claw back’ per Clause B.6 (b).	(1) Yes. The payment of 80% of the available fee at the maximum rate will be made as soon as all of the required waste is certified and ready for shipment (potentially before 12/31/2018 based on contractor performance, but NLT than 12/31/2018). (2) If all the waste has been certified by 12/31/2018, then the payment of 80% of the available fee at the maximum rate made pursuant to this provision is not subject to ‘claw back’ per Clause B.6 (b). Note that if the ISA CH-TRU and RH-TRU waste is not certified by 12/31/2018, any fee paid will remain provisional and will remain subject to the ‘claw back’ per Clause B.6 (b). (3) Any subsequent payment of the remaining fee to be made as the waste is shipped is not subject to ‘claw back’ per Clause B.6 (b) as long as the waste was certified and ready to ship by 12/31/2018.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
68	C.5.0	Waste Management	C-18 and C-19	The last paragraph on page C-18 and the first paragraoh on page C-19 states that "TRU waste must be treated to meet the requirements of the most current version of the WIPP WAC…" Are significant changes to these requirements anticipated in light of events at WIPP--e.g., a possible requirement to remove potentially reactive constituents and the introduction of new treatment methods to accomplish this removal?	Changes to the WIPP WAC are unknown at this time. Per Attachment L-8 at Section C.5.0 Offerors shall "Assume the WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria will not change from current criteria for Idaho waste."	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
69	C.5.1.05	CH-TRU Treatment	C-22	This section lists the available treatment processes that the contractor may use to treat the CH-TRU. Is treatment limited to these existing processes or would new technologies and equipment be allowed such as a thermal, non-incineration process that would reduce both mass and volume of wastes and remove reactive materials? This question is related to question above.	This should be addressed within each Offeror's tech. approach which should be based on the current WAC. See response to question #68.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)

#	RFP Section/Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	SEB Response	Posting Status
70	C.6.1	Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) Operations and Turnover (PRICED OPTION)	C-31	Under the existing ICP contract, CWI is to operate the IWTU for the treatment of SBW using the patented THOR Steam Reforming Technology under license from THOR Treatment Technologies, LLC (TTT) to URS and then URS to CWI. The license may be transferred to the new contractor under certain license provisions. The RFP states that "Transfer of the third party license for steam reforming from the incumbent contractor to the new Contractor will have to take place in order to use the existing steam reforming treatment process." Who's responsibility is it to make this license transfer a reality? What relationship does DOE contemplate between TTT, the licensor of the technology, and the new Contractor, the ulitmate new licensee? For example, the THOR technology could be classified as DOE-furnished technology under an agreement between TTT and DOE or the the new contractor could be required or advised to reach an agreement with TTT for use and support of the technology. The principal concerns are that the THOR technology is properly implemented by the new contractor to maximize the opportunity for successful processing of the SBW. Some modifications to the current license language may be needed, for example, to recognize different conditions and involved parties for the new contact. In the event that other non-SBW wastes are to be processed through the IWTU using the THOR technology, a new license agreement between TTT and the new contractor will be required.	Per Attachment L-8 at Section C.6.1 "The third party license for steam reforming includes successive contractors so it shall be assumed no costs are associated with transfer of the license for steam reforming of the 900,000 gallons of SBW. However any use of steam reforming at IWTU for processing additional waste water should assume a $10 per gallon license fee."	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
71	C.6.1	Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) Operations and Turnover (PRICED OPTION)	C-31	Is DOE amenable to re-use or additional use proposals for the IWTU following the current SBW processing mission and prior to faciltiy stripout to support calcine processing? An example of such reuse would be a demonstration of the processing of other DOE liquid wastes.	Per Attachment L-8 at Section C.6.0 "Current PWS does not include any additional use scope for IWTU (in its current configuration) beyond treating the 900,000 gallons of SBW and subsequent LWFC."	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
72	C.6.3	Liquid Waste Facility Closure	C-33	This section states that the Contractor shall operate the IWTU as needed to process waste from the INTEC Tank Farm Closure, from RCRA closure of the INTEC Liquid Waste Management System (including the PEWE and LET&D Systems), and RCRA closure of the NWCF. From discussions elsewhere in the RFP, it appears that the Department does not consider these wastes to be "SBW" in terms of fee for processing through IWTU. Is this correct? What is the fee structure for processing of these wastes?	Correct, the Department does not consider waste from the INTEC Tank Farm Closure, from RCRA closure of the INTEC Liquid Waste Management System (including the PEWE and LET&D Systems), and RCRA closure of the NWCF to be subject to the fixed fee structure under CLIN 00006 for "SBW." There is not a separate fee structure for processing these wastes, however, SM-4 under CLIN 00001 is the fee structure associated with RCRA closure of the remaining four 300,000 gallon tanks (Tanks WM-187, WM-188, WM-189, and WM-190; including the tank vaults, cooling coils, valve boxes, and ancillary piping) of the INTEC Tank Farm Facility.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
73	C.4.3.01	Idaho CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF)	C-13	What is the assumed tipping fee or waste disposal cost, if any, for ICDF after turnover to a successor contractor on October 1, 2016?	In accordance with C.4.3.01, the ICP Core Contractor is responsible to transport and place CERCLA waste in ICDF in accordance with the interface agreement it will establish with the construction/D&D contractor . Given this responsibility for transport and placement and the assumption in Section L Attachment L-8 that the ICP Core Contractor should assume ¼ FTE to support the interface with the construction/D&D contractor, no additional tipping fee should be necessary or assumed. Section L Attachment L-8 will be amended to include the assumption of no additional tipping fee related to C.4.3.01.	Q&A Post #2 (4/14/15)
74	C.5.1.02	CH-TRU Waste from Other DOE Sites	C-20	Assumption for PWS C.5.1.02 states that the 100 cubic meters of CH-TRU from other DOE sites will be received in the first three years of the performance period and nothing beyond 9/30/18. If the contract starts on 6/1/16, three performance periods would be through 6/1/19 which exceeds 9/30/18. Please confirm when the last of the CH-TRU waste from other DOE sites will be received.	Attachment L-8 will be amended at C.5.1.02 to delete: "*and nothing beyond 9/30/18.*"	Q&A Post #4 (4/22/15)
75	C.5.4	Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) Pieces, Parts, and Fines (PPF) (RHTRU LOT 10)	C-27	To process LOT 10, security clearances are required above and beyond what is currently in place. Who is responsible for the cost of the security clearances and if the contractor, how much cost should be assumed for each person requiring a clearance?	In accordance with Exhibit C-2, Site wide Safeguards and Security services are provided by the INL contractor at no cost to the ICP Core contractor.	Q&A Post #4 (4/22/15)