

**Savannah River Site Liquid Waste Services
Request for Proposal DE-SOL-0008913
Questions and Answers #1
Questions #1 through #10
Posted July 15, 2016**

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
1.	Please expand on statements during SWPF tour regarding tie-in of SWPF at LPPP and isolation of ARP/MCU.	Tie-in information for the SWPF has been updated in the Final RFP and can be found in Section C.2.2 Salt Waste Processing Facility Integration. Information on the isolation of ARP/MCU has been updated in the Final RFP and can be found in Section C.1.1.1 Actinide Removal process/Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit.
2.	Please provide transfer system configuration before and after as Draft RFP request Contractor to lay-up ARP/MCU and transfer system configuration is needed to understand abilities to flush ARP/MCU.	ARP/MCU lay-up and transfer system configuration information has been updated in the Final RFP and is discussed in Section C.1.1.1 Actinide Removal Process/Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit. Additionally, clarity will be added via Amendment 000001 to the Final RFP to clearly state that ARP/MCU shall be flushed and isolated prior to SWPF radioactive tie-ins to the liquid waste system.

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
3.	<p>Please expand on statements during SPF/SDU tour regarding operations of transfers from SWPF to SPF/SDU and use of SSRT #1 and #2. Transfer route alignment and valving of the two SSRTs is needed to understand feed rate and transfer frequency. (SSRT – Salt Solution Receipt Tank)</p>	<p>Two Salt Solution Receipt Tanks (SSRTs) at the SPF support the planned increase in salt waste processing when SWPF begins operations. The SSRTs will serve the same function as the existing Salt Feed Tank which has a significantly smaller capacity. SSRT #1 was constructed with significantly thicker shield walls to accommodate the higher Cs-137 concentrations processed through the MCU. SSRT #1 will be the only SSRT used to receive MCU-processed DSS. Once SWPF becomes operational, the Cs-137 concentrations in the DSS will be significantly lower and will allow the use of both SSRTs. SSRT #1 will be placed into service prior to contract award and SSRT #2 is physically complete.</p> <p>The DSS produced by the SWPF will be transferred to Tank 50 at a nominal rate of 150 gpm for subsequent transfer to the SPF via either SSRT #1 or SSRT #2. In the event it becomes necessary or desirable to transfer DSS from SWPF directly to the SPF, the SWPF transfer line is connected to the Inter-area Transfer Line between Tank 50 and the SPF. Any DSS transfers into the SPF are controlled by SPF operators via a permissive switch.</p> <p>While the SSRTs have a nominal capacity of 60,000 gallons each, use will be constrained to SSRT #1 and approximately 15,000 gallons volume during receipt of DSS processed by MCU due to radiation shielding requirements. Operation of the SSRTs during receipt of DSS that was processed by SWPF will be consistent with the approved safety basis for the SPF. The nominal grout pump speed is 140 gpm, which includes DSS feed from the SPF tanks at a nominal feed rate of 115 gpm.</p> <p>References: C13, SWPF ICD 10; I02, Saltstone System Design Description Saltstone Process; I22, Saltstone Waste Acceptance Criteria; L33, Tank 50 Waste Compliance Plan</p>
4.	<p>SWPF: 1) Are the rad monitors in the pump and valve rooms?</p>	<p>No. There are no rad monitors in the pump and valve rooms as they are not accessible during normal operations.</p>

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
5.	SWPF: 2) What are the allowed rad levels during maintenance?	Per Parsons' Radiation Protection Program (RPP), SWPF has a 400 mrem/job limit and a limiting exposure of 1000 mrem/yr for rad workers with no special permission. The next Liquid Waste Contractor will be responsible for determining allowable rad levels for maintenance of SWPF after assumption of operation of the facility.
6.	<p>Would DOE be willing to provide the following info on the ETF?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Average Annual Operating Costs and Breakdown 2. Average Annual Employment Level 3. Utility Costs (Direct) 4. ETF Specific Safety Record (past 5 years) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ETF operating costs are not currently collected separately from Tank Farm operations. 2. See Document Library, G16, SRR Organization Tree r1, page 1, Org code WRA112G1 through 4 3. ETF Lab and Utility costs are collected separately. FY16 estimated costs are \$729K for the ETF Lab and \$3.8M for Utilities. 4. ETP had no Occurrence Reports issued in the last 5 years.
7.	Is the ETF being considered for a SB set aside by DOE? If not, could a bidder propose it could demonstrate cost Savings and other efficiencies?	The ETF is included within the contract scope, and is not a Small Business set aside. Any proposed cost savings and other efficiencies should be included within offeror proposals.
8.	B.8(b)(1); Target Activity PBI Fee; Page B-7. What is the basis for target fee (in B.8 (b) 1) associated with the volume of salt waste processed in the period of performance of the contract now that clause B.6 (b) indicates that SWPF Operations CLIN 103 will be an optional CLIN in the contract and therefore outside of direct control by the Contractor even though salt processing is defined as requiring SWPF operations in C.1.1.2.2 and again in C.1.4?	CLIN 0103 is considered an option within the base contract period of performance because it will not be exercised initially with the other base period CLINs. However, C.1.4 and F.4 indicate that work under CLIN 0103 for C.1.4 scope is anticipated to begin on March 1, 2020, and this work scope is therefore included in the Target Activity PBI Fee calculations for base period salt waste processing. A start date either prior to or later than March 1, 2020 for SWPF Operations under CLIN 0103 could result in a post-award contract change.

No.	Industry Question	DOE Answer
9.	C.1.4; Salt Waste Processing Facility Operations (post transition); Page C-25. C.1.4 indicates that the Contractor shall maximize SWPF waste throughput, and in addition, the Contractor shall implement the NGS into SWPF (see C.2.6.1) during the Contract period to ensure compliance with minimum salt waste processing requirement, and the implementation of NGS shall occur at the end of the 2nd year of hot operations. How are these directives possible for proposal planning if these are all activities under an optional CLIN 103 for operation of SWPF?	Proposals shall assume a start date for SWPF Operations work scope under CLIN 0103 in accordance with the March 1, 2020 date included in C.1.4 and F.4.
10.	C.1.4 and C.2.6.1; Salt Waste Processing Facility Operations (post transition) and Next Generation Solvent Deployment; Page C-25. C.1.4 and C.2.6.1 both indicate that implementation of NGS <u>shall</u> occur at the end of the 2nd year of hot operations. Similar to other planning assumptions in the RFP which provide a no later than date, should this direction be reworded to state "implementation <u>no later than</u> the end of the 2nd year of SWPF hot operations?	Amendment 000001 to the Final RFP includes an adjustment to the term "no later than."