

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
52.	<p>We have noticed some instances in the Specifications requiring a warranty for certain equipment being provided in which items may be replaced or repaired based upon the opinion, or at the discretion of the Engineer. Can you please provide clarity on how the Engineer will make this type of determination?</p>	<p>Attachment J-1 <i>Specifications</i>, Sections 43 22 56.01; 40 96 01; and 31 23 23.15 will be revised after contract award to remove language requiring work to be performed based on the opinion of the Engineer.</p>
53.	<p>Specification 43 22 56.01 Misc. Mixers. Paragraph 1.04 A This paragraph requests a written guarantee on uniformity of mixing based on an opinion of the engineer. Please define the attributes of “Uniform blend” of which the opinion of the engineer will be based and whether the data sheets contain the required information to supply adequate mixers.</p> <p>We cannot warranty that the specified mixers will meet the opinion of the engineer. The contractor does not own either the design nor the specified data on the data sheets for the mixers, as such the contractor cannot ensure that the specified mixers will provide adequate mixing.</p>	<p>The mixers are to be provided in accordance with the specifications and applicable datasheets. Uniform mixing for stormwater and equalization tanks is defined as uniformly distributed solids throughout the liquid and no dead spots in the tank. For the chemical addition tanks, uniform mixing is defined as the added chemicals are to be well dispersed/mixed throughout the liquid.</p> <p>With respect to the topic discussed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph regarding “opinion of the engineer”, please see DOE’s response to Question #52.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
54.	Please provide specifications and data sheets for sulfuric acid overflow neutralization tank (CHEM-T-432) and portable sump pump (CHEM-P-420).	<p>Overflow Neutralization Tank (CHEM-T-432) identified on drawing I941002-F-0016 has been eliminated and is not a requirement of this scope of work. This Piping and Instrumentation Drawing (P&amp;ID) will be revised after contract award to reflect the elimination of CHEM-T-432.</p> <p>DOE assumes that the portable sump pump reference in the question was meant to be CHEM-P-520 and/or CHEM-P-531. These portable sump pumps shown on J-2 <i>Drawings</i> I941002-F-0016 and I941002-F-0017 are not a requirement of this scope of work. These portable sump pumps will be provided and utilized by the operating contractor after construction of OF200 MTF is complete. These P&amp;IDs will be revised after contract award to reflect the above.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
55.	<p>Specification 23 31 13 Insulated Stack P. 22-23 Sub-section 2.27 paragraph A speaks to the Underwriters Laboratories' Standard UL 2221. Since this standard seems to be for modular grease duct please clarify the reference.</p> <p>Bullet 3 of paragraph A calls for the stack to be assembled with banded flanges and joint sealant which would apply to non-structural duct not a free-standing stack. Please clarify.</p> <p>Paragraph B bullet 4b calls for the inner liner to be .036 not 10 ga. as stated on the referenced drawing. Please clarify.</p> <p>Drawing H941002-F-0013 calls for the stack to be constructed with a 10 ga. stainless steel inner liner and a ¼" A36 outer shell. Paragraph B bullet 5a/b calls for the outer shell to be .030 304 stainless steel while the drawing calls for ¼" A36. Please clarify.</p>	<p>UL 2221 listing will not be required for this stack. Text in Attachment J-2 <i>Specifications</i> Section 23 31 13 will be revised after contract award to remove the reference.</p> <p>Stack is to be a free-standing assembly with no guy wires or external bracing allowed. The stack manufacturer shall provide material thickness and fabrication required for the stack as free-standing assembly.</p> <p>The inner liner is intended to be 10 ga. Attachment J-2 <i>Specifications</i> will be revised after contract award to reflect 10 ga stainless steel.</p> <p>Materials, including outer shell, shall be 304 stainless steel. Drawing H941002-F-0013 will be revised after contract award to show stainless steel outer shell.</p>
56.	<p>Section J Attachment J-2 Circuit Sizing E941001-F-0001 AHU's #1- #4 call for 2 sets of 4" w/600kcmil conductors for a 400amp feed. Is this correct?</p>	<p>The conductors shown are correct.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
57.	Will the Government please provide the word files for the Section L Attachments to include L-1, L-2, L-3, L-4, L-6, L-7?	<p>For the convenience of offerors, DOE has provided Word-versions of Section L Attachments L-1 <i>Key Personnel Standard Resume Format</i>, L-2 <i>Past Performance Reference Information Form</i>, L-3 <i>Past Performance Cover Letter and Questionnaire</i>, L-4 <i>List of Contracts Terminated for Default or Convenience</i>, L-6 <i>List of DOE Contracts</i>, and L-7 <i>Work Performance Matrix</i>.</p> <p>As indicated within this file, in the event there is any conflict between the Word versions and the current version of the .pdf file for Section L, the .pdf file will control.</p>
58.	<p>Section I</p> <p>If there are new tariffs imposed after the proposal submission date that significantly affect commodity pricing and the offeror provides timely notification to the Contracting Officer, can the offeror submit a request for equitable adjustment?</p>	<p>Prior to contract award, proposal revisions will not be accepted after the proposal submission deadline. However, if the Government determines that discussions are necessary all offerors in the competitive range will be permitted to submit a proposal revision to any and all areas it deems necessary. Further, any potential request for equitable adjustment to the contract post-award related to newly imposed tariffs is anticipated to be evaluated pursuant to Section I clause I.78 FAR 52.229-3 <i>Federal, State, and Local Taxes</i>.</p>
59.	<p>Section J Attachment J-2 Drawings / S941002-F-0037 and C941001-F-0027</p> <p>Can DOE please confirm that the installation of the pipebridge is still included in the scope of work?</p>	<p>Yes, the pipe bridge is to be installed per Section J, Attachment J-2 <i>Drawings</i>. See drawing C941001-F-0027.</p> <p>Note that on p. 10 of the Pre-Solicitation Site Tour Script, and p. 9 of the Pre-Proposal Site Tour Script, there was an error that stated this new pipe bridge would be installed across the creek by another DOE contractor. However, this activity is within the scope of the OF200 MTF procurement.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
60.	Attachment J-2 Drawings E941001-F-0078 G fixture shown on Chemical Tank Roof refers to detail 2656-248 and 2656-218 which are not shown.	Stanchion mounted luminaires are shown in Attachment J-2 <i>Drawings</i> number E941002-E-0078, details 2656-210 and 2656-211. Drawing E941002-F-0011 is intended to reference these details. After contract award, in drawing E941002-F-0011 the reference to detail 2656-218 will be revised to 2656-210, and the reference to 2656-248 will be revised to 2656-211.
61.	Attachment J-2 Drawings MCC Locations E941002-F-0016 Switchgear Listing does not match electrical equipment plan and grounding plan. MCC-A & MCC-C are reversed.	Attachment J-2 <i>Drawings</i> number E941002-F-0016 will be corrected after contract award to make MCC-A and MCC-C labels consistent between details 1 and 2.
62.	C.3.1 Scope of Work/CLINs C-13 thru C-15 CLIN C.3.1.1 and C.3.1.2 – Please clarify the requirement that all “non-craft” labor should be in these two line items: Is this intended to be the “non-craft” labor of the Prime Contractor only or the “non-craft” labor of the Prime and all Subcontractors?	L.20 DOE-L-2011 <i>Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume III – Price Proposal</i> , paragraph (b) has been revised to add clarity. All professional, non-craft labor associated with other CLINs, with the exception of 0001A Mobilization and Pre-Mobilization Submittals Project Management, are to be proposed under SubCLIN 0001B Construction, Testing & Demobilization Project Management, to include allocation of subcontractor non-craft labor costs to the extent practicable.
63.	Section J Attachment J-4 DOE O 130.1 Please advise/describe expectation or responsibility of Contractor regarding this DOE Order.	DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 130.1 and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 130.1 from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.
64.	Section J Attachment J-4 DOE M 140.1-1B Please advise if this DOE Manual remains applicable as DOE-H-2006 was removed from the RFP.	DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE M 140.1-B and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE M 140.1-1B from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
65.	<p>Section J Attachment J-4 DOE-M-471.3-1 Chg 1 and DOE-O-471.3 Chg 1 Manual and Order for Identifying and Protecting OUO Information Please advise if OUO documents are anticipated to be encountered and/or created by the Contractor in the course of this project, and if created by the Contractor, will DOE provide the Derivative Classifier to review and make a determination of the document's classification, or is the Contractor to employ a Derivative Classifier?</p>	<p>DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 471.3 and DOE M 471.3-1 and has determined they are not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 471.3 and DOE M 471.3-1 from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.</p>
66.	<p>Section J Attachment J-4 DOE-O-251.1D Paragraph 3.b of this Order indicates that the Order does not apply to contractors. Please advise.</p>	<p>DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 251.1D and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 251.1D from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.</p>
67.	<p>Section J Attachment J-4 DOE-O-350.1 Chg 5 Contractor Human Resource Management Programs Please review/advise Contractors responsibilities under this order. Other than Workplace Substance Abuse Program, this Order appears to be directed to cost reimbursable operations and management contracts.</p>	<p>DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 350.1 and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 350.1 from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.</p>
68.	<p>Section J Attachment J-4 DOE-O-422.1 Chg 2 Conduct of Operations Please advise: This Order appears to be applicable to operation of facilities – what are the requirements/expectations of the Contractor related to this Order?</p>	<p>DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 422.1 and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 422.1 from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
69.	<p>Section J Attachment J-4 DOE-O-430.1C Real Property Asset Management Please advise: This Order appears to require that Real Property Management requirements be communicated separately from the Order. Are those requirements indicated in the Scope of Work, General/Special Conditions, etc.? Please describe intent/scope of this Order as related to this contract.</p>	<p>DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 430.1C and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 430.1C from Section J Attachment J-4 <i>List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B)</i> has been issued.</p>
70.	<p>Section J Attachment J-4 DOE-O-460.2A Departmental Materials Transportation and Packaging Management Please advise applicability of this Order to this Firm-Fixed-Price contract for construction. Are all shipments to be addressed to USDOE in care of Contractor, and uninsured (self-insured by DOE)? Is this contradicted by Section D, D.1 requirements?</p>	<p>DOE has reconsidered the applicability of DOE O 460.2A and has determined it is not applicable. An amendment to remove DOE O 460.2A from Section J Attachment J-4 List of Applicable DOE Directives (List B) has been issued.</p>
71.	<p>Section H clause H.27 Quality Assurance Paragraph H.27 includes reference to 10CFR830 Nuclear Safety Management, which also brings in PAAA protections and potential penalty actions. Please advise regarding the potential for the Contractor being responsible for and having to address Nuclear Safety. Is there a potential, or likelihood that some of the Mercury that may be encountered is a radioactive isotope? Is there anything known in this project at this time that requires/includes Nuclear Safety Related/Safety Significant Systems or the handling, removal, disposal of nuclear materials?</p>	<p>The Contractor is not responsible to address any nuclear safety issues as part of this contract.</p> <p>DOE conducted a characterization effort (see the files provided under the “Site Environmental Characterization Report” section of the procurement website’s <i>Documents Library</i> tab) of the areas related to this project and found no radiological contaminants. At this time there are no known Nuclear Safety Related/Safety Significant Systems or required handling, removal, or disposal of nuclear materials in any part of the sites.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
72.	<p>Drawing A941002-F-0015 Architectural Treatment Facility Door and Window Schedule This sheet references Specification Section 03 53 00, Concrete Topping appears to be missing in the RFP. Can this please be provided?</p>	<p>Attachment J-2 <i>Drawings</i> number A941002-F-0015 Interior Finish Schedule, note no. 7, is intended to reference Section 03 35 00, Concrete Finishing, for concrete sealer. The text on Drawing A941002-F-0015 will be revised after contract award to correct the Specification reference.</p>
73.	<p>Specification 13 34 19 Metal Building Systems 13 34 19-8 Page 8 makes reference to Section 08 11 01 which appears to be missing from the RFP. Can it please be provided?</p>	<p>Attachment J-1 <i>Specifications</i> Section 13 34 19, page 8, is intended to reference Section 08 11 00, Metal Doors and Frames. The text on Specifications Section 13 34 19 will be revised after contract award to correct the Specification reference.</p>
74.	<p>Section J Attachment J-2 Cable Tray Use 26 05 05 – 23 301 J. Cable Tray is mentioned several times in the Specifications. Are there any actual areas where open cables will be allowed to be run in cable tray or is all wiring to be installed in conduit?</p>	<p>All wiring is to be installed in conduit. Attachment J-1, <i>Specifications</i> Section 26 05 05 paragraph 3.01.J will be revised after contract award to clarify that open cable trays will not be used.</p>
75.	<p>Section J Attachment J-2 Specification 31 23 23 Fill and Backfill – Testing Paragraph 3.05.B indicates that Contractor’s Independent Testing Agency is to conduct in-place density tests. Drawing S941001-F-0004 Special Inspection Plans indicates in Table 3 that Owners Testing Agency will perform Compacted Fill Density Testing. Please review/advise.</p>	<p>Owner’s Testing Agency will perform the in-place density testing for Fill and Backfill consistent with the Special Inspection Plans.</p> <p>Attachment J-1 <i>Specifications</i> Section 31 23 23 paragraph 3.05.B will be revised after contract award to revise language that states the contractor shall provide independent testing laboratory and replace it with Owner’s Testing Agency.</p>

**Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility  
Request for Proposal 89303318REM000002  
Questions and Answers Round 5 - Questions 52 to 78  
Posted April 24, 2018**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Question</b>	<b>DOE Answer</b>
76.	<p>Section A SF 1442</p> <p>Will the Government please consider a 1-week extension to the due date to allow additional time to work with subcontractors, compile questions, and provide a better best-value proposal?</p>	<p>After additional industry input and further DOE consideration, the proposal due date is being extended 2 weeks, with a new proposal due date of 05/21/2018.</p> <p>An amendment has been issued that includes the proposal due date extension.</p>
77.	<p>Section L.13(h)</p> <p>In reference to RFP Section L, (h) Questions, please extend last day for questions to be submitted considering that the site visit is on April 10 and questions are due April 12.</p>	<p>While DOE has provided an extension to the proposal due date (see question #76 above), the question submittal period for the solicitation will not be extended or re-opened.</p>
78.	<p>While we respect the DOE response provided to questions 15 and 16 posted on 4/11/18, we still feel the time allotted is not adequate to provide DOE with a viable, accurate and technically sound proposal for this project.</p> <p>We hope that DOE will re-consider our request for an extension to 5/25/2018.</p>	<p>Please see DOE's response to question #76 above.</p>