

Solicitation #89303319REM000057
Paducah Infrastructure Support Services
Clarification Questions

#	Final RFP Section	Final RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Question	DOE Clarification
1	Section J	Attachment J-8.C.3.4.2.2	Estimated Annual Level I and Level II Service Order(s) and Example IDIQ Scope	<p>In the 211 Q&A responses provided by DOE on 03/03/20 the Infrastructure Contractor Work Control Information FY17-FY19 document, provided in the Document Library, is referenced 22 times in the response to questions. We have performed a detailed analysis of the document and found conflicting data when compared to Section J - Attachment J-8.C.3.4.2.2.</p> <p>1) J-8.C.3.4.2.2 shows for FY18 2117 Level I Service Orders were performed with the Average Labor Hours for Level I Service Hours equaling 78,489 hours. For FY18 the Infrastructure Contractor Work Control Information document shows 3216 Level I Service Orders and 14,660.30 Level I Labor Hours.</p> <p>J-8.C.3.4.2.2 shows for FY18 118 Level II Service Orders were performed with the Average Labor Hours for Level II Service Hours equaling 2902 hours. For FY18 the Infrastructure Contractor Work Control Information document shows 9965 Level II Service Orders and 76,946.80 Level II Labor Hours.</p> <p>2) For FY17 the Infrastructure Contractor Work Control Information document shows 2815 Level I Service Orders and 14,591.10 Level I Labor Hours and 10184 Level II Service Orders and 76,902.60 Level II Labor Hours.</p> <p>3) For FY19 the Infrastructure Contractor Work Control Information document shows 2859 Level I Service Orders and 10,318.70 Level I Labor Hours and 10576 Level II Service Orders and 64,552.60 Level II Labor Hours.</p> <p>Question: Which of the DOE provided documents accurately reflects the Level I and Level II historical workload experienced at the Paducah site?</p>	<p>The more detailed spreadsheet (Reference Document excel file titled "Infrastructure Contractor Work Control Information FY17-FY19") provides accurate information down to the work type level (preventative maintenance, Level I, Level II, etc.) This spreadsheet is more accurate to form a basis from than RFP Attachment J-8.C.3.4.2.2, "Estimated Annual Level I and II Service Order(s) and Example IDIQ Scope."</p>
2	Section J	J-11 QASP	QASP	<p>In our review of the QASP we have difficulty comprehending how the "Deduction (Impact on Contractor Payments)". Question and Answer #27 and #143 provided the following response: "The deduction is based on a percentage of the applicable CLIN value relative to the surveillance frequency (i.e. monthly, quarterly, etc.)"</p> <p>Per Section B, B.2 and B.3 CLINs are established for 34 and 24 months respectively. They can be expected to be very large numbers representing multiple years of projected pricing. For instance, Base Period 34 months CLIN 0101 represents FFP Operations may be greater than \$40M.</p> <p>There are no SUBCLIN pricing submittals aligned to the Performance Work Statement yet the QASP has 154 performance requirements aligned to PWS with specific deduction levels.</p> <p>The application of deductions is unclear and that creates a challenge when finalizing the risk register required by regulatory bodies for FFP bidding efforts. There are no examples of how the deduction is computed in the QASP and confusion on the base amount given the large CLIN values</p> <p>Exaple #1 PWS 3.5.2.1 "The Contractor shall trim grass/vegetation around utilities, fences, utility poles, lightning protection poles, guy wires, sign posts, fire hydrants, buildings, electrical structures, plastic and concrete jersey barriers, and parking lot bumpers." with a performance standard of "Objects within the mowing zone are trimmed around to a height no greater than 6 inches" and a deduction of "2% of applicable CLIN." What is the financial impact? Is it 2% of \$40M per day uncorrected or \$906K per day (\$40M * .02 / 34 months/base period / 30 days/month).</p> <p>Example #2. PWS C.2.4.1 " The contractor shall provide a Monthly Progress Report in accordance with C.2.4.1" with a performance standard of " The Monthly Progress Report reports Cost Performance for each funding account, and transmitted within 10 business days from the end of the prior month," and a deduction of "\$500 for each business day deliverable is past the due date or not technically accurate and complete" What is the financial impact if the report arrives on 12 business days, is rejected due to being technically inaccurate 10 business days later and it takes another 4 business days to correct." It is \$3,000 (2 days late \$500/day + 4 days to correct at \$500/day) or \$8000 (2 days late + 10 days processing + 4 days to correct or 16 days total *\$500) or is the financial deduction computed by another process.</p> <p>Requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We respectfully request the Government update the QASP by providing specific examples of how deductions are computed within each section. 2. What is the history of deductions assessed in 2019 on the incumbent contractor by PWS area and entotal? 	<p>If the Contractor does not perform the scope in compliance with the QASP requirements, there is a process by which DOE assesses those requirements and provides the deficiencies to the Contractor for response. DOE calculates the deduction based on the percentage of the scope in question. This varies for each instance and examples cannot be given that represents all the potential situations. DOE cannot provide deduction information related to the current incumbent contractor as this is sensitive information. Following is an example of how a potential deduction was handled related to snow and ice removal.</p> <p><i>"During the QASP review of a significant weather event, it was found that salt had been applied to a vast majority of the priority sidewalks, parking lots and roads and the Contractor had expended major effort to make them safe. However, it was found that salt had not been applied to at least 12 high-use foot and/or vehicular traffic areas within the 8 hour Performance Standard, and the AQL of no more than one observed defect had not been met (see the attached walkdown report and supporting marked up field review list). As such, this Performance Work Statement item outcome is considered Unsatisfactory.</i></p> <p><i>Recommend the minimum \$1,000 deduction."</i></p>