Waste Management Activities at the TRU Waste Processing Center
Responses to Offerors Questions
Solicitation No. DE-RP05-08OR23286

General Questions

1. **Will DOE provide offerors a copy of the DCAA audit report?**

   Response: It is not DOE's practice to release the pre-award DCAA audit report to offerors.

2. **When will DOE request the offerors to submit its revised proposals? Will DOE provide a schedule?**

   Response: DOE anticipates that it will request final proposal revisions in accordance with FAR 15.307 on May 13, 2009. The final proposal revisions shall be in writing and any changes or revisions from the offeror's initial proposal must be clearly identified. A common cutoff date to submit final revised proposals will be established. The Government intends to make award without obtaining further revisions.

   Additionally, the Government will release the final version of the RFP Amendment through IIPS by May 11, 2009. After the RFP Amendment has been issued, any questions that you may have regarding the amendment should be submitted through IIPS.

3. **Will all questions and answers be sent to offerors in the competitive range?**

   Response: No. All questions and answers will not be provided to offerors in the competitive range because discussions are tailored to each Offeror's proposal. However, general questions relating to public documents such as the solicitation and/or reference material provided on the TWPC procurement website will be provided to all offerors in the competitive range.

4. **If certain aspects of the offeror's proposal are not affected by the information learned during discussions or by the RFP amendment, should the original information be included in the revised proposal?**

   Response: Offerors in the competitive range will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal revision which can revise any aspect of the offeror's proposal. However, offerors are not required to make revisions it believes are unnecessary and may leave those aspects of its proposal unchanged.

Reference Documents

5. **Will DOE release Performance Management Baseline (PMB) information for the TWPC project that supports the most recent TWPC baseline validation, including any approved post-validation changes, posted to the DOE's TWPC project website?**

Response: DOE uploaded the TWPC Baseline Summary document on the Federal Business Opportunity website on May 16, 2008. The performance baseline provided on the website for the original RFP has not been significantly adjusted.

It is known that adjustments to the baseline are required due to technical issues for RH processing that were related to the late startup of the processing operation and then with issues discovered related to elevated neutron doses which prevent shipment of some of the waste and significant quantities of groundwater discovered in previously buried casks which have been retrieved. These issues have been carried as variances in baseline performance since it is known that a revised baseline will be developed at contract transition to address these issues. Methods have been put in place to handle accumulated groundwater, and modifications to enable neutron shielding to be used in canisters are being made by the Carlsbad Field Office. Increased drying time for wet waste should be assumed.

6. **What start date should be assumed for proposal purposes? Should a start date of October 1, 2009, be assumed?**

   Response: Yes. A start date of October 1, 2009 (FY2010) should be assumed for proposal purposes only. The offeror should assume that transition activities will occur during FY2009 and that baseline funding will be expended during the transition period.

7. **The Funding Profile that was provided on the TWPC procurement website implies that the Recovery Act funds will be available for use through FY2011. Is this an accurate assumption**?

   Response: Yes. It is anticipated that any carryover of Recovery Act funding from FY2010 can be used during FY2011. The updated version of the Funding Profile dated May 5, 2009 has been uploaded to the TWPC procurement website.

8. **Will DOE confirm that Contract Year 1 is FY2010? If so, how much of the Recovery Act funding will DOE require to be expended in FY2009, FY2010 and FY2011?**

   Response: See Responses to Question number 6 and number 7.

9. **Is there anything that prohibits using the Recovery Act funding exclusively in FY2010 and FY2011 until those funds are exhausted, then start using Baseline funds?**

   Response: No. Recovery Act funds are permitted to carryover from year to year within the restrictions of Recovery Act requirements. The Department anticipates that under this project, Recovery Act funding will be used exclusively in FY2010 and that any

carryover can be used during FY2011. Thereafter, it is anticipated that baseline funds will be available.

10. Will the Recovery Act funds be available for use through FY11?

Response: Yes. See Response to number 9.

11. Should the offerors assume that none of the Recovery Act monies will be expended in FY09?

Response: Yes. See Response to number 6.

12. Based on a review of the TWPC documentation provided via the DOE website, it would appear that NTS representatives have been involved in the TWPC review of the sludge system design. Could the DOE please provide any written correspondence or guidance between NTS and DOE contractors regarding WAC compliance?

Response: Although verbal conversations have been held with NTS with regard to acceptance of the solidified sludge, written documentation is not available. Verbal conversations have occurred with NTS which describe the solidification approach, and NTS has indicated that the approach will meet Waste Acceptance Criteria.

Section L

13. Could DOE please address the following questions regarding certain assumption ratios provided in section L of the DRAFT Amended RFP.

- **Please clarify whether Item 1 refers to the ratio of CH TRU waste volume in boxes compared to the amount of CH TRU waste in drums.**

- **Do Items 5 and 7 apply exclusively to the packaging efficiency associated with this waste and not the fraction of CH & RH TRU waste that is MLLW and LLW.**

Response: Item 1 refers to the ratio of incoming CH TRU waste volume (m^3) in boxes compared to the CH TRU waste volume in drums and other types of containers. The ratio presented in **Item 5**, as well as **Item 6,** applies exclusively to the packaging efficiency. Finally, **Item 7** addresses the ratio of supernate to sludge that comprises the 2000 m^3 of sludge available for processing.

14. Is it DOE's intent that the Offeror solicit reference information on all Key Personnel again?

Response: Offerors in the competitive range will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal revision which can revise any aspect of the Offeror's proposal. Therefore, an Offeror may choose to revise past performance information and/or key personnel references. See also Response to number 4.

15. If an Offeror wishes to propose changes to its Key Personnel is the Offeror required to submit Key Personnel Reference Forms for the new Key Person or Persons?

Response: Yes. If an Offeror chooses to propose a different key person(s), the offeror shall submit reference forms for the new key person(s). However, the Government does not anticipate conducting oral presentations for a second time.

16. Are the bullets below level 3 WBS elements on pages L-19 and L-20 required to be specific level 4 WBS elements or simply that these items are to be included in the level 4 items that are proposed?

Response: The items under level 3 WBS elements on page L-19 and L-20 are not required to be specific level 4 WBS elements. However these items shall be included and clearly identified in the cost of the specified WBS element.

17. Please clarify whether the total mobilized volume requiring treatment is 10,000 cubic meters (2000 m^3 x 5 = 10,000 m^3) given technical assumption 8 in section L (p. L-26 of the Draft amendment) states offerors are to assume a ratio of 1:5 for "initial in-the-current storage tank Sludge/Supernate volume to mobilized volume."

Response: Section C of the draft amendment states that there will be approximately 2000 m^3 of incoming RH sludge and supernate waste available for processing. The Government assumed that mobilization of the sludge will require additional liquid to enable it to be mobilized for transfer to the TWPC for processing. Therefore, for proposal estimating purposes, we developed the ratio of 1:5 shown in Section L for mobilization, resulting in a volume of 10,000 m^3 transferred to the TWPC.

18. Will the 5 year time period (covering years 2003 – 2007) used for Corporate Experience (section L, Factor/Criterion 3) and Company Past Performance (Section L, Factor/Criterion 4) including ES&H Past Performance forms (Section L, Attachment 4) remain the same in the final version of the RFP?

Response: Yes. This time period will remain the same in the Final Amendment to the RFP.

19. Does DOE plan to increase the page allowance in Section L when the Final Amendment to the RFP is released?

Response: Yes. The Final Amendment to the RFP will contain the new page allowance.

20. Will DOE provide Microsoft excel versions instead of pdf format of all Exhibits in Section L?

Response: DOE will provide excel files for the Exhibit examples in the Final Amendment to the RFP.

21. Will the Offeror be required to split total price by both baseline funding and Recovery Act funding for the total contract term in its cost proposal? If so, will DOE provide further guidance in the Final Amendment to the RFP?

Response: The Final Amendment to the RFP will provide clarification on how to submit the cost proposal.

Section M

22. Can DOE please expand on what constitutes "Best Value" for proposal evaluation? Is DOE evaluating an offeror on its ability to: (1) Accomplish minimum production volumes at the least cost, or (2) Increase production and spending the full Budget Authority as identified in the Funding Profile?

Response: As stated in provision M.4, Basis for Contract Award, "the Government intends to award one contract to a single responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and is determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies, of each Offeror's technical proposal against the Evaluation Factors/Criteria described in Section M. In determining the best value to the Government, the Technical Proposal is significantly more important than the total evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior technical proposal than making an award at the lowest total evaluated price.

However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium that it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one proposal over another. The Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing Technical Proposals indicate superiority from the standpoint of (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the total evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference."

Your proposal will be evaluated using the criteria that are stated in the RFP. The Funding Profile was provided to offerors to inform offerors of the estimated budget authority and recovery act funding that has been allocated under the project. The Offeror should describe its best technical approach to perform the performance work statement

within the limitations of the funding profile provided. The Offeror's cost proposal should reflect the costs for the Offeror's technical approach. If the Offeror proposes to process waste volumes that exceed the required minimum processing rates as stated in Section C, the cost proposal shall clearly delineate the total project cost for processing the required minimum volumes and the proposed processing schedule.