



Department of Energy

**Environmental Management
Consolidated Business Center
250 East 5th Street, Suite 500
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 246-0500**

May 26, 2016

EMCBC-00598-16

To: Interested Parties

LOS ALAMOS LEGACY CLEANUP CONTRACT (LLCC) – DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

The Department of Energy (DOE) is releasing the Draft Request for Proposal (RFP), DE-SOL-0008109 pertaining to the LLCC procurement for review. The purpose of the Draft RFP is to solicit questions and comments from all interested parties.

DOE IS NOT REQUESTING PROPOSALS AT THIS TIME, AND INTERESTED PARTIES SHALL NOT SUBMIT PROPOSALS IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT RFP. DOE WILL NOT EVALUATE ANY PROPOSALS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT RFP. PROPOSALS SHALL BE SUBMITTED ONLY IN RESPONSE TO THE FINAL RFP, CURRENTLY ANTICIPATED TO BE ISSUED IN AUGUST 2016.

DOE hereby invites all interested parties to thoroughly examine the Draft RFP and the accompanying procurement website (<https://www.emcbc.doe.gov/SEB/LLCC/>) in their entirety and to submit comments in writing to the following email address: LLCC@emcbc.doe.gov. The Draft RFP is subject to change in the development of the Final RFP as a result of the DOE's consideration of the comments received from interested parties in response to the Draft RFP. In particular, DOE is seeking feedback from interested parties on the following:

1. DOE plans to conduct oral presentations and interview the proposed Program Manager in accordance with L.15(d). Please provide any input on how DOE might improve and/or streamline this aspect of the evaluation.
2. Does your company have any input regarding the relative importance of the Evaluation Factors that DOE should consider in making this contractor selection?
3. Are the Section B cost and fee structure and Section L pricing instructions and Cost Assumptions clear and understandable? If not, what is unclear and what improvements can be made?
4. Do you think DOE should include a fee ceiling percentage in B.2(c)(3)(E) or allow the Offerors to propose it and why?
5. How do you see the handling of pension costs? Also, if we have post retirement

pension and medical costs, how do you think DOE should handle these costs? Should it be by a separate Contract Line Item (CLIN)?

6. Are there any additional specific technical or programmatic documents and information that you think would be helpful to be posted to the EMCBC Acquisition website's documents library in order to assist in the preparation of proposals?
7. Does your company believe there is a sufficient level of detail in the interfaces section of the PWS, Section J Attachment J-6, Interfaces with NNSA Managing and Operating Contractor Systems and Services, and/or Section L cost assumptions to understand the complications and difficulties expected when working with the National Nuclear Security Administration Management and Operating Contractor. Is the level of detail also sufficient to provide an adequate proposal?
8. Are there any questions on the initial performance of the transuranic waste disposition program under the existing Basis for Interim Operations (BIO) as identified in Section C.4.2?
9. Are there any questions on the future implementation of and transition to a DOE-provided Document Safety Analysis (DSA) and Technical Surveillance Requirements (TSR) after the start of the contract as identified in Section C.4.2?
10. Are the requirements for complying with the draft 2016 Consent Order clear, especially the annual milestone and target development and stipulated penalty provisions, as identified in Section C.3.1.1 and Section J, Attachments J-8 and J-16?
11. Are the Section H workforce transition and hiring clauses clear? If not, what is unclear and how can these clauses be improved?
12. Is the Self-Performed Work clause in Section H clear and do you have any concerns with being able to meet the stated percentages? Also, is the definition of meaningful work clear?
13. Please note that this draft RFP does not include a requirement for the identification of major subcontractors that have historically been defined with a dollar threshold. Do you see a benefit for the Final RFP to include a dollar threshold requirement? If the final RFP should include a major subcontractor requirement, what should the dollar threshold be?
14. Is the definition of "critical subcontractor" clear? Does that cause you any concerns? How many critical subcontractors do you foresee in your proposal?
15. Are the page limitations included in Section L of the Draft RFP for the Technical and Management Proposal (Volume II) sufficient? If not, please provide input.
16. Would your company see benefit in an additional site tour after release of the Final RFP? If so, what additional facilities/areas would you be interested in seeing?
17. Do you have any additional suggestions?

Interested parties will have until COB June 24, 2016, to submit comments regarding the Draft RFP. All comments shall be submitted in the Microsoft Word format provided on the procurement website, and separated by RFP section. Please do not make any changes to the Microsoft Word formatting with the exception of adding rows as needed. DOE will not

respond to or post on the procurement website, any verbal or written questions or comments pertaining to the Draft RFP; however, DOE will consider comments when preparing the Final RFP. Interested parties will be given the opportunity to submit questions and comments in writing for DOE response once the Final RFP is issued.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kimberly A. Tate", enclosed within a thin black rectangular border.

Kimberly A. Tate
Contracting Officer

Enclosure:

Draft RFP DE-SOL-0008109