

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
87.	C.11.2.18	Cañon de Valle Aggregate Area	C-108	Comment: The Final RFP states that "a field implementation plan (FIP) was prepared in June 2011 and contains deviations to the IWP that make the FIP more consistent with the current approach to collecting analytical samples." If available, please provide a copy of the referenced FIP for review.	The FIP for TA-14 was completed and has been posted to the document library.

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
88.	Section C.14	Additional Assignments (ID/IQ)	C-131	<p>Section C.14 states that the types of scopes to be performed under C.14 as additional ID/IQ assignments include: “Emergent environmental remediation activities that are within the contract scope but <i>not currently identified or quantifiable</i>, such as discovery of a larger than expected contaminant plume resulting from initial aggregate area investigations that shall be conducted in accordance with Section C.11 process and requirements” and “<i>currently known environmental remediation activities that are not developed sufficiently to rely on current estimates or allow accurate estimating</i> by the contractor.”</p> <p>We interpret this to include Aggregate Area (C.11) activities where field investigations are incomplete, the results are not publicly known/available, or the potential release site has not yet been investigated. Therefore we interpret this to mean that the Offerors shall NOT provide an estimate in its Volume III cost estimate for the PWS/WBS for C.11 (because these are to be addressed by future C.14 scope) scopes for those Aggregate Area environmental remediation activities that are pre-investigation or results are not publicly known, or results have not been resolved with NMED since this would fit precisely into the definition of “<i>currently known environmental remediation activities that are not developed sufficiently to rely on current estimates or allow accurate estimating.</i>”</p> <p>Please clarify if this was DOE’s intent – yes or no? and if no, then please provide an assumption to use for the amount of environmental remediation (cubic meters to excavate) that Offerors should assume for the currently insufficiently developed sites for each Aggregate Area (C.11.2.1 to C.11.2.27). This will ensure that Offerors will be using the same assumption on which to base the cost of these undefined scopes.</p>	<p>The Offeror shall propose an estimate for the aggregate area investigations required under C.11. There is more than enough history of aggregate area investigations conducted to date to be able to provide a technical approach and estimate for the work.</p> <p>The ‘not currently identified or quantifiable’ statements are to address Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU) that are not currently identified (2016 Consent Order, Appendix A). For example, each of the aggregate areas in C.11 has a septic system and we have already characterized ten such septic systems; therefore, the remaining aggregate septic systems should be estimable with the current information.</p> <p>The RFP, Section C, will be amended to provide clarification under C.14.</p>

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
89.	Attachment J-10 and Attachment L-8	Draft PEMP and Assumptions	J-10-31 and L-8	J-10, Page J-10-31, indicates that Campaign M for the Pajarito Watershed should complete in Option Period 2; however, L-8 states that Campaign M for the Pajarito Watershed is “anticipated to start and complete in Option Period 1.” Please advise whether for the RFP, DOE desires completion of Campaign M Pajarito Watershed in Option Period 2 or Option Period 1 and update the RFP to correct the inconsistency between J-10 and L-8.	<p>DOE provided the assumption in Section L-8 to start and complete Campaign M in Option Period 1. The Offerors shall make every attempt to prioritize this campaign in the order of campaigns listed, and start and complete them in the timeframes requested.</p> <p>In this case, the PEMP (Attachment J-10) identified an incentive for Campaign M to be completed sometime in Option Period 2. This incentive will be adjusted upon award of a contract with a specific schedule to be negotiated between DOE and the Contractor. It is anticipated that the PEMP statement will be negotiated based on the awardee contract proposal baseline.</p> <p>No change to the RFP is required.</p>

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
90.	H.66 Security Clearances	Security Clearances	H-79	<p>Question: How many of the current staff currently have security clearances and at what levels? What positions will require such clearances and at what levels? What areas that will be remediated require such clearances and at what levels?</p>	<p>There is not a current dedicated staff for the EM work.</p> <p>Most of LANL cleanup sites are within property protection areas, including TA-21 and Area G. Clearances are not required for access to a property protection area.</p> <p>TA-9, TA-15, and TA-16 with high explosive contaminated sites are behind a limited access area fence requiring an “L” clearance for access. The number of individuals needed to work behind the fence is dependent on the Offeror’s Technical and Management Proposal.</p> <p>Area G RTR has the possibility of exposing information that might require a temporary limited access area within Area G (on an infrequent case by case basis). Therefore, there is a need for some Q cleared employees for the TRU waste scope to resolve unintended packaging issues, dependent on the Offeror’s Technical and Management Proposal.</p>

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
91.	C.3.7.3	Site Planning Efforts	C-42	<p>The last sentence requires that the Contractor not interfere with the Manhattan Project National Historical Park schedule.</p> <p>Will the DOE make available the current Manhattan Project National Historical Park development and implementation schedule prior to the proposal due date?</p>	<p>The Manhattan Project Park schedule has not been provided in sufficient detail to provide to the Offerors.</p> <p>The RFP will be amended to delete the reference to the schedule in C.3.7.3.</p>
92.	C.12.1.11	Construction Remedy Projects	C-115	<p>The last sentence of the paragraph states "...the following proposed remedy construction activities." Nothing follows the sentence.</p> <p>Will the DOE identify the proposed remedy construction activities that are missing?</p>	<p>The RFP will be amended to delete "any of" and "following" from C.12.1.11.</p>
93.	C.14	Additional Assignments (ID/IQ)	C-131	<p>The fifth bullet of C.14 states: "Implementation of the remedy of MDA-C including remedy development of alternatives and remedy selection in-line with the regulatory process and public involvement and conducted in accordance with Section C.12.1 processes and requirements" as part of the additional assignments under ID/IQ. Since no cost estimates are to be provided for C.14 scope, please confirm that Offerors are NOT to provide cost estimate for MDA-C remedy implementation in their Volume III costs for PWS C.12.2.2.</p>	<p>Section C.12.2.2 for MDA-C proceeds through execution of the remedy project for MDA-C (which was identified as an engineered ET cover).</p> <p>The RFP will be amended to remove the bullet under C.14 that refers to MDA-C.</p>

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
94.	C.14	Additional Assignments (ID/IQ)	C-131	<p>The last bullet on page C-131, section C.14 states: “Implementation of a potential remedy for the combined MDA-A and MDA-T area, which requires completion of characterization, especially the geological processes resulting in potential cliff retreat that has not been characterized and evaluated, and conducted in accordance with Section C.12.1 processes and requirements” as part of the additional assignments under ID/IQ. Since no cost estimates are to be provided for C.14 scope, please confirm that Offerors are NOT to provide cost estimate for MDA A & T remedy implementation in their Volume III costs for PWS C.12.2.1 and 12.2.6.</p>	<p>Section C.12.2.1 for MDA-A and C.12.2.6 for MDA-T both proceed through execution of the remedy project for MDA-A (which was identified for planning as an engineered ET cover).</p> <p>The RFP will be amended to remove the last bullet under C.14. Therefore, the Offerors shall provide a cost estimate for the remedy projects as per the requirements in C.12.2.1 and C.12.2.6.</p>
95.	J-6, 27.b	Interfaces with NNSA Managing and Operating Contractor Systems and Services: Airnet Monitoring Stations	J-6-8	<p>The subparagraph states eight Airnet stations will have to be “picked up”. This could refer to physical relocation or transfer of financial responsibility.</p> <p>Does “picked up” refer to transfer of financial responsibility for the eight stations to the Contractor?</p>	<p>As a clarification, these eight stations will remain in the NNSA M&O Airnet program, but it will be the LLCC Contractor’s responsibility to ensure the stations are operable. The difficulty is that the Contractor will have to make sure the NNSA M&O Contractor maintains the stations. The Contractor will not conduct maintenance on the stations itself. The LLCC Contractor has financial responsibility for these stations including reimbursement to the NNSA M&O Contractor for maintenance costs of these stations.</p> <p>The RFP, Section J, Attachment J-6 will be amended to clarify the eight Airnet stations have to continue to be operated for EM operations at TA-54 Area-G.</p>

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
96.	Section J, Attachment J-10		J-10-30	<p>Section J, Attachment J-10, of the RFP lists 9 campaigns for which Aggregate Area cleanup is required in accordance with Appendix C of the Consent Order. Campaigns B, E, G, J, L, M and N, as named in the RFP, are also named in Appendix C of the Consent Order. Campaign D in the RFP is named Administrative Site Completion, but is believed to be equivalent to Campaign D, Supplemental Investigation Reports Campaign from the Consent Order. Please confirm.</p> <p>Campaign F in the RFP is named Los Alamos/Pueblo Canyons Sediment; however Campaign F in the Consent Order is RDX Remedy Campaign. Please clarify the scope of Campaign F as it relates to Aggregate Areas.</p>	<p>The RFP, Section J, Attachment J-10, Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan, Exhibit 3, Milestones 9, 10, 11, and 15 will be amended.</p> <p>Campaign D in the will be amended to reflect SIR campaign from the 2016 Consent Order. Campaign F in will be amended to reflect the RDX Characterization campaign in the 2016 Consent Order. Campaign F applies to RDX and not aggregate</p>

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
97.	C.3.2.7; C.3.7.5; C.5.2.4; C.5.3.2; C.5.3.6; C.6.4.1; C.7.1.4; Attachment J-16	Tribal Nations; Environmental Information Management System & Public Access; Pueblo de San Ildefonso Drinking Water Supply Wells; Periodic Monitoring Reports; Annual Update to the Appendix A Sample and Analysis Plan for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso; Monitoring Wells (4" Inner Diameter at Depth): Construct Perched- Intermediate Monitoring Well R-10i; Sampling at the Early Notification System in Lower Los Alamos and Pueblo Canyons; Memorandums of Understanding; Memorandums of Agreement, and Agreements,		<p>These sections all reference the following document “<i>Memorandum of Agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy and the Pueblo de San Ildefonso</i>” and the three associated protocols:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocol for Access to Pueblo Lands, • Protocol for Protecting Confidential Pueblo Information, through review and release of data and reports, and • Protocol for Inadvertent Discoveries of Native American Human Remains and Cultural Items. <p>However, this document is not available in the Environmental Reading Room or on the RFP references page https://www.emcbc.doe.gov/SEB/LLCC/Document%20Library.php). Will the government provide a copy to bidders via email or some other secure transmission?</p>	The document has been posted to the procurement website documents library.

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
98.	H.35	DOE-H-2043 Assignment and Transfer of Subcontracts	H-58	Accepting existing/incumbent subcontracts may impact Offeror's Government Approved Purchasing System approval. Please add the following language to the clause: DOE acknowledges that transfers and assignments of incumbent subcontracts constitutes a novation and a change that will require subcontractors to accept successor Prime Contractor terms and conditions. Should negotiations become unsuccessful with incumbent subcontractors, the Contractor reserves the right to reopen the scope to competition.	This is a DOE corporate clause. No change to the RFP is required.
99.	C.4.1.7	Number of shafts for Other Retrievals and Remediation	C-55	The first sentence states "The Contractor shall retrieve CH-TRU waste packages from shafts 262-266, 235 and 302-306." The last sentence states "The Contractor shall provide field surveys, data collection, and preparation of a report addressing the conditions of the waste packages and Hot Cell Lines shafts 302-306 and Tritium Canister shafts 262-266." The bullets describe the contents of 10 shafts. Should shaft 235 be excluded from the list? If not, what are the contents of the 11 th shaft?	See response to Q&A #31.

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
100.	Attachment J-17, Section 6 PWS Section C.4	CH-TRU	J-17 p.12 and C-50	<p>The hot cell liners, as described in Attachment J-17, are defined as remote handled waste: “The presence of mixed U-Pu isotopes of these materials and the results of some required examinations produced high beta-gamma and alpha contamination within the liner making them remote handled (RH) waste.” If determined to be M/LLW, they may be left in place: “...should be classified as LLW or mixed LLW and does not require excavation.”</p> <p>If TRU, they become RH-TRU, and are excluded from the scope of this contract per section C.4: “The Contractor is NOT responsible for remote-handled TRU waste processing.”</p> <p>Is the intent to retrieve the hot cell liner if TRU and place in storage?</p>	No. If the Hot Cell liners are determined to be RH-TRU waste then they will not be within the scope of the contract. No further action would be required other than general inventory reporting and monitoring of site conditions.
101.	C.11.2.6	Upper Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area	C-104	<p>Question: The Final RFP states that the Phase II Work Plan for Lower Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area, LA-UR-14-xxxxxx, June 2014 was prepared, but does not state the document was submitted or approved. There appears to be no record of NMED involvement in the EFRR after June 2014 with regard to this subject. Was the Phase II Work Plan for Lower Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area approved or denied? If so, please provide a digital copy for review.</p>	The correct section for which the question was asked is C.11.2.7, Lower Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area. The report was not previously prepared and the Contractor will have to prepare it. The RFP will be amended at C.11.2.7.

Q&A's 87 through 102 [\(Q&A 102 has been revised as it was inadvertently posted yesterday before it was final\)](#)

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
102.	Q&A released October 24, number 58	WBS organization		<p>The response to question #58 is “DOE will not add a level 3 to the WBS/PWS. The Offeror may propose how it is going to distribute support to individual project activities in the Basis of Estimates; however, the Offeror may not change the L-6 or L-7 Worksheets.”</p> <p>Does this mean offerors may add lower level WBS/PWS elements to help organize the schedule and estimates, as long as the additions do not impact the L-6/L-7 tables?</p>	Yes : <u>No</u>