

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
1	J-2	List of Contract Deliverables	Contract Transition Deliverables T-7 TO Proposal - Implementation Period (TO2) T-8 TO Proposal - IWTU Operations (TO3) T-9 TO Proposal - Essential Missions (TO4)	J-2-4	Proposals for Task Orders 2, 3, and 4 are shown as Transition Deliverables. Please confirm that DOE intends to issue Request for Task Order Proposals (RTPs) for TOs 2, 3, and 4 during the 90-day transition period.	Yes, it is DOE's intent to issue Request for Task Order Proposals (RTPs) for TOs 2, 3, and 4 during the 90-day transition period.
2	J-2, Attachment L-7, C.1; RFP section C.2	List of Contract Deliverables, Transition Task Order, PWS	Contract Transition Deliverables for task order proposals	J-2-4, 2 (Attachment L-7), C-10 to C-13	Section J-2, identifies proposals for task orders 2, 3, and 4 as transition deliverables; however the statement of work does not include this activity. Would DOE please resolve this discrepancy? Are the proposals for the task orders to be prepared during transition?	While the proposals for TOs 2, 3, and 4 may be required during the 90-day transition period, these are not considered scope activities to be priced under the Transition TO. The RTPs for TOs 2, 3, and 4 will include necessary details for appropriate cost accounting and billing of the TO 2, 3, and 4 proposal development costs. Proposal costs for post-award task orders will be reimbursed in accordance with the Contractor's disclosure statement; and must be allowable, allocable, and reasonable. The Contractor's proposal for TO 2 - Implementation Period must be prepared and negotiated before the end of the transition period. The due dates for the Contractor's proposals for TOs 3 and 4 will be finalized post award in the respective RTPs.
3	L	L.10.c	Hard copy proposal submittal	L-7	The RFP requires hard copy submittal of the proposal. We request that DOE make the proposal an electronic submittal only. Printing of the proposal requires collocation of resources. It is unpredictable when COVID-19 work restrictions will be withdrawn. We believe that an electronic copy only submittal aligns with "revised process considerations that may be necessary due to enhanced telework, social distancing, and travel restrictions," identified in the letter to prospective bidders that accompanied the final RFP.	DOE does not anticipate changing the hard copy proposal submission requirements.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
4	L	L.10.f.3	Print type	L-9	<p>We believe that there are conflicting/confusing requirements with regard to the font requirements. As such, we recommend that DOE delete the last sentence of RFP sub-section L.10.f.3 or amend it to read ""Print type used in completing forms attached to this RFP as Microsoft® Word®, Access®, or Excel® documents should not be changed from the styles used in the attachments." In the final RFP, DOE added Microsoft Word versions of the section L attachments - some of these additions appear to be partial forms, some are guidelines and some are forms. Some of these documents generally have tables or graphics added, which generally would meet the 9 point font requirement of this subsection. It is unclear from the subsections last sentence if this is allowable or if those would be expected to meet the font standard on the individual form. For example, the key personnel standard resume format, attachment L-2, appears to be a listing of items covered in the resume. It contains language that states "Note: The Offeror may amend the format for Attachment L-2, Key Personnel Standard Resume Format, as long as the exact information, font and size (per DOE-L-2001), and page limitations are followed." It would be an assumption that the requirements allow the addition of table information in a 9 point font that meets the requirements of L.10.f.3 and not the 11 point font included on the standard format, which is attachment L-2. Further, we believe that this requirement's intent was to avoid the issues of printing the cost attachments in past RFPs. The spreadsheets on this RFP are straight forward and do not contain the printing concerns from large multi-year spreadsheets. Would DOE please clarify the font requirements.</p>	<p>The RFP will be amended to delete the last sentence of Section L.10 (f)(3).</p> <p>In the event there is a conflict between the font size of the MS Word versions of the Section L Attachments posted for the Offeror's convenience and the current version of the Section L .pdf file instructions, the Section L .pdf file instructions will control.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
5	L	L.10 (f)(3); Attachment L-2 Key Personnel Standard Resume Format Attachment L-3 Past Performance Reference Information Form	Print type	L-9	<p>L.10 (f)(3) states "Paragraph text shall be 12 point or larger, single spaced, using Times New Roman font. Paragraph headings and section titles may use Arial or Times New Roman font 12 point or larger. Headers and footers, spreadsheets, charts, tables, diagrams or design drawings, and graphs must be 9 point or larger using Times New Roman or Arial font. Bold and italics are acceptable, and narrow is not acceptable. Print type used in completing forms attached to this RFP as Microsoft® Word®, Access®, or Excel® documents should not be changed from the styles used in the attachments." Attachment L-2 and L-3 states "The Offeror may amend the format for ..., as long as the exact information, font and size (per DOE-L-2001), and page limitations are followed. Question. Amending the format of Attachments L-2 and L-3 generally includes adding tables of information to respond to specific areas. Based on this requirement, it is unclear if the new table would be required to meet the 10 or 11 point font in the attachment or if it is required to meet the 9 point font specified in L.10.f.3. Also, it is traditional to provide text on both of these forms. We assume that text is required to meet the 10 or 11 point font (based on the Microsoft Word RFP attachments), but not the 12 point requirement in section L.10.f.3. Please note that the notes on Attachments L-2 and L-3 are confusing when referring back to DOE-L-2001 as it is now written has requirements for fonts to be a minimum of 9, 10, 11 and 12 points with no clear specification of when 10 and 11 point fonts may be used. Recommendation. We recommend that DOE modify the last sentence of section L.10.f.3 to remove Microsoft Word documents or deleting the last sentence of L.10(f) to eliminate the confusion/contradict in requirements.</p>	<p>The RFP will be amended to delete the last sentence of Section L.10 (f)(3). In the event there is a conflict between the font size of the MS Word versions of the Section L Attachments posted for the Offeror's convenience and the current version of the Section L .pdf file instructions, the Section L .pdf file instructions will control. The Offeror may amend the format for Attachment L-2 and Attachment L-3 as long as the font and 12-point size (per DOE-L-2001) for the majority of the information is utilized. If tables of information are used to supplement specific areas within the L-2 or L-3, the information must be 9-point or larger using Times New Roman or Arial font.</p>
6	L	L.16.b	Management Approach	L-28	<p>The red line mark up shows changes to this section. However, the as-revised section is identical to the draft RFP. Would DOE please verify that the final RFP is correct for this requirement.</p>	<p>The Final RFP is correct, and takes precedence over the redlined copy of the Final RFP sections.</p>
7	L	L.17.c	Basis of Estimate	L-30	<p>Please clarify the instructions for basis of estimate. The basis of estimate includes a description of scope and cost element by cost element description of the estimated cost. Based on the requirements, there appears to be a single task order and single scope that we are estimating and for which we will provide a basis of estimate (BOE). That is the transition task order.</p> <p>However, section L.17.c, states, "The Offeror shall clearly indicate for the Contract Transition, fully burdened labor rates (excluding fee/profit), and Key Personnel estimates by cost element (direct labor, indirect rates, direct materials, etc.): (1) what data is</p>	<p>The Section L.17 cost instructions will be amended to clarify the BOE requirements.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
					existing and verifiable, (2) judgmental factors applied in projection from known source data to the estimate, (3) key assumptions (not in conflict with the PWS), and (4) the basis of each cost element." This sentence states that there should be a estimate by cost element for labor rates and key personnel, but these are single cost elements and do not have an associated work scope. If our understanding is correct, we recommend that DOE move the discussion to support the basis of key personnel and fully burdened labor rates to a different section to avoid confusion associated with scope and cost element discussions of a BOE.	
8	L	L.17(h)	Offeror's Proposed Accounting System Information	L-31	Will DOE please identify which, if any, business systems (e.g., accounting, finance, project controls, HR) will be transitioned to the new contractor?	Offerors will be allowed to transition all business systems, which are Government-owned, currently being used by the current contractor.
9	L	Attachment L-6a	Transition Costs and Cost Elements	Attachment L-6a	The Form L-6a Transition Costs includes "Other Subcontract Costs" (line 30) as a cost element of the prime level direct costs. However, that cost element is not included under the "Teaming Partner/JV Costs" (line 56) Cost Elements or in Section L.17(d) Cost Elements (Page L-30). For consistency, we believe "Other Subcontract Costs" should be added to Cost Elements and teaming partners/jv costs? If not, would DOE please explain the rationale for this difference?	Attachment L-6a of the RFP will be amended for consistency.
10	L	Attachment L-6b	One Year Fully Burdened Labor Rates (excludes Fee)	Attachment L-6b	The Cell in O8 on tab Attachment L-6b of Attachment L-6 references "Column H" as the location of "Prime Contractor Fully Burdened Hourly Rate". Column H is G &A Amount. Would DOE please clarify.	Attachment L-6a of the RFP will be amended to clarify.
11	L.14 and M.2	L.14(a)(3) and M.2(a)	L.14 Key Personnel and M.2 Key Personnel	L-20 and M-5	In the final RFP, DOE deleted "DOE will evaluate the proposed key personnel authority level" from section M.2(a). The corresponding requirement in final RFP section L.14(a)(3) still includes the requirement for authority level. Should the text also be deleted in section L.14(a)(3) to align the requirements?	Yes, L.14(a)(3) will be amended to delete the text regarding key personnel authority level.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
12	L.14.e	L.14.e	Virtual Orals	L-21	The RFP states that, "DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct oral..." Would DOE please elaborate on the process that is planned for virtual orals, including the specific software to be used; plans to resolve logistical issues (i.e., software, encryption and firewall compatibility; connectivity failures); collocation of (some/all) resources; process for sharing of flip charts, white boards and notes; use of materials and other software products on computers; and handling emergent issues during orals. We believe that these issues require ahead planning and training for personnel.	If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020. In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. Plans to resolve logistical or emergent issues will be included in these instructions. If virtual orals are conducted, each Key Person is required to participate in person; but, each person's location will not be prescribed. Whether the Key Personnel (KP) team is collocated will be at the discretion of the offeror. Every effort will be made to stay as close to the in-person oral instructions as possible and to ensure that no special electronic devices or software programs will be necessary beyond a computer, smart phone or tablet needed to connect to the conferencing software with audio and video capability. For example, flip charts may simply be substituted with 8 1/2 X 11 inch paper that can be held up to the presenter's electronic device camera.
13	L.14.e.1	L.14.e (1)	Virtual Orals	L-21	The RFP states, "All of the Offeror's proposed key personnel shall actively participate in the oral problem scenarios and be physically present." It is unclear what physically present means with respect to virtual orals. Does DOE expect the Offerors proposed key personnel team to be physically present at a DOE facility or another location? Does DOE expect the entire team to be collocated?	If virtual orals are conducted, each KP is required to participate in person; but, each person's location will not be prescribed. Whether the KP team is collocated will be at the discretion of the offeror.
14	L.14.e.3.i	L.14.e.3.i	Virtual orals	L-22	In this section, DOE discusses the presentation room. Would DOE please define this with regard to a virtual orals? What is permitted in the individual's room(s) (e.g., RFP, proposal copies, visual aides)? What information/software is accessible on the communication computer? How will collaborative working with the room's white boards and flip charts work (i.e., is it virtual – working with PowerPoint or similar software)? Will cameras be used to take a picture of and communicate white boards and flip charts? Are cameras/scanners allowed/required?	Note L.14 (e)(vi) "If conducted virtually, the Offeror shall not utilize any computers (other than the ones required to host the web-based conference platform being utilized for the oral problem scenarios and oral interview), tablets, smart phones, or separate conference lines/phones, while conducting the oral presentation, and shall not bring or distribute any written or electronic materials during the oral presentation. The Offeror participant may need a separate phone/conference bridge to connect to the oral problem scenarios and oral interview, however that phone shall only be used for that purpose and no other." In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. Additional details regarding virtual orals will be included in these instructions.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
15	L.14.e.3.iii	L.14.e.3.iii	Virtual orals	L-22	This section refers to "applicable laws and statutes." To what is this referring? What are the applicable laws and statutes that cover virtual orals?	This is simply in reference to standard procurement integrity laws and statutes that will apply in any case regardless of whether oral interviews are done in person or virtually.
16	L.14.e.3.v	L.14.e.3 v	Virtual Orals	L-22	The RFP states, "Offerors may elect to utilize white boards or flip charts during the oral problem scenarios as well and can upload such items to the web-based conference platform, as appropriate." Would DOE please expand on use of white boards or flip charts during a virtual oral problem scenario? What will be the origin of the white boards or flip chart tools in a virtual meeting? Will DOE provide? Where will they be provided for access by virtual team? Please expand on the process to upload such items?	In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. Additional details regarding virtual orals will be included in these instructions.
17	L.14.e.3.v	L.14.e.3 v	Virtual orals	L-22	The RFP states, "If conducted virtually, Offerors may utilize any virtual drawing features or functions during the oral problem scenarios and oral interview provided in the web-based conference platform, as applicable." Would DOE please expand on the "web-based conference platform?"	If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020.
18	L.14.e.3.v	L.14.e.3 v	Virtual orals	L-22	The RFP indicates that a "web-based conference platform" will be used for virtual orals. To ensure a level playing field is DOE considering providing standard equipment to each bidder?	No, DOE will not provide standard equipment to each bidder. As noted above, if it is determined that virtual oral interviews will be necessary, every effort will be made to stay as close to the in-person oral instructions as possible and to ensure that no special electronic devices or software programs will be necessary beyond a computer, smart phone or tablet needed to connect to the conferencing software with audio and video capability. For example, flip charts may simply be substituted with 8 1/2 X 11 inch paper that can be held up to the presenter's electronic device camera.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
19	L.14.e.3	L.14.e.3.v and vi	Virtual orals	L-22	<p>What is the plan to ensure that the virtual platform will work with company encryption and fire walls? What are the internet requirements on the participant end? Is collocation of any/all individuals prohibited? What is the ramification if the virtual platform fails during the orals process? Are there specific certifications that companies and/or individuals will need to provide? What is the schedule for addressing logistical issues?</p>	<p>If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020. The Zoom for Government platform can support at least 100 participants from different locations. There are not specific certifications that companies and/or individuals will need to provide. In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. Plans to resolve logistical or emergent issues will be included in these instructions. If virtual orals are conducted, each KP is required to participate in person; but, each person's location will not be prescribed. Whether the KP team is collocated will be at the discretion of the offeror. The Government and the Offeror may agree to test the connection at a convenient time prior to the oral presentation. Every effort will be made to stay as close to the in-person oral instructions as possible and to ensure that no special electronic devices or software programs will be necessary beyond a computer, smart phone or tablet needed to connect to the conferencing software with audio and video capability. For example, flip charts may simply be substituted with 8 1/2 X 11 inch paper that can be held up to the presenter's electronic device camera.</p>
20	L.14.e.3	L.14.3.3.v and vi	Virtual orals	L-22 to L-23	<p>Would DOE please clarify these sections that appear to have conflict relative to the use of phones. Section vi states that smart phones are not allowed, but it also states, "The Offeror participant may need a separate phone/conference bridge to connect..." Would DOE please clarify. In addition, section v states, "...can upload such items to the web based conference platform." Does this involve taking pictures with a smart phone? Or is there another mechanism planned for capturing prepared information?</p>	<p>The offeror shall not utilize any computers (other than the ones required to host the web based conference platform being utilized for the oral presentation), tablets, smart phones, or separate conference lines/phones, while conducting the oral presentation, and shall not bring or distribute any written or electronic materials during the oral presentation.</p> <p>The offeror participant may need a separate phone/conference bridge to connect to the oral presentation, however that phone shall only be used for that purpose and no other.</p> <p>The offeror participants shall not reach back, by phone/conference bridge, email or any other means, to any other personnel or persons for assistance during the oral presentation.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
21	L.14.e	L.14.e(1)	Virtual Orals	L-21	<p>The RFP states that, "DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct orals...". We appreciate DOE's pursuit of effective alternatives given the extraordinary circumstances facing us all and respectfully ask that DOE commit now to an orals process (i.e. traditional process vs. virtual) to aid in planning. The uncertainty around potentially holding the orals virtually requires us to presuppose a multitude of alternatives that may or may not come to fruition, and attempt to train against all of them in addition to the traditional approach. Additionally, if a virtual setting is selected, we request that the process be defined as early as possible to improve the quality of the outcome and avoid significant unnecessary expense associated with preparing for multiple potential alternative approaches. Would DOE please identify which process (virtual or in-person) will be used for evaluation purposes?</p>	<p>It is the intent of DOE to conduct in-person Key Personnel (KP) oral problem scenarios and the Program Manager (PM) interviews in Idaho Falls, Idaho. For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE is tentatively planning to conduct orals Monday, August 17 – Saturday, August 22, 2020 and may extend into the week of August 24, 2020 if necessary.</p> <p>However, in the event the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interviews are unable to be conducted in-person due to COVID-19 or other extenuating circumstances, DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interview (as stated in Section L.14). For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE would tentatively conduct virtual orals in mid to late September, 2020. If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020.</p> <p>In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized.</p> <p>DOE will take all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of all parties by strictly following the guidelines provided by the Center for Disease Control and the Idaho Rebounds: Our Path to Prosperity Plan. It is imperative for DOE to provide industry the best opportunity to deliver their best team efforts while still also considering individuals' health and well-being.</p>
22	L.17 and Task Order 2	L.16(c)	Small Business Participation	L-28	<p>Task Order 2 (Attachment J-14) states "During the implementation period, the Contractor shall continue performance in the same manner as the prior contractor(s), including small business participation." Will DOE provide the incumbent contractor's small business participation and subcontracting plan for offerors to include as part of approach to subcontracting and achieving the 15% target of cumulative task order value?</p>	<p>DOE will consider this request during the post-award phase to facilitate negotiations of the Implementation Task Order.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
23	L.17	L.17(b)(5) and (e)	Fully Burdened Labor Rates and Fringe Benefits	L-29 and L-30	These sections state that the offeror has the ability to propose its own labor rates or fringe benefit rates consistent with the references cited in each section. Task Order 2 Implementation Period (Attachment J-14) and Task Order 4 IWTU Operations Task Order (Attachment J-16) state that the "Contractor shall utilize the same or similar workforce skill mix, talent and technical capabilities as the incumbent contractor." Task Order 3, ICP Essential Mission (Attachment J-15) does not contain a similar statement. Should offerors assume for purposes of pricing that it is required to utilize the same or similar workforce skill mix, talent, and technical capabilities as the incumbent contractor or does the contractor have the ability to perform with a different skill mix, talent, and technical capabilities than the incumbent? Will DOE provide the incumbent workforce skill mix, talent, and technical capabilities? Or should offerors assume that the labor categories provided represent the incumbent's workforce skill mix, talent and technical capabilities?	Correct, Task Order 3, ICP Essential Mission (Attachment J-15) does not contain a similar statement. This will be handled posted award in the RTP for Task Order 3.
24	Attachments J-14 and J-16	Task Order 2 (Attachment J-14) and Task Order 4 (Attachment J-16)	Workforce Skill Mix	Attachment J-14, pg. 2; Attachment J-16, pg. 2	Will DOE provide the incumbent workforce skill mix, talent, and technical capabilities? Or should offerors assume that the labor categories provided represent the incumbent's workforce skill mix, talent and technical capabilities.	The Offerors shall assume the labor categories represent the incumbent workforce skill mix, talent and technical capabilities.
25	J-2	J-2 List of Contract Deliverables	Deliverable T-14. Radiation Protection Program (RPP) Within 180 days after the end of contract transition	J-2-4	Radiation Protection Program (RPP) is shown as Transition Deliverable, however, it is not shown as due until within 180 days after the end of transition. Would DOE please clarify?	Attachment J-2 List of Contract Deliverables will be amended to clarify as follows: # T-14 will be amended to state "adopt or submit a new RPP for approval prior to end of transition." # 95 will be amended to add a note that states "If RPP is not adopted during transition."
26	M.2	M.2.d	Virtual Orals	M-6	The evaluation criteria for orals problem scenarios did not change from the draft RFP and reflect a standard oral scenario process. Is DOE considering changes to the evaluation process/criteria as the oral process is being developed?	DOE does not anticipate changes to the Section M evaluation criteria for virtual orals.
27	M.4	M.4(a)	Evaluation Factor -- Management Approach, Contract Transition Approach	M-8	Section M.4(a) states that "DOE will evaluate the Offeror's approach to...for the safe, effective and efficient transfer of responsibility for execution of the Master IDIQ Contract with little or no disruption to ongoing operations." Should offerors assume that Task Orders 2 and 4 will be issued during the transition period in order for there not to be disruption or little disruption to ongoing activities?	Yes, it is DOE's intent to issue Request for Task Order Proposals (RTPs) for TOs 2, 3, and 4 during the 90-day transition period.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
28	M.5	M.5, 2nd paragraph	Realism of Costs and Understanding	M-9	Section M.5 states, "These analyses will be used to determine whether the proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed and reflect a clear understanding of the requirements." Is the reference to "these analyses" a reference to the cost realism analysis for the offeror's approach and costs for the Contract Transition mentioned in the first part of this paragraph? It appears based on the 3rd sentence in the second paragraph of Section M.5, that only a cost analysis will be done on the estimated direct productive labor hour costs and the proposed key personnel costs. Will DOE clarify the considerations used in evaluating key personnel costs? If there is a realism analysis conducted of the estimated direct productive labor hour costs, what will be taken into consideration by DOE in determining whether an offeror has a clear understanding of the requirements?	Section M.5 of the RFP will be amended to clarify.
29	L-15	L-15(h)	Past Performance References	L-26	L-15 (h) states "The Offeror shall provide the Past Performance Questionnaire contained in Attachment L-4, Past Performance Cover Letter and Questionnaire, to the appropriate contract client reference within the Program Office/Project Office and/or the Contracting Office for completion for those contracts described in paragraph (a) for which no contractor performance data is available in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)." Small businesses have had minimal to no opportunity to perform as a prime contractor in the past four years, and thus are unlikely to have projects available in CPARS. On subcontracts/contracts with the DOE prime contractors, we have found it difficult to obtain PPQs from the Prime Contractor reference on those projects, as there is frequently a conflict of interest for the reference (i.e., direct competitor on this procurement or teammate). In these cases, we believe there is a high potential that the PPQ is filled out neutrally and does not fairly represent performance. Due to this conflict of interest, is it acceptable to (1) reference DOE to the CPARS for the prime contractor to whom we were a subcontractor or (2) provide the PPQ to the DOE Contracting Officer for the reference contract on which we were a subcontractor?	The Government requires that clients of entities responding to the solicitation be identified and their participation in the evaluation process be requested. In the event a DOE Prime Contractor is contacted for information by the Government on work a subcontractor has performed, the DOE Prime Contractor is authorized to respond to those inquiries. As required in Section H, Subcontracted Work of this RFP, it is the Government's expectation that DOE Prime Contractors will respond to past performance inquiries for subcontractors upon request from DOE and other Federal agencies.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
30	L-15	L-15(h)	Past Performance references	L-26	There are cases where the contracting officer or standard reference for a past performance project for a small business subcontract with a DOE prime contractor has a conflict of interest on this procurement or the knowledgeable contracting officer is no longer available. In some cases the contracting officer or company representative communicates that they are unwilling to provide a reference and will not complete the PQQ form. Is it acceptable to provide an alternative reference in those cases? For example, is it acceptable to use a knowledgeable DOE representative? Is it acceptable to use a retired prime contractor employee? Or will DOE define an acceptable alternate method of obtaining past performance reference information in such circumstances?	The Government requires that clients of entities responding to the solicitation be identified and their participation in the evaluation process be requested. In the event a DOE Prime Contractor is contacted for information by the Government on work a subcontractor has performed, the DOE Prime Contractor is authorized to respond to those inquiries. As required in Section H, Subcontracted Work of this RFP, it is the Government's expectation that DOE Prime Contractors will respond to past performance inquiries for subcontractors upon request from DOE and other Federal agencies.
31	L-15	L-15(c)	Small Business Past Performance	L-25	There have been very few large-scale DOE cleanup projects set-aside for small businesses over the past 10 years. Therefore, small businesses who are named as teaming subcontractors are at a competitive disadvantage in presenting past performance projects of similar size to the work they are proposed to complete on this ICP procurement. Please reconsider the past performance requirements, as it pertains to small business teaming partners, for size and currency to encourage bidders to pre-identify meaningful work scope as part of their commitment to small business subcontracting similar to the past performance timeframes seen in Department of Defense procurements (i.e. 10 years.). We suggest that specific requirements for small business team subcontractor past performance projects be include as follows: For small businesses named as teaming partners, provide information on contracts that are most similar in scope and complexity, as defined above in paragraph (b), to that portion of the work that the Teaming Subcontractor is proposed to perform under this solicitation for projects currently in progress or completed in the last 5 years.	No change. Past performance information shall be provided for contracts that are currently being performed or have a period of performance end date within the last four (4) years from the original solicitation issuance date.
32	B and L	B.5 (a)(1) and L.17(b)2	B. Suppliers or Services and Price/Costs Take Order Fee and/Profit Ceiling and L. Proposal Preparation Instructions Cost and Fee	B 6 and L 27	The description of the Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee (CFIF) Task Order maximum fee amount in Section B, DOE-B-2015 is different than what is requested in Section L-17(b)(2). DOE-B-2015 states that "the maximum fee ceiling shall not exceed 15 percent of the target cost." Section L-17(b)(2) states that "the Offer shall propose a target fee ceiling percentage that shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the estimated cost of CPIF Task Orders." Could DOE please clarify this discrepancy.	This is not a discrepancy. Section L.17(b)(2) requires the offeror to propose a target fee ceiling no greater than 10%, not a maximum fee ceiling. In accordance with FAR 52.216-10, Incentive Fee, and "DOE-B-2003 Cost Plus Incentive Fee Task Order: Total Estimated Cost and Incentive Fee (Oct 2014) (Revised)," there are both target fees and maximum fees established for CPIF type task orders.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
33	B	B.13	Performance Management Incentive	B-14	<p>The meaning of the second paragraph excerpted below is not clear:</p> <p>“The Performance Management Incentive (PMI) is a contract-wide incentive measured individually among all active Task Orders (excluding Transition). The PMI is exclusive of any Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan. For any active Task Order, available PMI fee may be reduced unilaterally by the CO based on the degree of non-achievement. Fee actions described in this clause will not duplicate any other fee action.”</p> <p>Will the PMI be applied to all task order types described in Clause B.2, including Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Cost Plus Award Fee, Cost Plus Incentive Fee, and Firm Fixed Price? If so, will there be separate evaluation criteria for a Cost Plus Award Fee task orders and Cost Plus Incentive Fee task orders? Are these separate evaluation criteria what is meant by a “Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan” in this paragraph? Is the “Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan” the same thing as the “Performance Evaluation Management Plan” referred to in the ICP Essential Missions Task Order? Is the \$2M allocated for the Performance Management Incentive in Clause B.13 in addition to the maximum fee amounts in Clause B.5 as proposed by the Offeror in Section L.17(b)(2)?</p>	<p>Yes. The PMI will be applied to all active task order types.</p> <p>The same evaluation criteria will apply for each active Task Order and is a separate fee pool from any other fee structures negotiated for the individual Task Orders.</p> <p>There will be no separate evaluation criteria. The CO will establish a quarterly evaluation process that is separate from any Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan required for a CPAF Task Order.</p> <p>The ICP Essential Missions Task Order will be revised to correctly read Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan.</p> <p>The \$2M must be included in the maximum fee amounts described in Section B.5. The estimated PMI fee allocation will be provided to the Contractor when Requests for Task Order Proposals (RTP) are issued.</p>
34	H	H.51(g) and H.52	Task Ordering Procedure and Subcontracting Work	H--76 and H-79	<p>Is the correct interpretation of Clause H.51(g) and Clause H.52 that the Offeror is required to subcontract only 15 percent of the cumulative value of Task Orders under the contract to small businesses, but still have a minimum small business subcontracting goal of 45 percent?</p>	<p>Yes, 15% is tied to the cumulative value of the contract. The 45% is tied to the subcontracting base.</p>
35	H	H.66	Organizational Conflict of Interest	H-88	<p>Is the correct interpretation of Clause H.51(g) and Clause H.52 that the Offeror is required to subcontract only 15 percent of the cumulative value of Task Orders under the contract to small businesses, but still have a minimum small business subcontracting goal of 45 percent?</p>	<p>Note: This appears to be an unintentionally repeated question. The reference section/subsection, Subject/Title & Page number do not match the question. No response is given due to the inconsistency.</p>
36	L	L.14 (e)(3)(iii)	Key Personnel Logistics	L-22	<p>Please clarify what is meant by the following statement: By participating in the oral problem scenarios and oral interview, the Offeror acknowledges that it is in full compliance with all solicitation terms and conditions, in accordance with applicable laws and statutes. Since the Offeror is already required to submit its representations and certifications in Section K, is this statement included to ensure that the Offeror will follow the instructions given for a virtual oral problem scenario and oral interview?</p>	<p>This is simply in reference to standard procurement integrity laws and statutes that will apply in any case regardless of whether oral interviews are done in person or virtually.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
37	L and M	L-16 (c) and M-4 (c)	Factor 3 Management Approach and Evaluation Factor - Management Approach	L-28 and M-8	Given DOE's policy on providing the maximum amount of subcontracting opportunities to small businesses, consider revising the evaluation of the Offerors' approach to small business participation from the minimum requirement of 15 percent to the minimum subcontracting goal requirement of 45 percent in accordance with the Offerors' Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Such a revision would ensure that there is no inconsistency or contradiction with the requirement to make the Small Business Subcontracting Plan a responsibility factor in Volume I.	There is no change anticipated to Factor 3. The Master Subcontracting Plan is not a requirement for evaluation in source selection, but rather, a Volume I responsibility determination.
38	M	M-5	Evaluation Factor - Cost and Fee/ Profits	M-9	Please clarify whether the "cost analysis" that will be performed for Offerors' fully burdened labor rates will actually be a "cost realism analysis." Will a cost realism analysis of fully burdened labor rates also be used for establishing the evaluated price to determine best value? Will the percentage of fee proposed by Offerors be used in the best value determination?	Section M.5 of the RFP will be amended to clarify. DOE will perform a price reasonableness analysis on the Offeror's fully burdened labor rates. The price reasonableness as it related to the fully burdened labor rates applied to the provided Direct Productive Labor Hours (DPLH) will be used as part of the best value determination. The proposed fee percentage applied to the funding dollars provided will be used in the best value determination.
39	B	B.2 and B.6	Table B-1 Master IDIQ Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) Structures and Funding Profile Table	B-3 and B-7	Table B-1 identifies the Maximum Value of Services at \$6.4 Billion with a contract ordering period of Ten (10) years from the effective date of contract where as Section B.6 indicates a \$6.360 funding profile over a 15-year period (FY21 to FY36). Please clarify.	The following clarifications are provided. From B.6 footnote under funding table, "**FY 2031 – 2036 funding may be available if Task Orders are issued that extend beyond the 10 year ordering period." From F.3 Period of Performance: (a) " The contract ordering period shall be ten (10) years from the effective date of this contract. Issuance of Task Orders will not occur beyond the end of the contract ordering period." (c) "Performance of all Task Orders issued before the end of the contract ordering period shall not exceed five years beyond the end of the contract ordering period."

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
40	L and M	L.15 and M.3	Past Performance	Several	<p>Clarification on L.15 and M.3 DOE Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II – Past Performance: DOE EM officials have made numerous assertions that it desires to broaden its contractor responses and is actively encouraging commercial and high hazard nuclear and chemical operators to lead or have meaningful participation in Environmental Management solicitations for cleanup at Idaho and other sites using the ID/IQ concept for closure contracts. In order for commercial companies to get appropriate past performance credit for operating facilities they own and that provide services and products (similar to the multiple task order concept envisioned for this procurement) to several customers from a single facility, DOE EM must consider alternate criteria for demonstrating past performance besides a single contract basis. Numerous question and comments have been submitted and discussions held by industry with DOE EM in order to enable past performance from commercial operations (plant and service based) that are characterized by multiple customer delivery at large operating plants or multi-year service contracts and delivered at multiple customer sites. These differ from, only in the nature of the contract form, the single contract based performance scope typical of DOE government site operations and closure projects. Generally, the government will enter into a single contract for operation of a government owned facilities (e.g. DUF6 Conversion Facilities at Piketon and Paducah, or operations of the Direct Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW) at Hanford). Commercial nuclear and chemical operators own and operate facilities to produce products for multiple customers. This operating and manufacturing approach requires companies to manage multiple product lines with multiple product specifications.</p>	See below for response.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
40	L and M	L.15 and M.3	Past Performance	Several	<p>(continued): Additionally, they operate their plants in near 24/7 operational configuration and schedules delivering product and services that are task order specified and contracted. These contracts when considered for an entire facility, are in many ways similar to the indefinite-quantity indefinite-delivery concept contemplated by DOE. When taken as a whole these commercial operations and services contracts demonstrate scope, size and complexity similar to operations of many EM cleanup/closure scopes of work, with total combined cost to operate and receipts in excess \$500M per year. When evaluating a single customer contract at a commercially operating plant or service arrangement, a single customer contract value often represents a small fraction of the overall facility operating/service revenue stream. Obviously, a single contract fails to demonstrate scope and size. Again, when the total annualized contracts of all the companies requesting services and fuel production are combined the size and complexity often exceeds the size and complexity associated with a typical Department of Energy operation. This is illustrated by the complexity and management sophistication associated with managing production of multiple products (with various specifications) and overall operations of the facility (workforce, maintenance/availability, and waste management operations). The evaluation of an owner/operator facility performance and relevancy is severely diminished or lost without taking into consideration the numerous product and service contracts, and customers simultaneously served. A listing of customers could be provided with a sample past performance questionnaire submitted by one, or a couple of the largest customers. This would provide a fair and directly relevant measure of past performance for such a commercial operation. Discussions with several EM officials, including one over the last three weeks, have indicated that such an approach could be considered to further the viability of commercial operator participation in EM procurements. Will EM change the past performance criteria in the Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) to include full facility operation of commercial plants, and/or multi-year services contracts with the same customer serving several operations, when a full listing of customers (commercial contracts) and a sample of those customers providing a past performance questionnaire is provided to demonstrate size, scope and complexity of the full commercial facility operations?</p>	<p><u>Question posed (pasted here for ease of viewing):</u> Will EM change the past performance criteria in the Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) to include full facility operation of commercial plants, and/or multi-year services contracts with the same customer serving several operations, when a full listing of customers (commercial contracts) and a sample of those customers providing a past performance questionnaire is provided to demonstrate size, scope and complexity of the full commercial facility operations?</p> <p><u>DOE Response:</u> If the reference contract is for facility operation of a commercial plant, the L-3 form may be utilized to reflect the contract or binding agreement with a client for the referenced services performed. The past performance questionnaire should represent the same contract or binding agreement reflected on the L-3 form.</p> <p>Consistent with item #11 of the L-3 Form, a single contract or binding agreement with multiple instances of similar services/products to the same customer may be utilized as a single reference contract L-3 submission.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
41	Section J	J-2	Task Order Proposal Transition Deliverables (T-7, T-8, T-9)	J-2-4	In Attachment J-2, the first 52 deliverable numbers are preceded by "T" implying that these deliverables are due during the 90-day transition period. This includes deliverables T-7, T-8, and T-9 which are for the submittal of Task Order Proposals TO2, TO3, and TO4. However, the C.2 Contract Transition scope of work does not mention any activities associated with task order definitization, proposal development or negotiations. Please add language to C.2 to make it clear that task order proposal development is part of the scope to be conducted during the transition period and confirm that these deliverables are, in fact, due during the Transition period.	While the proposals for TOs 2, 3, and 4 may be required during the 90-day transition period, these are not considered scope activities to be priced under the Transition TO. The RTPs for TOs 2, 3, and 4 will include necessary details for appropriate cost accounting and billing of the TO 2, 3, and 4 proposal development costs. Proposal costs for post award task orders will be reimbursed in accordance with the Contractor's disclosure statement; and must be allowable, allocable, and reasonable. The Contractor's proposal for TO 2 - Implementation Period must be prepared and negotiated before the end of the transition period. The due dates for the Contractor's proposals for TOs 3 and 4 will be finalized post award in the respective RTPs.
42	Section L	L.10(c)(4)	Submission of Proposals -- Paper and USB Flash Drive Copies	L-7	Due to current restrictions and health and safety concerns associated with the COVID pandemic, would DOE consider eliminating the requirements for paper hard copies and USB Flash Drives to be mailed or hand carried and instead require only electronic submittal. The process required to print multiple hard copies and gain wet signatures for originals involves a lot of close contact integration. In addition, under current conditions, traditional overnight mail services are not guaranteeing onetime delivery. The virus can remain active on plastic surfaces for three days and so the packaging, binders and USB flash drives themselves may present a hazard. Many other US Government Agencies have modified their proposal submission requirements to require only electronic submittal. We greatly appreciate DOE's consideration. Please update Section L.10(c)(4) to delete hard copy/paper and USB flash drive submittal requirements.	DOE does not anticipate changing the hard copy proposal submission requirements.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
43	Section L	L.14(e)(3)	Oral Problem Scenario and Interview Logistics	L-22 to L-23	<p>To allow proper time for advanced logistics and preparations, can DOE commit to notify Offerors a minimum of 30 days prior to the orals on the final planned logistics (traditional in person versus virtual). These logistics will have a major impact key personnel preparations for orals and adequate time needs to be allowed for training and familiarity on virtual methods and tools as well as system dry runs, etc. This advance notice would be greatly appreciated. Please update L.14(e) to reflect a 30-day advance notice on traditional/in-person versus virtual orals.</p>	<p>It is the intent of DOE to conduct in-person Key Personnel (KP) oral problem scenarios and the Program Manager (PM) interviews in Idaho Falls, Idaho. For Offerors’ planning purposes, DOE is tentatively planning to conduct orals Monday, August 17 – Saturday, August 22, 2020 and may extend into the week of August 24, 2020 if necessary.</p> <p>However, in the event the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interviews are unable to be conducted in-person due to COVID-19 or other extenuating circumstances, DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interview (as stated in Section L.14). For Offerors’ planning purposes, DOE would tentatively conduct virtual orals in mid to late September, 2020. If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020.</p> <p>In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized.</p> <p>DOE will take all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of all parties by strictly following the guidelines provided by the Center for Disease Control and the Idaho Rebounds: Our Path to Prosperity Plan. It is imperative for DOE to provide industry the best opportunity to deliver their best team efforts while still also considering individuals’ health and well-being.</p>
44	Section L	L.14(e)(3)	Web-Based Conference Platform	L-22 to L-23	<p>Please clarify in Section L.14(e)(3) that DOE will specify the web-based conference platform and that all Offeror's will conduct orals using the same web-based conference platform designated by DOE. Please update the RFP to include the specific name and version of the web-based platform tool that DOE will be use for the orals (i.e., WebEx, Microsoft Teams, etc.). This information is needed so Offeror's may train their key personnel on use of the specific tool and so Offeror's may identify writing or virtual drawing tools that interface well with DOE's selected web-based platform. Please amend the RFP to provide this information as soon as possible.</p>	<p>If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020. The Zoom for Government platform can support at least 100 participants from different locations. There are not specific certifications that companies and/or individuals will need to provide. All Offerors shall conduct orals using the same web-based conference platform designated by DOE.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
45	Section L	L.14(e)(3)(vi)	Virtual Orals Controls	L-22 to L-23	<p>To ensure the ability of DOE to monitor compliance with the instructions and requirements in L.14(e)(3)(vi), please provide additional instructions and requirements that specify 1) the approximate size of the room to be used for the Project Manager Interview and Oral Scenarios, 2) the location of key personnel for the orals scenario (whether they all need to be in one large room wearing masks and practicing social distancing or whether they should each be located in their own separate room). It is important that each Offeror Team do it the same way to allow the same level of interaction, etc. For example if some do not wear protective masks then DOE will see their facial expressions and if another team wears masks, DOE will not, etc. 3) Placement of observation cameras with the provision of video feed back to DOE for DOE to monitor the entire area of the room(s), including doors and windows, where the oral interview and oral problem scenarios are taking place. So in addition to the video link to transmit key person video and audio there would be separate links to monitor the environment the orals are taking place in. 4) Provide instruction that key personnel hands and faces must be positioned to be easily visible by DOE through camera positioning at all times during the interview/problem scenarios. Such controls are necessary to provide the same level of security and control that is provided during traditional in-person orals. Alternatively, DOE could send an official monitor to each orals location to observe the virtual orals so long as social distancing could be practiced and the gathering size does not exceed the recommended not more than 10 persons. This would result in restricting the maximum number of key people allowed to 9 plus the monitor. Alternatively, DOE could eliminate the orals problem scenarios and only conduct one-on-one virtual interviews, which are more closely controlled.</p>	<p>In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized.</p>
46	L.15/M.3(a)	Factor 2 (a-e)	Past Performance	L-24	<p>DOE has stated that it will evaluate each member companies past performance for purpose of size, scope and complexity to the scope for which that company is being proposed and has previously advised during one-on-one sessions this an aggregate evaluation of all 3 projects (or 2 if a subcontractor) – meaning, all three Past Performance projects in aggregate must add up to meet the size, scope and complexity of its proposed scope. The department should consider amending L-15 and/or M.3(a) to specifically clarify the past performance of each offeror is evaluated in aggregate.</p>	<p>Each reference contract will be evaluated for scope, size, and complexity. No further amendments to the RFP are anticipated.</p> <p>In accordance with Section M.3 (d), DOE will evaluate the Offeror and all members of a teaming arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1) and any Teaming Subcontractors, in accordance with the work each entity is proposed to perform to cover the work scope described in the Master IDIQ PWS. The resulting rating will consider whether the Offeror’s team as a whole (including Teaming Subcontractors) have demonstrated relevancy to all PWS requirements.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
47	L.15	Factor 2 (a-e)	Past Performance	L-24	<p>Per paragraph L-15 (c.) Teaming Subcontractor past performance. “The Offeror shall provide information on contracts that are most similar in scope, size, and complexity, as defined above in paragraph (b), to that portion of the work that the Teaming Subcontractor is proposed to perform under this solicitation.” It is assumed based on the language (plurality of contracts) that the scope of the teaming subcontractor could be represented by an amalgamation of those relevant contracts that contain scope, cost, and complexity relevant to the Teaming Subcontractor ICP scope. Therefore in Attachment L-3 #5 is it allowable to list multiple contracts that when combined provide a comparable scope, cost, and complexity to the Teaming Subcontractor scope. This would appear to be reasonable as the teaming subcontractor scope may span multiple elements of the PWS on ICP as well as require multiple past contracts to capture relevant Past Performance. Additionally, this allows for broader competition which supports the concept of full and open competition which in turn drives efficiency. If this is unavailable many large companies with specific technology or technical differentiators to contribute to Idaho’s mission, may be left out of the acquisition.</p>	<p>It is not allowable to list multiple contracts within item #5 of the Attachment L-3 form, and each reference contract will be evaluated for scope, size, and complexity. Consistent with item #11 of the L-3 Form, a single IDIQ contract with multiple task orders to the same customer may be utilized as a single reference contract L-3 submission.</p> <p>In accordance with Section M.3 (d), DOE will evaluate the Offeror and all members of a teaming arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1) and any Teaming Subcontractors, in accordance with the work each entity is proposed to perform to cover the work scope described in the Master IDIQ PWS. The resulting rating will consider whether the Offeror’s team as a whole (including Teaming Subcontractors) have demonstrated relevancy to all PWS requirements.</p> <p>DOE-EM made further revisions to the scope, size, and complexity definitions in the Final RFP to enhance competition.</p>
48	M.3	(a-b)	DOE-M-2008 Evaluation Factor - Past Performance	M-6, M-7	<p>In an IDIQ contract the size of any given task can vary between the stated minimum and maximum values stated in Clause I.47, 52.216-19, a named teaming subcontractor that is a large business may be teamed for various work scope with the fee share and amount of participation undefined; that is, the fee share and amount of task participation would be defined upon receipt and negotiation of the individual task order. Indeed, in an IDIQ structure a team may choose to have a large business teaming subcontractor for certain intended scopes of work that will only be negotiated into certain IDIQ’s, and the ability to determine the size of the scope, the value and therefore the relative share of that company’s participation to determine the Past Performance size standard is unknown. In reference to M.3 DOE-M-2008, how does DOE intend to evaluate Past Performance of a named large business teaming subcontractor if that named subcontractor is a scope based partner and it’s percent or dollar share of the award and/or fee cannot be determined given the unknown value of the scope areas in an IDIQ contract?</p>	<p>The RFP will be amended to delete item 14 from the L-3 form. Each Offeror will be evaluated on performing work similar in scope, size, and complexity to the portion of the Master IDIQ PWS that each entity is proposed to perform to assess the Offeror’s potential success in performing the work required by the contract. Similar size is defined as a dollar value (approximate average annual value in relation to proposed work).</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
49	L.15	Factor 2 (a-e)	Past Performance	L-24	The 4 year lookback period that DOE has for this RFP does not appear to recognize that DOE and most federal agencies award contracts on 5 year base, often with options that extend to 10 years. This would appear to dismiss the past performance developed during the previous cycle of acquisitions from successful contractors who may have had previous experience on a project but did not win the next round of acquisitions (potentially 5 years ago, but with past performance still readily applicable to the work). And in some cases, small businesses or others have had to not-compete for projects they may have had as prime, but may still be performing similar work as a subcontractor but now to another company that could be a competitor on this RFP. Request past performance be based on up to 5 years, which aligns with Federal / DOE acquisitions cycle as well as supporting the maintenance of a robust contractor base.	No change. Past performance information shall be provided for contracts that are currently being performed or have a period of performance end date within the last four (4) years from the original solicitation issuance date.
50	Attachment L-6	Attachment L-6(a) worksheet	Transition Costs	NA	Question: If an offeror has multiple JV partners or teaming subcontractors, should rows 56-95 in the Attachment L-6(a) worksheet in the Attachment L-6 workbook be repeated for each JV teaming partner(s) and/or teaming subcontractor(s)?	Yes.
51	Attachment L-6	Attachment L-6(a) and Attachment L-6(e) worksheets	Transition Costs and Estimating Flat File	NA	The estimating flat file in the Attachment L-6(e) worksheet in the Attachment L-6 workbook is inconsistent with the Attachment L-6(a) worksheet, as it does not allow for a prime contractor to add G&A (if applicable) to a teaming subcontractor cost that may include G&A as well. Question: Can the columns of the estimating flat file be modified to account for this cost element or will a new Attachment L-6 be provided to address this issue?	Attachment L-6(e) will be amended to allow for the prime contractor to add a column for Prime Contractor's G&A.
52	L, Attachment L-6	L.10(c)(2), Attachment L-6(a) and Attachment L-6(e) worksheets	Transition Costs and Estimating Flat File	NA	On page L-7, it states: "Subcontractor submissions of proprietary information may provide a password protected document file to the prime and share the password with the CO. The subcontractor proposal must adhere to the proposal due date/time in the solicitation and be submitted by the prime Offeror via FedConnect." Question: If an offeror has teaming subcontractors that prefer to submit cost details in a sealed envelope, should subcontractors complete the required details in Transition Costs worksheet (Attachment L-6(a)) and Estimating Flat file worksheet (Attachment L-6(e)) and submit them separately? Or will the DOE provide separate files to accommodate sealed bid details from subcontractors?	Yes. DOE will NOT be providing separate files to accommodate sealed bid details from subcontractors.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
53	M	M.5	M.5 Evaluation Factor – Cost and Fee/Profit	M-9	<p>The total evaluated price is defined as follows: For purposes of determining the best value, the evaluated price will be the total of the proposed fee/profit (all fee/profit proposed by Task Order type) for a one-year period (FY 2022), costs for Key Personnel (FY 2022), costs for the FY 2022 fully burdened labor rates (excluding fee) applied to the DOE provided Estimated Direct Productive Labor Hours, and realistic costs for the Contract Transition Task Order period. If offerors propose more than the 3 required key positions, their costs for key personnel (FY22) would most likely be higher than offerors who only propose the 3 required key positions.</p> <p>Question: Will DOE make any adjustments to how the total evaluated price is calculated to account for differences in the number of key personnel proposed so the offerors who propose more than 3 key personnel are not penalized for having a high price? It is recommended that the total evaluated price is revised to only include the cost of the 3 required key positions.</p>	<p>No. The Offeror must propose the KP it believes will be best for its proposal. The evaluation and the trade-off considerations by the Source Selection Authority will consider the number of KP verses the KP total cost in a way that does not bias the evaluation to a certain number of KPs. In addition, M.5 (b) states: The Evaluation Factors for Technical and Management proposal (Vol II), when combined, are significantly more important than the total evaluated price (Vol III).</p> <p>M.7 Basis for Award, states: "The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior Technical and Management Proposal than making an award at the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one Offeror's Technical and Management Proposal over another. Thus, to the extent that Offerors' Technical and Management Proposals are evaluated as close or similar in merit, the evaluated price is more likely to be a determining factor in selection for award."</p>
54	CJ	C.2.1Attachment J-2	INL Mandatory and Optional Site Services Deliverable T-4	C-13J-2-4	<p>Comment: C.2.1 last paragraph states: "By end of contract transition, the Contractor shall establish a formal interface agreement with the INL contractor ... Section J, Attachment J-4, List of INL Mandatory and Optional Site Services... This formal interface agreement shall be submitted to DOE for <u>concurrence</u>." <i>[underline added]</i> This contract deliverable is included in Attachment J-2, List of Contract Deliverables, at T-4, Interface Agreements; and the DOE Action is identified as "Approve". Please resolve the discrepancy.</p>	<p>Added an additional deliverable, T-5, for the interface agreement for the INL Mandatory and Optional Site Services.</p>
55	L	L.11(b)(4)-(5)	DOE-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume I – Offer and Other Documents – Alternate II, Alternate III, Alternate IV, Alternate V, and Alternate VI (Oct. 2015)	L-12	<p>Comment: L.11(b)(4) and L.11(b)(5) indicate that the DOE would like Attachments L-6 and L-7 included in Volume I. These two attachments contain cost and pricing data. Please confirm that Attachments L-6 and L-7 are only to be included in Volume III.</p>	<p>The documents must be submitted in accordance with Vol I and Vol III instructions.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response														
56	L	L.11 (k) (2)	Small Business Subcontracting Plan	L-15	<p>Paragraph (2) reads, in part: "To be considered acceptable, the Offeror's plan shall address, in adequate detail, and shall contain all elements required in FAR 52.219-9, except goals. Failure by a large business Offeror to submit and/or negotiate a subcontracting plan that addresses each element identified in FAR 52.219-9, except goals, in adequate detail may make the Offeror ineligible for award of a contract."</p> <p>Comment/Question: The requirement incorporates FAR 52.219-9. Paragraph (d) (1) instructs offerors to provide "separate goals" for socio-economic categories. Does the referenced requirement mean that offeror's Master Small Business Subcontracting Plans should not include goals?</p>	<p>Correct, the Offeror's Master Small Business Subcontracting Plans should not include goals. In accordance with FAR 52.219-9 Definitions, a "Master subcontracting plan means a subcontracting plan that contains all the required elements of an individual subcontracting plan, except goals, and may be incorporated into individual subcontracting plans, provided the master subcontracting plan has been approved."</p>														
57	L	L.11 (k) (3); Table L-3	Small Business Subcontracting Plan	L-15 - L-16	<p>Paragraph (3) reads, in part: "The Offeror shall establish separate small business subcontracting goals at the Task Order level (with the exception of the Transition Task Order) that afford small businesses with the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in Contract performance consistent with efficient performance. In developing its proposed separate small business subcontracting goals, the Offeror shall establish minimum goals for each small business category as follows (Table L-3)."</p> <p>Comment/Question: Are the goals in Table L-3 mandated minimum goals for each Task Order or are they overall goals to be achieved for the entire contract? Having the goals in Table L-3 as overall goals for the entire contract will enable offerors to approach subcontracting for each Task Order more strategically. For example, an offeror may use a highly capable subcontractor who qualifies as an SB in specific socio-economic category for Task Order A but not Task Order B. Conversely, a separate subcontractor who qualifies as a SB in a different socio-economic category may be better suited for Task Order B. Having subcontractors exceed these goals by Task Order will enable offerors to meet the goals in Table L-3 for the overall contract.</p>	<p>Refer to Section H.51 Task Ordering Procedure, paragraph (g): (g) With the exception of the Transition Task Order, the Contractor's Task Order Proposals shall include separate small business subcontracting goals that afford small businesses with the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in Task Order performance consistent with efficient performance. In developing its proposed separate small business subcontracting goals, the Contractor shall establish minimum goals for each small business category for each Task Order to ensure overall cumulative compliance with the following small business subcontracting goals for the Master IDIQ Contract:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Small Business Category</u></th> <th style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"><u>Small Business Goals</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Small Businesses (categories below are subsets within this category)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small Disadvantaged Business</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Women-Owned Small Business</td> <td style="text-align: right;">5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>*The small business subcategories may not necessarily add up to the overall percentage in the Small Business category, since some small businesses may not fall into any of the subcategories, while others may fall into more than one subcategory.</i></p> <p>Proposed small business subcontracting goals shall be the percent of total subcontracted work specified in each TO in compliance with the Contractor's Master SB Subcontracting Plan, the requirements of the Section H clause entitled, Subcontracted Work, and FAR 52.219-9. With each TO Proposal, the Contractor shall submit a revised Section J, Attachment J-9, Master SB Subcontracting Plan.</p>	<u>Small Business Category</u>	<u>Small Business Goals</u>	Small Businesses (categories below are subsets within this category)	45%	Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)	3%	Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)	3%	Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone)	3%	Small Disadvantaged Business	5%	Women-Owned Small Business	5%
<u>Small Business Category</u>	<u>Small Business Goals</u>																			
Small Businesses (categories below are subsets within this category)	45%																			
Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)	3%																			
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)	3%																			
Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone)	3%																			
Small Disadvantaged Business	5%																			
Women-Owned Small Business	5%																			

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
58	I	Table I-1	FAR 52.219-9	I-4	The FAR 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan is dated Aug 2018. Comment/Question: The latest revision for this FAR is Mar 2020. Should offerors use the latest revision?	The RFP will be amended to reflect the most recent FAR update of June 2020.
59	L.10	(e)(3)	Submission of proposals	L-9	The final RFP states that "Except as may be provided elsewhere in the solicitation (including paragraph (f)(2) below), Offerors shall not cross reference to other volumes of the proposal and shall provide complete information within the appropriate volume". Question: Paragraph (f)(2) does not contain cross reference table information, please clarify whether a cross reference table is required for submission.	A cross reference table is not required for submission.
60	L.14	(e)	Oral problem scenarios – key personnel, and oral interview – Program Manager	L-21	This section states that "DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the oral problem scenarios with each Offeror's proposed key personnel team." and "DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the oral interview with each Offeror's proposed Program Manager." Question: When will DOE confirm that oral problem scenarios and PM interview will be held either in person or using virtual procedures? If the sessions will be held remotely, will DOE provide the "virtual procedures" so bidders can prepare for the meetings? We recommend that the oral problem scenarios and PM interview be held in person if at all possible.	It is the intent of DOE to conduct in-person Key Personnel (KP) oral problem scenarios and the Program Manager (PM) interviews in Idaho Falls, Idaho. For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE is tentatively planning to conduct orals Monday, August 17 – Saturday, August 22, 2020 and may extend into the week of August 24, 2020 if necessary. However, in the event the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interviews are unable to be conducted in-person due to COVID-19 or other extenuating circumstances, DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interview (as stated in Section L.14). For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE would tentatively conduct virtual orals in mid to late September, 2020. If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020. In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. DOE will take all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of all parties by strictly following the guidelines provided by the Center for Disease Control and the Idaho Rebounds: Our Path to Prosperity Plan. It is imperative for DOE to provide industry the best opportunity to deliver their best team efforts while still also considering individuals' health and well-being.
61	L.11	(e) (2)	Subcontractor Teaming Agreements	L-13	Comment: Please confirm that teaming agreements with team member subcontractors are not required to be submitted with proposals.	Correct, teaming agreement(s) and operating agreement (if applicable) are only required of the Offeror.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
62	B	Clause B.5(a)(1); L.17(b)(2)	CPIF	B-6; L-28	Comment: The description of the Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee (CFIF) Task Order maximum fee amount in Section B, DOE-B-2015 is different than what is requested in Section L-17(b)(2). DOE-B-2015 states that “the maximum fee ceiling shall not exceed 15 percent of the target cost.” Section L-17(b)(2) states that “the Offer shall propose a target fee ceiling percentage that shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the estimated cost of CPIF Task Orders.” Please clarify this discrepancy.	This is not a discrepancy. Section L.17(b)(2) requires the offeror to propose a target fee ceiling no greater than 10%, not a maximum fee ceiling. In accordance with FAR 52.216-10, Incentive Fee, and "DOE-B-2003 Cost Plus Incentive Fee Task Order: Total Estimated Cost and Incentive Fee (Oct 2014) (Revised)," there are both target fees and maximum fees established for CPIF type task orders.
63	H	Clause H.51(g); Clause H.52	Contract Allocation	H-84; H-85	Question: Is the correct interpretation of Clause H.51(g) and Clause H.52 that the Offeror is required to subcontract only 15 percent of the cumulative value of Task Orders under the contract to small businesses, but still have a minimum small business subcontracting goal of 45 percent?	Correct, 15% is tied to the cumulative value of Task Orders issued under the contract. The 45% is tied to the subcontracting dollars base.
64	M	M.5	Cost Analysis	M-5	Comment/Question: Please clarify whether the “cost analysis” that will be performed for Offerors’ fully burdened labor rates will actually be a “cost realism analysis.” Will a cost realism analysis of fully burdened labor rates also be used for establishing the evaluated price to determine best value?	Section M.5 of the RFP will be amended to clarify. DOE will perform a price reasonableness analysis on the Offeror's fully burdened labor rates. The price reasonableness as it related to the fully burdened labor rates applied to the provided DPLH will be used as part of the best value determination.
65	B	B.7	Allowability of Subcontractor Fee (Applies to CR Task Orders only)	B-7	This clause constitutes a deviation from FAR 31.205-26(e)(2) which permits subcontract awards to affiliates at a price (cost plus fee/profit) when the award is based upon adequate price competition. We request that this be amended to permit affiliate fee when the criteria in the FAR clause has been met.	No change. Separate, additional, subcontractor fee is not an allowable cost under Task Orders for individual team members, or for a subcontractor, supplier, or lower tier subcontractor that is a wholly owned, a majority owned, or an affiliate entity of any team member.
66	B	B.8	Small Business Subcontracting Fee Reduction	B-7	It is not clear how DOE intends to manage the Small Business Subcontracting goals. This paragraph states DOE intends to evaluate progress toward meeting the cumulative small business subcontracting goals annually for the Master IDIQ Contract. Yet a Master Subcontracting Plan does not include goals. Goals are established at the Task Order level according to H.51. It is recommended that DOE require an annual SB Subcontracting Plan that is evaluated across all TOs and if issues are identified, they would be addressed against the annual PEMP.	Refer to deliverable entitled "Subcontracted Work Performance Report" required annually, which will be amended to clarify reporting requirements.
67	C	C.4.3	Idaho CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF)	C-16	How much waste has been disposed in Cell 2 and what is the freeboard available? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
68	C	C.4.3	Idaho CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF)	C-16	Is there a waste forecast database available showing the waste to be placed in Cell 2 including point of origin, type, and volume (e.g. current ICDF Waste Placement Plan)? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.
69	C	C.4.3.01	ICDF New Cell Construction	C-17	Has the OU 3-13 ROD, the ICDF Complex Remedial Action Work Plan, or other relevant CERCLA decision documents been modified, released for public comment, and approved to allow construction of the third cell? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.
70	C	C.4.3.01	ICDF New Cell Construction	C-17	Has the ICDF performance assessment been updated to include the new cell and has the DOE EM Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Federal Review Group (LFRG) approved the performance assessment? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
71	C	C.4.3.01	ICDF New Cell Construction	C-17	Has the CERCLA remedial design work plan been approved by the regulators for design/construction of Cell 3? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.
72	C	C.4.3.01	ICDF New Cell Construction	C-17	Is there a CD-0 for Cell 3 construction? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.
73	C	C.4.3.01	ICDF New Cell Construction	C-17	What is the volume of Cell 3? If this information is publicly available, please provide a link or identify the location (e.g., emcbc website for ICP) where this information is currently publicly available.	The current ICDF disposal cell (cells 1&2 combined) is about 75% full. Evaluation of expected waste receipts over the next several years is ongoing. Given that the cell is approaching capacity, DOE is beginning to refine its expectations of when a new cell will be needed. But, nothing is formalized at this point. A general requirement for constructing a new disposal cell is included in the PWS, because it is likely that a new cell will be needed during the first few years of the contract performance period. But, further refinement of the specific timing, size, etc., including regulatory interactions and any needed updates to, or development of, regulatory, waste management basis or DOE Order 413 documents, will occur in a partnering environment among DOE, the Contractor, and regulatory agencies post-award.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
74	C	C.9.0	End State Contracting Model	C-44	DOE's End State Contracting Model (ESCM) will require the contractor to respond expediently to the CO's Request for Task Order Proposal (RTP), efficiently and fairly negotiate the terms of the RTP and then manage and execute the individual Task Orders (TO) through their various end dates. Section C.1.1 of the DRFP provides a high-level overview of the ESCM, issuance of an RTP and the need for the contractor to be compliant with FAR Subpart 15.4 and H.51 (f) clause. Since there will likely be multiple TOs in excess of hundreds of millions of dollars over the life of the contract, the ability to demonstrate experience and expertise in negotiating, managing and executing parallel run TOs will be important. We recommend DOE consider expanding section C.9.0 to include a subparagraph that addresses the management and execution of the overall ESCM, RTPs and TOs.	DOE does not anticipate updating C.9.0 to include additional scope details for management and execution of the contract. Also, see C.9.7.01 paragraph (a) under Business Administration. Also, the Management Approach Factor provides an opportunity for Offerors to address how it will manage, implement (including good faith negotiations with DOE) and execute multiple Task Orders for the Master IDIQ PWS.
75	G	G.7(a)	Invoice/Payment Procedures	G-6	What is the purpose and intent of the statement, "[Note: The 14 day payment period must be approved by OAM for each respective procurement.]"	The questioned statement will be deleted in an amendment to the RFP.
76	H	N/A	Preexisting Conditions	N/A	Given the scope of work, respectfully request the Government to incorporate DEAR 970.5231-4.	DEAR 970.3170 is the driver for this clause and it's specific to M&O contracts. Not applicable to this procurement. B.9 Basis for Changes, has specific language for risk ownership for the Government and the contractor.
77	H	H.4(1) and H.9	H.4(1) Hiring preferences H.9 Labor Relations	H-7 and H25 thru H-27	Can DOE provide details on the site personnel demographics such as the total number of incumbent employees and total number of union employees?	DOE can provide the following information: Total Fluor Employees – 1,661 (of which 789 are represented by Unions) Fluor Subcontractors – 166 Total STI Employees - 53 STI Subcontractors - 39
78	L.10	L.10(c)(4)	Submission of proposals	L-7 and L-8	The RFP requires both electronic and hard copies submission of the proposal to two locations, Idaho, and EMCBC. Due to the current pandemic situation mail services are not as reliable having delays in delivery. Also in-person submission will require two company personnel to travel exposing them to the pandemic situation. Therefore (1) we recommend that DOE makes the proposal an electronic submittal only. (2) If not, we recommend that DOE makes the electronic submittal the official proposal submittal with the hard copies possibly lagging in receipt up to 1-2 days.	DOE does not anticipate changing the hard copy proposal submission requirements.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
79	L.14	14(e)(1)	Oral problem scenarios	L-19	With the current COVID-19 situation, it makes it more difficult for the entire key personnel team to effectively execute oral problem solving scenarios either in person or in a virtual setting. We request that DOE reconsider eliminating the oral sample problem scenario for the entire key personnel team [(e) (1)] and rely on the oral interview of the Program Manager to support evaluation [(e) (2)]. Additionally, it is requested that DOE provide guidance on whether or not orals will take place under the virtual procedure or in-person as early as possible and preferably prior to June 30th to allow for adequate preparation under the unique circumstances.	It is the intent of DOE to conduct in-person Key Personnel (KP) oral problem scenarios and the Program Manager (PM) interviews in Idaho Falls, Idaho. For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE is tentatively planning to conduct orals Monday, August 17 – Saturday, August 22, 2020 and may extend into the week of August 24, 2020 if necessary. However, in the event the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interviews are unable to be conducted in-person due to COVID-19 or other extenuating circumstances, DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interview (as stated in Section L.14). For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE would tentatively conduct virtual orals in mid to late September, 2020. If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020. In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. DOE will take all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of all parties by strictly following the guidelines provided by the Center for Disease Control and the Idaho Rebounds: Our Path to Prosperity Plan. It is imperative for DOE to provide industry the best opportunity to deliver their best team efforts while still also considering individuals' health and well-being.
80	L.14	L.14(e)(3)(v)	L.14 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II	L-22	L.14, (e) (3) (v) states, "If conducted virtually, Offerors may utilize any virtual drawing features or functions during the oral problem scenarios and oral interview provided in the web-based conference platform, as applicable." To properly prepare the key personnel team, will the government please provide the name of the web-based conference platform that will be utilized? (i.e., is it WebEx, Zoom, other?)	If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020.
81	L.14	L.14(e)(3)(v)	L.14 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II	L-22	L.14, (e) (3) (v) states, "Offerors may elect to utilize white boards or flip charts during the oral problem scenarios..." Please clarify that the referenced white boards or flip charts are physical objects and not virtual elements of the web-based conference platform.	Confirmed, the referenced white boards or flip charts are physical objects and not virtual elements of the web-based conference platform.
82	L.14	L.14(e)(3)(v)	L.14 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II	L-22	L.14, (e) (3) (v) states, "...as well as can upload such items to the web-based conference platform, as appropriate." Please clarify that the intent of this is to have the content that will be uploaded will either need to be photographed or scanned by the offeror key personnel team and uploaded to the web-based conference platform.	The referenced language will be deleted from the Section L instructions in a forthcoming amendment.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
83	L.14	L.14(e)(3)(v)	L.14 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II	L-22	L.14, (e) (3) (v) states, "The Offeror may utilize 8 ½ x 11 sketch pad or legal pad during the oral problem scenarios and oral interview." Is it the government's intent for the Offeror key personnel team to show the web-based camera the content of these during the scenarios and interview? How will the government retain this material and ensure that Offerors are not keeping the material after the conclusion of the Oral Presentations?	Yes, it the Government's intent for the Offeror key personnel team to show the web-based camera the content of any presentation materials utilized during the KP oral scenarios and PM interview if conducted virtually. If conducted virtually, any presentation material will be the responsibility of the Offeror. Whether the oral interviews are held in person or virtually, it is DOE's intention to record the interviews both video and audio for future reference. If it is determined that virtual procedures will be necessary, every effort will be made to stay as close to the in-person oral instructions as possible and to ensure that no special electronic devices or software programs will be necessary beyond a computer, smart phone or tablet needed to connect to the conferencing software with audio and video capability. For example, flip charts may simply be substituted with 8 1/2 X 11 inch paper that can be held up to the presenter's electronic device camera.
84	L.14	L.14(e)(3)(v)	L.14 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II	L-22	L.14, (e) (1) states, "All of the Offeror's proposed key personnel shall actively participate in the oral problem scenarios and be physically present." L.14, (e) references to "if conducted virtually" throughout the Section L.14 instructions, please clarify if the government's intent for the Offeror Key Personnel team to be physically together in one geographical location or virtually across multiple locations. Will the government have a representative physically in attendance with the Offeror's team to ensure consistency in adherence to the instructions / RFP requirements among Offerors? If virtually, will the government please increase the Scenario times by 15 minutes to allow for inefficiencies created with online collaboration tools and the need to have multiple breakout groups to address scenarios?	<p>If virtual orals are conducted, each KP is required to participate in person and must be physically present on the screen; but, each person's location will not be prescribed. Whether the KP team is collocated will be at the discretion of the offeror. The Government will not have a representative physically in attendance with the Offeror's team if conducted virtually.</p> <p>In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. Plans to resolve logistical or emergent issues will be included in these instructions.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
85	L.14	L.14(e)(3)(v)	L.14 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II	L-23	L.14, (e) (4) states, "Each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions related to its oral problem scenario and oral interview." Will the government please provide the anticipated or tentative location of Orals now to allow for planning by the Offeror should Orals be conducted in person.	<p>It is the intent of DOE to conduct in-person Key Personnel (KP) oral problem scenarios and the Program Manager (PM) interviews in Idaho Falls, Idaho. For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE is tentatively planning to conduct orals Monday, August 17 – Saturday, August 22, 2020 and may extend into the week of August 24, 2020 if necessary.</p> <p>However, in the event the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interviews are unable to be conducted in-person due to COVID-19 or other extenuating circumstances, DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interview (as stated in Section L.14). For Offerors' planning purposes, DOE would tentatively conduct virtual orals in mid to late September, 2020. If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020.</p> <p>In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. DOE will take all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of all parties by strictly following the guidelines provided by the Center for Disease Control and the Idaho Rebounds: Our Path to Prosperity Plan. It is imperative for DOE to provide industry the best opportunity to deliver their best team efforts while still also considering individuals' health and well-being.</p>
86	L.16	Factor 2 Instructions	Factor 2: Past Performance	L-24	Companies keep their OSHA 300 logs (from which DART and TRC rates are calculated) based on "establishments." For Small Businesses (SB), these "establishments" do not necessarily nor typically align with a SB's contracts as they do for single-purpose LLCs organized exclusively for a particular contract. So, except for cases where an "establishment" and a "reference contract" are one and the same, an SB is unlikely to have collected OSHA 300 logs on a contract basis so as to enable it to calculate the requested safety statistics for a specific reference contract. Given this, is it acceptable to report either a SB Teaming Subcontractor's firm-wide safety statistics or its statistics based on the "establishment" most relevant to the reference contract, rather than safety statistics based on the specific reference contract itself?	Section L.15 (f) includes the requirements for safety statistics reporting. Additionally the Offeror shall report safety statistics within the L-3, item #19 by reference contract by Government Fiscal Year (GFY).

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
87	L	L.17 (b)(5)	Indirect Cost Determination - Trends	L-29	In order to help determine indirect costs that may need recovered based on direct project activities, please provide the incumbent's Monthly Cost Performance Reports for the past 12 months.	Currently all site contract work is covered under the PWS; therefore direct to the contract. It is anticipated Task Orders will be negotiated and issued post award covering all site work activities within the PWS (similar to the current contract); and therefore would be accounted for as a direct charge. Proposed Overhead or G&A rates would be dependent on how the Offeror sets up its organizational structure. Any additional indirect rates (such as Labor Overhead and G&A) applied to compute the proposed fully burdened labor rates shall be identified within L-6b and supporting documentation and a detailed explanation shall be provided in order to gain fully understand of the proposed indirect rates basis and applicability. Supporting documentation could be, but is not limited to, a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement(s) or budgetary documentation.
88	L	L.17 (b)(5) Attachment L-6	Indirect Cost Determination – Staff Aug Support	L-29 Tab Attachment L-6b	Please confirm if the Estimated Prime Direct Productive Labor Hours (DPLH) for the first year (October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022) provided in Attachment L-6, tab entitled "Attachment L-6b" represent only employee hours and not staff aug (i.e. subcontracted) hours. If any of the DPLH are associated with staff aug support, please provide the breakout by work discipline of hours associated with employees vs. staff aug.	No. The provided Direct Productive Labor Hours (DPLH) hours are for all hours potentially needed during the first year of the contract (employees and staff aug). As provided for in Section L, Offerors shall bid the base labor rates as if the labor is being self-performed.
89	L	Attachment L-6	Indirect Cost Determination	L-29 Tab Attachment L-6b	Assuming an indirect rate is determined using a portion of the DPLH provided for any particular labor resource, how does DOE want Offerors to reflect that rate in Attachment L-6 which is organized to assume that an overhead rate would apply to all labor hours for any particular labor resource? Do Offerors have the flexibility to create new rows if necessary in the tabs for Attachment L-6?	DOE is not assuming there is an overhead rate needing to be applied; however it is provided as a potential fill-in, as applicable, for Offerors to accommodate its organizational structure. No. The Offeror does not have the flexibility to create new rows in the tabs for Attachment L-6 with the exception to add information related to Attachment L-6(a) for JV partner(s) and/or teaming subcontractors.
90	L.17	L.17(b)(5)	Indirect Cost Determination - Organization	L-29	Please provide a current organization chart with employee headcount by work discipline and/or by labor category as shown in attachment L-6(b).	DOE does not anticipate providing such information.
91	L.17	L.17(b)(5)	Indirect Cost Determination - Non-Labor Recovery	L-29	In order for Offerors to determine the non-labor portion of indirect costs that may need recovered based on direct project activities, please provide current annual non-labor costs associated with management and administration of offices, site facilities and infrastructure (i.e. staff augmentation, leases/rent, depreciation, maintenance, utilities, etc....); business software and maintenance; IT management, maintenance and configuration; telecommunication expenses; office supplies/materials; insurances.	Currently all site contract work is covered under the PWS; therefore direct to the contract. It is anticipated Task Orders will be negotiated and issued post award covering all site work activities within the PWS (similar to the current contract); and therefore would be accounted for as a direct charge. Proposed Overhead or G&A rates would be dependent on how the Offeror sets up its organizational structure. Any additional indirect rates (such as Labor Overhead and G&A) applied to compute the proposed fully burdened labor rates shall be identified within L-6b and supporting documentation and a detailed explanation shall be provided in order to gain fully understand of the proposed indirect rates basis and applicability. Supporting documentation could be, but is not limited to, a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement(s) or budgetary documentation.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
92	M	M.3(a)	DOE-M-2008 Evaluation Factor – Past Performance (Oct 2015) (Revised)	M-8	The DRFP language changed from "will be evaluated on the favorability of relevant and recent past performance information," an understood and tested standard, to "will be evaluated on the <u>Government's assessment</u> of relevant and recent past performance information..." This language change is not clear. Please clarify how the government will assess relevant and recent past performance information.	The currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance will be considered by the Government. The Government's assessment of relevant and recent past performance information will be used by the Government to determine whether the past performance information is reasonably predictive of the quality of the Offeror's performance under this proposed contract.
93	M	M.3(g)	DOE-M-2008 Evaluation Factor – Past Performance (Oct 2015) (Revised)	M-8	DOE changed the language from DOE "will" consider contracts, to DOE "may" consider contracts, meaning DOE may, or may not, use this as an evaluation factor. <u>Considering "cure notices" and "conditional payment of fee" issues is problematic.</u> A cure notice may have been issued but upon reply by the contractor may have been withdrawn or possibly dropped as an issue by the Agency. Further, if a cure notice was issued and the condition cured, how will that situation be considered? Likewise, a Conditional Payment of Fee reduction may have been taken but was insufficient in amount to dispute in court. So even though the contractor disagreed, no legal action was taken to dispute the fee reduction. Finally there is no evaluation statement in this paragraph indicating what and how any information provided or obtained will be evaluated, e.g., past performance is evaluated based on relevance in size, scope and complexity. There is no such standard establish under this criteria. It is recommended that the addition of cure notice and CPOF issues be deleted	The addition of cure notice and CPOF issues will not be deleted from the RFP. As noted within the Attachment L-5, explanatory information may be provided for cure notices and CPOF issues.
94	M	L.16(b) and M.4(b)	Evaluation Factor – Management Approach	L- 28 and M-8	How does DOE intend to evaluate implementation "including good faith negotiations with DOE"? What information exists to evaluate good faith negotiations, and what standard will be used?	DOE will evaluate the Offeror's management approach to effectively manage, implement (including good faith negotiations with DOE), and execute multiple Task Orders for the Master IDIQ PWS; to interface and collaborate with other site contractors; and to partner with DOE and the Regulators to achieve desired End States.
95	M	M.5	Evaluation Factor – Cost and Fee/Profit	M-8	How does DOE intend to evaluate "price" in accordance with FAR 15.402(a) which addresses Pricing Policy? How does DOE intend to use its cost realism analysis? Does DOE intend to do a most probable cost adjustment where appropriate? What is the intended difference of doing a cost <u>realism</u> analysis on Contract Transition Task Order costs, but only a cost analysis on the proposed fully burdened labor rates? DOE states "The cost proposal will be compared to the Volume II proposal for consistency and understanding" but does not state how or what will occur if there is inconsistency or misunderstanding. Please clarify how DOE intends to evaluate the contractor cost submittal.	The evaluation will include a cost realism analysis of the Offeror's proposed Contract Transition Task Order costs to determine whether the proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the methods of performance described in the Offeror's approach to transition activities. The evaluation will also include a price reasonableness analysis of the proposed fully burdened labor rates (excluding fee) for FY 2022 applied to the DOE-provided direct labor hours, and a price reasonableness analysis for the key personnel costs (first year).

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
96	M.3	(c)	Meaningful involvement of affiliated companies	M-7	<p>Issue: The RFP states, in part: "The Offeror, whether or not they are a newly formed entity, may provide past performance information for its parent organization(s), member organizations in a joint venture, LLC, or other similar or affiliated companies, provided the Offeror's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent, member, or affiliated company will be provided or relied upon in contract performance such that the parent, member, or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. Meaningful involvement means the parent, member, or affiliate will provide material supplies, equipment, personnel, or other tangible assets to contract performance; or how the common parent will utilize the expertise, best practices, lessons learned, or similar resources from the affiliate to affect the performance of the Offeror...."</p> <p>Question: The RFP states that the Offeror may demonstrate meaningful involvement of an affiliate where a "common parent company" will utilize "expertise, lessons learned, or similar resources from the affiliate to affect performance of the Offeror..." In the case of a newly created LLC as the Offeror, please confirm the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Member company of the Offeror is a "common parent" to the Offeror and wholly-owned subsidiaries of the Member company. 2. A Member company of the Offeror is a "common parent" to the Offeror and other special purpose LLCs for which the Member company or a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Member company is also a member. 3. A parent company that wholly owns a Member company and "sister" subsidiaries of the Member company is a "common parent" as the term is used in the RFP. 	<p>It will be up to each Offeror to describe the affiliate relationship (e.g., self, subsidiary, parent, etc.).</p> <p>A common parent company of the Offeror or LLC member company, and any company owned or controlled by the common parent company (either directly or indirectly), would be considered an affiliate.</p> <p>In accordance with FAR 2.101 definition: "Affiliates" means associated business concerns or individuals if, directly or indirectly either one controls or can control the other; or third party controls or can control both.</p> <p>If a common parent company is being used to establish the nexus between the Offeror and an affiliated company, then the Offeror must describe how the affiliate and Offeror rely on, for example, similar assets, resources, policies, and procedures of the common parent company.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
97	FRFP Section L	L.10(f)(4)	In Section L, L.10 DOE-L-2001 Proposal Preparation Instructions – General (Oct 2015) Alternate I and Alternate II (Oct 2015) (Revised), paragraph (f), subparagraph (4), the RFP states: “Each page shall, within the one inch top or bottom margins, set forth the solicitation number; name of the Offeror; and, as applicable, the legend in accordance with paragraph (e)(2), Restriction on disclosure and use of data, of the provision at FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition. The page margins may also include page numbers. This is the only information that can be displayed within the margins.”	L-9, L-10	For ease of navigation within the document, may we also put the volume number and section number in the margins? And may we also put the name of the solicitation, “Idaho Cleanup Project,” within the margins?	The RFP will not be amended to allow for the additional information.
98	FRFP Section L	L-13, L-16, and L-17	Transition Approach and Estimate	L-19, L-27-32	For purposes of ensuring appropriate resources are available during transition, please provide the breakdown of current ICP employee headcount by Exempt, Non-Exempt (SCA) and Bargaining unit categories in the solicitation document library.	DOE can provide the following information: Fluor: Total Fluor Employees – 1,661 (of which 789 are represented by Unions) Fluor Subcontractors – 166 Total STI Employees - 53 STI Subcontractors - 39

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
99	FRFP Section L	Attachment L-2	Key Personnel Standard Resume Format requires offerors to describe each candidate's experience in regard to: (i) Recent and relevant management experience in direct project execution in the field; (ii) Experience at partnering and good-faith negotiations with client(s) that achieved measurable performance improvements; (iii) Experience performing under an incentive-based contractual arrangement resulting in a significant performance improvement or an end-state completion; and (iv) Experience in successful regulatory interactions and compliance with demonstrated positive benefit to the client(s).	L-35	Would DOE please increase the page limit for resumes from 4 pages to 6 pages to allow for complete description of each candidate's qualifications in regard to items (i) through (iv), which is in addition to the required information for positions and projects?	The page limits are sufficient to provide the information requested.
100	FRFP Section L	Attachment L-2	Key Personnel Standard Resume Format	L-35	To make best use of the page-limited resume format, would DOE please reduce the requirement for "name, title, and phone number of supervisor" to the last 10 years? Supervisor information from more than 10 years ago will most likely not be relevant to the proposed position.	DOE does not intend to reduce the requirements to a specified timeframe.
101	FRFP Section L	Attachment L-3	Attachment L-3, Past Performance Reference Information Form requires offerors to identify the portion (%) of work each company identified in Line 2 is to perform on the ICP contract.	L-39	Without a technical approach and cost volume for all PWS elements, we are uncertain how to define the percentage each team member company is proposed to perform on ICP. We believe that Line 15, which requires offerors to define scope for each team member company by PWS provides an accurate representation of work split among team members. Will DOE either: (a) provide guidance on how to determine the appropriate percentage [e.g., single year budget, multi-year budget, or some other methodology] or (b) delete Line 14 and require offerors to define team member work scopes by PWS element in Line 15?	The RFP will be amended to delete item 14 from the L-3 form.
102	FRFP Section H	H.15(b)	RFP Section H.15(b) states that "If the contractor plans to adopt any existing business system from the previous Contractor, the Contractor is responsible for the system and shall comply with the system requirements and criteria required in that specific business system clause."	H-34	To enable offerors to prepare accurate transition cost estimates, please describe the existing business systems (e.g., those used for HR application tracking and transitioning incumbent labor) that offerors may consider adopting from the incumbent contractor?	A current list of all existing systems is provided, see page 38 for details.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
103	FRFP Sections H, J, L	H.52; L.11(k); Attachment J-9	RFP Section L.11(k) asserts that "The Offeror shall establish separate small business subcontracting goals at the Task Order level (with the exception of the Transition Task Order) that afford small businesses with the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in Contract performance consistent with efficient performance."	L-15-16	The RFP requires offerors to commit to SB participation percentages without the additional discovery and diligence required to develop task order scopes of work. In consideration of the requirement to afford small businesses the "maximum practicable opportunity to participate" in this contract, will DOE please provide a list of subcontractors and their scopes of work that are incorporated into the current contract?	A current list of ICP subcontracts is provided, see page 39 for details.
104	Section L	Att. L-6	Relocation Costs, Transition		FAR 31.205-35, Relocation Costs, provides that relocation costs are generally allowable, provided that there is a "...permanent change of assigned work location (for a period of 12 months or more)..." Given the IDIQ nature of the RFP and contemplated Master IDIQ contract, presumption by the offeror that subsequent task orders for a period of 12 months or more will be issued is questionable and may, in fact, be improper for inclusion in a response to the RFP. However, the ICP cost worksheets include relocation costs, implying an expectation that relocation costs are to be included. We request that DOE clarify the intent and expectations with respect to the inclusion of relocation cost in our response to the RFP.	All Relocation costs shall be included in the Transition TO. It is anticipated Task Orders will be in place (exceeding the one year requirement) covering all individuals requiring to be relocated. DOE will consider the circumstances if employment of a relocated person does not meet the one year requirement.

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

No.	RFP Section	RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Industry Comment/Question	DOE Response
105	L.14 and M.2	L.14 (e) and M.2 (d) & (e)	Factor 1: Key Personnel: Oral problem scenarios	L-21, L-22 and L-23, and M-6	<p>Given that the COVID situation will most likely not be resolved before orals training begins, we offer the following two options for DOE’s consideration. Option 1 – Conduct separate interviews with each proposed Key Personnel candidate in lieu of team-based problem solving. The individual interviews could go beyond the typical questions posed to the Program Manager, and include queries on knowledge of the Master IDIQ PWS and technical and management problem-solving. For example, DOE could develop four sets of standard questions for all three required positions (Program Manager, ESH&Q Manager, and Business Manager) and any additional positions proposed by the Offeror. If adopted, this approach necessitates changing the orals evaluation criteria, as factors such as team leadership and team problem-solving don’t lend themselves to an interview format. While not ideal, this option has been successfully used on prior EM procurements and provides DOE with a balanced and uniform basis for selecting the most qualified team. Option 2 – Forgo orals and rely on resumes and references provided in the proposal.</p>	<p>It is the intent of DOE to conduct in-person Key Personnel (KP) oral problem scenarios and the Program Manager (PM) interviews in Idaho Falls, Idaho. For Offerors’ planning purposes, DOE is tentatively planning to conduct orals Monday, August 17 – Saturday, August 22, 2020 and may extend into the week of August 24, 2020 if necessary. However, in the event the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interviews are unable to be conducted in-person due to COVID-19 or other extenuating circumstances, DOE may utilize virtual procedures to conduct the KP oral problem scenarios and PM interview (as stated in Section L.14). For Offerors’ planning purposes, DOE would tentatively conduct virtual orals in mid to late September, 2020. If virtual procedures are determined to be necessary, DOE currently anticipates using the Zoom for Government platform (https://www.zoomgov.com/) and notifications to that effect will be made no later than August 3, 2020. In accordance with Section L.14 (4), each Offeror will be notified within 5 working days after the proposal submission deadline of the date, time, location, agenda, and other instructions, including whether in-person or virtual procedures will be utilized. DOE will take all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of all parties by strictly following the guidelines provided by the Center for Disease Control and the Idaho Rebounds: Our Path to Prosperity Plan. It is imperative for DOE to provide industry the best opportunity to deliver their best team efforts while still also considering individuals’ health and well-being.</p>

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

List of Existing Business Systems - ICP (per Q&A #102)			
	Name	Area	Description
1	Project Controls Reporting System	Project Controls & Estimating	Homegrown Reporting Database and Data Warehouse
2	Deltek Cobra	Project Controls & Estimating	EVMS Baseline Management, Earned Value Engine, Prices Schedules
3	Oracle Primavera P6	Project Controls & Estimating	Scheduling
4	Acumen Fuse	Project Controls & Estimating	Schedule Health Checker
5	Safran	Project Controls & Estimating	Risk and Schedule Risk Analysis
6	@Risk	Project Controls & Estimating	Risk and Schedule Risk Analysis
7	ICP Performance Dashboard	Project Controls & Estimating	Homegrown Metric Reporting. SQL Database
8	Deltek Costpoint	Accounting/Supply Chain/HR	Accounting, HR, Supply Chain
9	ADP	Accounting/HR	Payroll, HR
10	Maximo	Accounting/Supply Chain	Inventory
11	Sunflower	Property	Property
12	Cognos	Accounting/Supply Chain	Report Writer for Costpoint
13	DataSplice	Supply Chain	Barcode Readers Software
14	Microsoft Suite	All	
15	Vizio	HR	Org Charts

IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT (ICP) – FINAL RFP, INDUSTRY Q and A
SOLICITATION NO. 89303319REM000034

List of Existing Subcontracts - ICP (per Q&A #103)		
	SCOPE DESCRIPTION	NAME
1	Analytical Services	Test America Laboratories
2	Analytical Services - IH	ALS Group USA, Corp
3	Crane Maintenance Services	AMERICAN CRANE & EQUIPMENT CORPORATION
4	Electrical Services	Wheeler Electric
5	Engineering Services	WALSH ENGINEERING SERVICES
6	Equipment Rentals	Western States Equipment
7	Fabrication and Testing Support	DIVERSIFIED METAL PRODUCTS
8	Fabrication Services	PREMIER TECHNOLOGY INC.
9	Fire Suppression Support and Inspection	3D Fire Protection
10	Infrastructure Support	Battelle Energy Alliance, LLC
11	IWTU Testing	HAZEN RESEARCH INC
12	Laundry	ALSCO/AMERICAN LINEN
13	Laundry (Rad)	UNITECH SERVICES GROUP
14	MLLW and LLW Transportation	Visionary Solutions, LLC
15	MLLW/LLW Transportation Services	BED ROCK, INC. DBA TRI STATE MOTOR TRANSIT CO.
16	Network. Install Support, Data Center Move Support, and Software/Hardware	THOMAS GALLAWAY CORPORATION DBA TECHNOLOGENT
17	Nitrogen Tanks Lease and Supply of Bulk Nitrogen and Oxygen	PRAXAIR INC
18	Office and Janitorial Supplies (Porter's)	PORTER'S SUPPLY & DISTRIBUTING, INC.
19	Plumbing Services	FIRST STREET PLUMBING & HEATING CENTER
20	Portable Toilet Rentals and Servicing	CAMMANS MVP LLC dba MVP RENTALS
21	Propane and Propane Tank Lease	CHS Propane
22	Staff Augmentaiton and Technical Services	BHI ENERGY
23	Technical and Data Validation Support	Portage, Inc.
24	Technical Services	E2 O&M
25	Technical Support Services	North Wind Inc.
26	Technical Support Services	TRADEWIND SERVICES LLC
27	Technical Support Services in support of IWTU	Studsvik, Inc
28	Tire Services	Jack's Tire and Oil
29	Transport Retrieval Mockup Pre-Filters	PORVAIR FILTRATION GROUP
30	Transportation Treatment and Disposal of INL Non-Radioactive Waste	CLEAN HARBORS
31	UCS Upgrade	AVANTech, Inc.
32	Waste Control Services	Waste Control Specialists, LLC
33	Waste Disposal Services	Energy Solutions Services, Inc.