

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Question 1: Is the NAICS code correct?

Answer 1: According to FAR 19.102, the NAICS and corresponding size standard selection should be based on the definition that best describes the principal nature of work, with the greatest percentage of contract price. The Source Evaluation Board along with the Johnson Space Center (JSC) Small Business Office reviewed the definition of the subject NAICS code, with a cross-comparison to the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and background information provided in L-6. After review, it is determined that the principal nature of work required by the ECO PWS directly coincides with the Environmental Remediation Services NAICS code 562910 (see below).

NAICS 562910 – Environmental Remediation Services (NAICS code definition)

For purposes of classifying Government procurements as Environmental Remediation Services, the general purpose of the procurement must be to restore or directly support the restoration of a contaminated environment. This includes activities such as preliminary assessment, site inspection, testing, remedial investigation, feasibility studies, remedial design, remediation services, containment, and removal of contaminated materials or security and site closeouts. The general purpose of the procurement need not necessarily include remedial actions. Also, the procurement must be composed of activities in three or more separate industries with separate NAICS codes or, in some instances (e.g., engineering), smaller sub-components of NAICS codes with separate and distinct size standards. These activities may include, but are not limited to, separate activities in industries such as: Heavy Construction; Special Trade Contractors; Engineering Services; Architectural Services; Management Consulting Services; Hazardous and Other Waster Collection; Remediation Services; Testing Laboratories; and Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences. If any activity in the procurement can be identified with a separate NAICS code, or component of a code with a separate distinct size standard, and that industry accounts for 50 percent or more of the value of the entire procurement, then the proper size standard is the one for that particular industry, and not the Environmental Remediation Service size standard.

ECO PWS Requirements

For the ECO contract, the principle nature of work specified is for restoration and remediation services, with a smaller portion of the work specified for compliance program oversight. Offerors shall review the RFP in its entirety to evaluate and determine the scope of the ECO compliance services as well as the scope directly attributable to the restoration and remediation services portion of the contract. The principle nature of products and services to be provided is to directly support the restoration of a contaminated environment; primarily groundwater contamination, but

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

also soil contamination. The activities involved in the groundwater and soil remediation process include assessments, inspections, testing, remedial investigation, monitoring, containment, design/implementation of groundwater and soil contamination treatment systems. Examples of these large-scale remediation services include the 1,076 gpm plume-front pump and treat system, the mid-plume pump and treat system, and the closure unit investigation work plans and follow-on fieldwork. Post investigative fieldwork, corrective action evaluations and implementations will be required at the various closure units.

Question 2: How big are the small burn pit areas?

Answer 2: The burn pits are standard Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) that vary in size. The smaller units were approximately 25 ft. length x 10 ft. width x 1 ft. depth. The larger burn pit was approximately 60 ft. x 20 ft. x 2 ft. depth.

Question 3: How many fire points and how often is the small arms range used?

Answer 3: There are six fire points/lines on the small arms range, which is a bullet trap/capture system that collects the lead bullets for recycling. All WSTF security personnel currently qualify at the firing range on a semi-annual basis. The firing range is also made available to the security personnel from the contiguous Federal facilities, including the White Sands Complex (WSC) and the Aerospace Data Facility (ADF).

Question 4: What is the "FOL" hangar?

Answer 4: The FOL is the Forward Operating Location aircraft hangar located at the El Paso International Airport. Attachment L-3, Sample Task Order 3.0, Section 1.aa, will be updated in the final RFP to spell out the FOL acronym.

Question 5: Approximate volume of asbestos materials to be disposed annually?

Answer 5: The quantity of asbestos disposed annually by the ECO contractor is normally small-scale, but can vary based on site-specific project requirements. Over the last 3 years, the annual disposal quantity has varied from zero to approximately 5 cubic yards of asbestos material.

Question 6: What is the scope of archaeological and native cultural work in support of the Historic Preservation Officer?

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Answer 6: As described in the Workload Indicators (Attachment L-7), the scope of cultural resource management activities is approximately 3-5 requests per year for routine assistance to the Historic Preservation Officer. As stated in the Performance Work Statement, Section 3.5.5, these requests are generally documentation assistance requests related to Section 106 consultations, Section 110 inventory work, and National Historic Preservation Act work including requests for photos and historical information from NASA Headquarters, NASA Environmental Tracking System (NETS) data call responses, and oversight of identified cultural resources (e.g., maintenance/inspections of the Love Ranch facility, GPS of newly discovered artifacts, and procurement/oversight of field survey work for new construction projects).

Question 7: How much and what types of hydrazine's are stored and utilized annually on the property? Are you still using unsymmetrical dimethyl hydrazine on site? Any other hypergols utilized on this site? Any other "unique" fuels used or stored on the property?

Answer 7: The types and quantities of hydrazines on-site can significantly vary based on project-specific requirements. Based on the 2009 SARA Title III Tier II publicly accessible Community-Right-to-Know report, the ranges of hydrazine fuels stored on-site for 2009 are reported as follows:

- 1,1 - Dimethyl hydrazine (UDMH): Average daily amount in the range of 1,000 to 9,999 lbs (Code 3 – SARA report)
- Monomethylhydrazine (MMH): Average daily amount in the range of 10,000 to 99,999 lbs (Code 4 – SARA report)
- Hydrazine: Average daily amount in the range of 10,000 to 99,999 lbs (Code 4 – SARA report)

Nitrogen tetroxide (N₂O₄) is also stored on-site (oxidizer). There are no other unique fuels stored on the property.

Question 8: Are there any habitat management requirements?

Answer 8: WSTF is not responsible for any habitat management areas.

Question 9: Who performed the design and construction of the Plume Front Treatment System?

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Answer 9: The design for the Plume-front Treatment System was performed in-house by the environmental contractor (Lynx, Ltd). Construction was performed by in-house WSTF contractors (Honeywell) with assistance from off-site contractors (CH2M HILL and URS Corporation).

Question 10: Who performed the design and construction of the Mid Plume Treatment System?

Answer 10: Design for the Mid-plume Treatment System was performed in-house by the incumbent environmental contractor (North Wind Inc.). Construction for the Mid-plume Treatment System was completed by an off-site contractor (Denco, Inc).

Question 11: Would NASA consider reducing the page count of the proposal by approximately ½? It is believed an 80 page technical approach and a 100 page other plans and data volume is excessive for a contract of this magnitude and complexity.

Answer 11: Based on several comments from industry, the Volume I Mission Suitability page count has been lowered from 80 pages to 50 pages. Additionally, the Volume II Past Performance page count has been lowered from 20 pages to 15 pages. For the Volume I page count, offerors are advised that the management approach summary (overview) narratives should be relatively brief while the required plans provide the detailed approach. Offerors should minimize duplication of information between the Plans and the Volume I narratives. Offerors are also advised that the page limits are only to be considered maximum values. There is no requirement to fully meet any page limit maximum value.

Question 12: Can NASA confirm that the Section M “riddle” (Mission Suitability being greater than Past Performance and Price combined and Past Performance being greater than Price) is appropriate for this contract? The scope of the contract is not that challenging and there will be limited opportunities with this scope to provide innovations and an approach that will have significant differentiators for Mission Suitability scores.

Answer 12: The evaluation factors contained in Section M.6 shall remain. The Government considers the large-scale, complex, restoration program requirements, as well as the RCRA treatment unit management, operations, and future closures, to be technically challenging. As described in L.19.3.1, offerors are encouraged to identify any procedural or technical innovations, efficiencies, emerging technologies, or improvements, along with an associated rationale, that could simplify, streamline, or enhance the work identified in the Performance Work Statement. Additionally, FAR 15.101 provides, that “the less definitive the requirement, the more development work

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

required, or the greater the performance risk, the more technical or past performance considerations may play a dominant role in source selection.”

Question 13: Is performing the analytical services for the groundwater monitoring program a part of the contract scope? PWS 2.3 states:

Requirements include preparing and tracking sampling schedules (both on-site wells and off-site wells, if required), well sampling field work, **coordination of analytical services**, sample shipments, data evaluations, QA/QC oversight, report preparation, internal QA audits with associated reports, documentation management, recordkeeping, technician oversight, geological and hydrogeological data collection, down-hole camera logging, water level measurements, pump tests, investigation derived waste management, pump-and-treat project support, and drilling program assistance.

It’s unclear if coordination of analytical services means that the sampling services are part of this contract or if NASA has some other contract for these services and the ECO contractor only coordinates them.

Answer 13: Analytical services to support compliance and restoration activities are part of this contract. This contract includes procuring the services of commercial off-site analytical laboratories and the coordination, oversight, and management of those procured services. The Performance Work Statement, Section 2.3, will be updated to state “procurement and coordination of analytical services”. Offerors are also directed to the Performance Work Statement, Section 1.7, which states the following: “Provide procurement services for all environmental program materials, services, travel, and fee payments (checks) with the exception of store stock supply materials obtained through the WSTF warehouse.”

Question 14: Is a Small Business Administration 8(a) approved joint venture company that is under 500 employees considered to be a small business for this procurement?

Answer 14: Yes. As long as the joint venture meets the size standards for the NAICS code, the joint venture is considered a small business.

Question 15: Is past performance and experience of the partners in a newly formed 8(a) SBA-approved Joint Venture allowed as the past performance and experience of the Joint Venture?

Answer 15: Yes. A newly formed joint venture has no past performance and thus

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)
normally relies on the past performance of the entities that comprise the joint venture.
<p>Question 16: Are only the costs of the Joint Venture required, or are cost sheets required for each partner of the Joint Venture since the JV costs were derived from the partner companies?</p> <p>Answer 16: Costs for the joint venture will be required.</p>
<p>Question 17: Is the \$1M dollar level for a Major Subcontractor based on annual or total contract revenue?</p> <p>Answer 17: The \$1M dollar threshold is based on annual gross revenues. See FAR 19.101(7).</p>
<p>Question 18: How many employees are covered by the collective bargaining agreement?</p> <p>Answer 18: Currently, the CBA information for the FOSC contract is contained in Attachment J-15 and the Technical Resource Library. Note that the J-15 list of CBA employees was inconsistent with the IGE in Section L, Table L-9. Attachment J-15 will be updated at the time of the final RFP. The 12 technicians listed in Table L-9 have been updated to be consistent with the 11 technicians in Attachment J-15. Note that the 11 technicians are the Government's IGE for those standard labor categories (SLCs) with respect to the work identified in the ECO contract.</p>
<p>Question 19: Is home office support acceptable when needed for assistance during times of peak work load?</p> <p>Answer 19: The Government does not specify what is acceptable, or not acceptable, for staffing the contract during any variations in work load. It is expected that management and staffing approaches that address peak work load periods would be discussed in each proposal as requested in Sections L.19.3.2, MA4 and L.19.6 (D).</p>
<p>Question 20: It was stated in the pre-bid meeting that a bidder can accept all the incumbent and collective bargaining rates. If the bidder elects to accept this option, NASA stated that they would redo our cost estimates by inserting the Incumbent rates for the specific SLCs and recalculating our cost proposal. Based on this, does NASA still require that a bidder fill out all the cost sheets or just the ones associated with</p>

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

indirect rates that were developed for the cost proposal?

Answer 20: Completion of all cost sheets is required.

Question 21: If we bring non-NASA equipment on site, will gasoline, diesel and LPG fuel be available for this equipment or will we have to bring our own fuel on site?

Answer 21: Fuel is available at the on-site fueling station for equipment used to support the ECO contract requirements.

Question 22: Will the contractor have access to the existing fueling station, and what type of fuel is provided – gasoline for fleet vehicles, diesel for heavy equipment, and LPG for forklifts?

Answer 22: The contractor will have access to the fueling station for the ECO contract requirements. Gasoline, E-85, and diesel fuel are currently available.

Question 23: It was stated in the pre-bid meeting that evaluations will be performed midyear and annually, however, there was no clarification as to the reason for these reviews, and who performs these reviews (e.g., NASA, NMED). Please clarify the types and who will perform these reviews.

Answer 23: As described in Clause F.8, evaluations will be performed annually by NASA on a NASA Form (NF) 1680 to evaluate overall contractor performance and to provide input to the Government's Past Performance Database. Additionally, as described in DRD-ECO-001, NASA will also review and evaluate overall contractor performance on a semi-annual basis and provide feedback to the contractor. The annual and semi-annual reviews will be performed at WSTF by the Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR), and Environmental Program Manager.

Question 24: If the new ECO contractor is issued an approved work plan to implement that was prepared by the previous contractor, but the work plan is in conflict with the current PWS or other contractual requirement, will the new ECO contractor be allowed to revise the plan to bring it into compliance with the PWS or other contractual requirement prior to implementation of the work plan?

Answer 24: Yes, if an approved Work Plan is in conflict with the current PWS or other contractual requirements, the contractor may propose revisions to the Work Plan.

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Question 25: If the NMED requires new wells based on past work plans, will the ECO contractor be responsible for installing new wells and/or replacing existing wells?

Answer 25: The ECO contractor is responsible for the implementation of all NMED-required compliance and restoration requirements during this contract's period of performance, including any new wells and/or replacing existing wells.

Question 26: In order to avoid mistakes in formatting, page numbering, and font size in MS Word files, will you allow the electronic word files to be submitted in PDF format?

Answer 26: To maintain consistency and fairness during the evaluation of all proposals with respect to the Section L.8 page limits, margins, and font requirements, the MS Word format is required as described in Section L.19.2. The PDF format will not be accepted for the electronic files.

Question 27: It is our understanding that the Fire Brigade has been historically manned strictly by volunteers. As currently written, if a specific number of employees are requested by Emergency Services, then providing Fire Brigade support could be mandatory per the Performance Work Statement. Does NASA intend on the Fire Brigade being comprised of strictly volunteers, or would mandatory assignment of support personnel be necessary to comply with this PWS requirement?

Answer 27: The Fire Brigade has recently been disbanded and is no longer in service at WSTF. The reference to the Fire Brigade in the Performance Work Statement, Section 1.3, has been deleted. Additionally, the reference to the Fire Brigade in Attachment L-3, Task Order 1.0, Section 3.b has also been deleted.

Question 28: We did not see a requirement in the draft RFP for the ECO contractor to participate in the VPP program. Will the ECO contractor be required to maintain VPP Star status?

Answer 28: The WSTF safety culture is based on the VPP tenets. However, it is not the Government's intent to contractually require the ECO contractor to obtain and maintain VPP Star status. As stated in Section 1.3 of the Performance Work Statement: "The Contractor is responsible for ensuring that procedures and operations are performed safely and consistent with NASA, Federal, and State regulations to minimize hazards to personnel, property, and the environment. The Contractor shall comply with JSC and the WSTF safety program requirements, which are patterned to meet the intent of the OSHA Voluntary Protection Program (VPP)."

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Question 29: Attachment L-3, page 3, Section 4.a indicates the EMS coordinator manages the ISO 14001 program. Is it NASA's intent that the ECO contractor has primary responsibility for maintaining ISO 14001 certification? Also, is the TEST contractor primarily responsible to maintain ISO 9001 certification, with the ECO contractor providing support for the environmental components of the certification?

Answer 29: As stated in the Performance Work Statement, Section 1.4 and Attachment L-3 (Task Order 1.0) Section 4.a, the ECO contractor has primary responsibility for maintaining the ISO 14001 certification. The ECO contractor does not have primary responsibility for the ISO 9001 certification, but will support any ISO 9001 requirements that are specific to environmental compliance and restoration activities.

Question 30: We request that this text be revised to indicate that the "signature-ready" requirement be applied to only "final" submittals and not to "drafts." This request is consistent with the requirement of Attachment L-3, WSTF Task Order Performance Work Statement Section 2.0 page 5, Section 4.a.v. which indicates that only the 90% Advanced Design of Investigation Work Plan document be submitted "signature-ready."

Answer 30: The term signature-ready applies to final deliverables. The Performance Work Statement, Section 1.5, paragraph 2, will be changed to state "final deliverables". Additionally, Task Order 2.0, page 5, Section 4.a.v will have the signature ready requirement removed from the 90% draft document.

Question 31: Section 2.8.12 - Does this requirement indicate that the ECO contractor is responsible to develop and maintain pressure vessel packages and subsequently obtain final approval of the packages through the TEST contract, or does this requirement indicate the packages are developed and maintained by the TEST contractor and the ECO contractor would be responsible to remove/replace hardware as needed? We respectfully request that this requirement be clarified.

Answer 31: The TEST contractor will develop and maintain the packages. As stated in the Performance Work Statement, Sections 2.8.12 and 3.14.2, and the Background Information in Attachment L-6, Section 2.4.3, Table 1, the ECO contractor is responsible for ECO-specific pressure vessel systems, but obtains engineering and code support for the pressure vessel packages from the TEST contractor through ordered services to ensure up-to-date, completed, and approved packages are maintained. The ECO contractor is responsible to remove/replace hardware as needed.

Question 32: Sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.6, and 3.1.12 - These sections indicate that the ECO contractor will manage the satellite accumulation, 90 day, universal waste, and

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

used oil accumulation areas. We request that this section be revised to include a discussion of the responsibilities of the TEST contractor and other contractor as generators who deposit wastes in these areas.

Answer 32: Sections 3.1 has been updated to include the following: “For waste management activities described in Sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.6, and 3.1.12, note that the end-user (TEST, or other, contractor) of the waste accumulation areas (waste generator) will also have specific roles and responsibilities for maintaining the areas on a day-to-day basis, ensuring compliant operations, and communicating any deficiencies or other issues to the ECO contractor in a timely manner. The roles and responsibilities between the ECO contractor and the waste generator shall be clearly defined in the contractor ACA(s).” Additionally, note that the performance standards in Section 4.0 have been updated to state the 100% compliance standard is applicable only to the areas under the direct control and management of the ECO contractor.

Question 33: Section 3.1.7 - *“Prepare a written waste characterization package for each off-site shipment ...”* Can you confirm that this “written” requirement indicates electronic package format?

Answer 33: The written waste characterization packages for each off-site shipment are provided in an electronic format, currently as Adobe PDF files.

Question 34: Sections 3.1.13 and 3.1.15 - This section indicates that the ECO contractor will manage the e-scrap evaluation process, but does not indicate that the same contractor will manage the accumulation areas. Will the ECO contractor be responsible for inspecting the areas and ensuring proper storage and management? The ECO contractor is responsible to manage PCB wastes, but there is no clear responsibility for accumulation areas. We request that all sections for waste (hazardous and other) accumulation be modified to reflect consistent responsibilities and requirements.

Answer 34: Section 3.1.13 states that the ECO contractor is responsible for inspecting the areas to ensure proper storage and management. To clarify the general area management requirements, Section 3.1.13 has been updated to state the following: “Note that the TEST contractor personnel that manage the e-scrap accumulation areas will also have specific roles and responsibilities for maintaining the areas on a day-to-day basis, ensuring compliant operations, and communicating any deficiencies or other issues to the ECO contractor in a timely manner. The roles and responsibilities between the ECO contractor and the e-scrap management area personnel shall be clearly defined in the contractor ACA(s).”

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

For Section 3.1.15, the text has been updated to include the following: “Note that the end-user (TEST, or other, contractor) of the PCB waste accumulation areas (waste generator) will also have specific roles and responsibilities for maintaining the areas on a day-to-day basis, ensuring compliant operations, and communicating any deficiencies or other issues to the ECO contractor in a timely manner. The roles and responsibilities between the ECO contractor and the waste generator shall be clearly defined in the contractor ACA(s).”

Question 35: Sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and 3.3.4 - We request that these sections be revised to include reference to the TEST contractor’s responsibilities.

Answer 35: Section 3.3 has been updated to include the following: “For the air permit requirements described in Sections 3.3.1 – 3.3.4, note that the organization that is conducting tests or operating facilities or equipment with an in-place environmental permit (TEST, or other, contractor) will have specific roles and responsibilities for maintaining required compliance data, updating tracking paperwork, ensuring operations are compliant with permit conditions, and communicating any deficiencies or other issues to the ECO contractor in a timely manner. The roles and responsibilities between the ECO contractor and a test, facility, or equipment operator with an in-place environmental permit shall be clearly defined in the contractor ACA(s).” Additionally, note that the performance standards in Section 4.0 have been updated to state the 100% compliance standard is applicable only to the areas under the direct control and management of the ECO contractor.

Question 36: Section 3.3.8 - This Section indicates that the ECO contractor will oversee preparation of the Risk Management Plan (RMP), but that the TEST Contractor will prepare the report. Is this statement accurate?

Answer 36: Yes, the statement is accurate. The responsibility of the ECO contractor for the RMP is limited to oversight; for example, tracking the submittal date, reviewing the final package, properly submitting the document(s) to the EPA, and maintaining a copy of the submittal in the environmental records management system. The actual content of the report will be prepared by the TEST Contractor.

Question 37: Sections 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, and 3.4.4 - We request these sections be revised to reference the TEST contractor’s requirements

Answer 37: Section 3.4 has been updated to include the following: “For the discharge plans described in Sections 3.4.1 – 3.4.4, note that the organization that is operating facilities with an in-place environmental discharge plan (TEST, or other, contractor) will

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

have specific roles and responsibilities for maintaining required compliance data, updating tracking paperwork, ensuring operations are compliant with permit conditions, and communicating any deficiencies or other issues to the ECO contractor in a timely manner. The roles and responsibilities between the ECO contractor and a facility operator with an in-place environmental discharge plan shall be clearly defined in the contractor ACA(s).” Additionally, note that the performance standards in Section 4.0 have been updated to state the 100% compliance standard is applicable only to the areas under the direct control and management of the ECO contractor.

Question 38: Section 3.13.1 - This Section requires that new, proposed or promulgated regulations be reviewed on a weekly basis. Can this be modified to a monthly basis?

Answer 38: A monthly review is sufficient for reviewing proposed and promulgated regulations for applicability to WSTF operations. The weekly requirement specified in the Performance Work Statement, Section 3.13.1, will be changed to a monthly basis instead of weekly.

Question 39: Section 4.0 - Multiple elements within this table provide an acceptable quality level of 100% regulatory compliance and zero 3rd party inspection findings. These should be the goals of all contractors and NASA employees at WSTF. Not all of the elements of the process are controlled by the ECO contractor; operation of waste accumulation areas is a shared function of both TEST and ECO contractors. Perhaps language similar to WBS 1.4 (Quality and Environmental Management Systems) “Successful” 3rd party inspections would be more appropriate here.

Answer 39: It is not the intent of Section 4.0 to hold the ECO contractor responsible for non-compliance scenarios or violations caused solely by negligence of the user of those provided services (for example, another contractor collecting oily rags in a maintenance shop). Section 4.0 will be updated to state that 100% compliance is specific to the areas, units, rules, regulations, permits, and associated requirements that are under the direct control and management of the ECO contractor. Additionally, it is expected that the specific roles and responsibilities for environmental compliance requirements between contractors would be clearly defined in the ACA as specified in Section H.7 of the RFP.

Question 40: Attachment L-3, WSTF Task Order Performance Work Statement Section 1.0:

Recommend that the text be revised to clarify that monthly HSE safety inspections are only required for areas for which ECO contract personnel are designated as Deputy HSEs.

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Answer 40: Task Order 1.0, Section 10.a, of Attachment L-3 will be modified to state: “Perform monthly HSE safety inspections, evaluate any resultant corrective action requirements (SIMS action items), and track to completion. HSE inspections are only required for facilities operated by ECO personnel and managed by ECO contract HSE personnel.”

Question 41: Section L.19.3.1 Tables L-7 and L-9: Tables L-7 and L-9 provided the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) of the direct labor staffing for the PWS sections represented by the fixed price IDIQ Task Order and the cost-reimbursable Sample IDIQ Task Orders for Contract year 1. There is a difference of six FTEs between the two tables. Can NASA please explain the difference in FTEs between the two tables?

Answer 41: The cost-plus-fixed-fee task orders are sample task orders for indefinite delivery indefinite quantity (IDIQ) work and do not represent 100% of the potential work. Therefore, Table L-7 only shows the estimated FTEs for all the task orders, including the cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF) sample task orders for Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the Performance Work Statement. Table L-9 only represents the Government’s estimate of cumulative labor FTEs for all estimated IDIQ work in Contract Year 1.

Question 42: Section L.19.3.1 TA1 Part 2, Section B, Basis of Estimate (BOE) & Efficiencies or Cost Savings - Can you please verify that the Basis of Estimates are to be provided in Volume I and not Volume III? Is it acceptable for the narrative portion of Volume III to reference back to the Basis of Estimates provided in Volume I?

Answer 42: The Basis of Estimates (BOE) referenced in L.19.3.1 TA1 Part 2, Section B refers to the labor and non-labor resources to be included in Volume I. A duplication of the BOE is not required in Volume III. However, in determining its probable cost, the Government will adjust the resources in Volume III to reflect those in Volume I should the resources differ in the two volumes due to obvious errors. Note that except in the case of obvious errors, information in the Cost Volume takes precedence over the labor resources information in Volume I.

Question 43: Section L.19.4(e) - We assume that you are not asking for this information for every contract our company has performed over the past three years, but rather a representative sampling of projects similar in size, scope and complexity to the ECO contract. Can you please confirm that our understanding of this requirement is correct?

Answer 43: The Government is only requesting past performance data from contracts

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

that are relevant in nature and magnitude to the work anticipated on this procurement as referenced in L.19.4 (a) and (b). However, the Government is requesting all data for these relevant contracts, which is considered more than a representative sampling.

Question 44: Will the SEB evaluate all proposals independently or will they use other NASA WSTF subject matter experts to review various technical sections of the proposals? Will other reviewers from outside of NASA be enlisted to review proposal submittals?

Answer 44: The SEB will evaluate each proposal. Additionally, the voting members of the SEB will utilize other WSTF subject matter experts for assistance with various sections of the proposals. For example, the safety sections and cost sections will have NASA safety and pricing experts to assist the SEB with the proposal evaluation. There are no reviewers outside of NASA civil servants involved in the proposal evaluation process.

Question 45: Section L.11 – Where in the proposal do we address the information called for in Section L.11 (Government Property)?

Answer 45: The Government does not advise offerors on how to structure, or where to provide data, within their proposals. However, the property management requirements for the proposals are described in Section L.11 and the Performance Work Statement (Section 1.9) has been updated to provide additional clarification on the property management requirements including the interface requirements between the TEST and ECO contractors.

Question 46: Section L.19.4 (e) – the first sentence in this section states; “Offerors shall provide the following performance data with explanatory remarks on contracts performed in the last three years.” Question – Does this mean ALL of the offeror’s contracts/work in the past three years or contracts/work in the past three years that are relevant to the scope of this (pre) solicitation?

Answer 46: The Government is only requesting past performance data from contracts that are relevant in nature and magnitude to the work anticipated on this procurement as stated in L.19.4 (a) and (b). The relevant past performance data should be limited to the previous 3 years as specified in L.19.4 (e).

Question 47: Will the technical library be available throughout the proposal process?

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

Answer 47: The library will be available throughout the proposal process. For the purpose of the ECO solicitation, the library contains the official versions of applicable and reference documentation. This library can be continuously updated until the release of the final RFP. After release of the final RFP, notification of any updates to the library will be made through amendments.

Question 48: Does NASA see any OCI issues with issuance of this contract to a contractor that is currently working doing similar efforts for White Sands Missile Range?

Answer 48: WSTF and the U.S. Army White Sands Test Facility are separate installations, independent operations, and have unique and separate EPA identification numbers and environmental permits; therefore the Government does not believe any OCI issues may be present. However, it is each offeror's responsibility to evaluate and identify any potential OCI issues and describe the requirements, if any, in their OCI Plan as described in Section L.19.6 (K).

Question 49: Under the compliance standards listed in Section 4 of the PWS, there are many items which require 100% compliance and yet duties associated with those items are not fully under the control of the ECO contractor. For example, the oily rags disposal within the maintenance shops is under the facility contractor until such time that the ECO contractor undertakes assistance for compliance/disposal purposes. How will compliance with the contract metrics be addressed under a scenario where a violation or non-compliance issue is identified when not under the control of the ECO contractor?

Answer 49: It is not the intent of Section 4.0 to hold the ECO contractor responsible for non-compliance scenarios or violations caused solely by negligence of the user of those provided services (for example, another contractor collecting oily rags in a maintenance shop). Section 4.0 will be updated to state that 100% compliance is specific to the areas, units, rules, regulations, permits, and associated requirements that are under the direct control and management of the ECO contractor. Additionally, it is expected that the specific roles and responsibilities for environmental requirements between contractors would be clearly defined in the ACA as specified in Section H.7 of the RFP.

Question 50: Please provide more clarification regarding how government furnished property is to be handled and coordinated between the ECO contractor and the Test/Facility contractor.

Answer 50: The ECO contractor will be responsible for providing a property custodian that will provide ECO property inventory data to TEST on an annual basis. ECO will be required to work with the TEST contractor to inventory and reconcile assigned accounts.

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

The TEST contractor will be responsible for managing and reporting all on-site Government Property on a SF 1324.

The TEST contractor is responsible for accounting, reporting, inventory, and reconciliation of all installation-accountable equipment. ECO is responsible for assigning property custodians that are responsible for maintaining accountability of ECO assigned installation-accountable property. ECO and their assigned custodians will be required to perform a 100% inventory at the start of the contract with the responsible TEST contractor Property Officer. In addition, ECO custodians will be required to perform and support annual scheduled property audits of items held within their custodial accounts. Lost items will be reported to the TEST contractor for final submittal to NASA. ECO property custodians will also be required to support periodic external and internal audits or reviews as prescribed by the NASA Property Administrator. The TEST contractor will be responsible for all property reporting that is required as part of the terms and requirements of their contract. ECO is only required to maintain accountability, support audits, and training requirements for custodians. This clarification will be added to the Performance Work Statement, Section 1.9.

Question 51: In Section L.19.4 (d) on page L-31, can the same reference be used for more than one past contract or does each contract require a unique reference?

Answer 51: It is suggested that each contract have a unique reference, however in the event that only one reference is available for more than one contract, the same references will be accepted.

Question 52: Attachment L-3 PWS Section 1.0, TO 1FAENOP:

- a. There is no mention of updating or maintaining a web based system in the PWS (Section C), although it is contained in the workload indicators data in Attachment L-7. Could the government clarify the requirements for this task order as defined in section 5.c and 5.d?
- b. In Section 11b, can the government provide guidance on what amount is minor and within the Task Order? Is there a monthly and/or annual limit as to what is minor?

Answer 52: The Performance Work Statement, Section 1.5, will be updated to include maintaining web-based information systems as described in the L-7 workload indicators data. The 1.0 Task Order requirements defined in sections 5.c and 5.d of Attachment L-3 are routine web-page updates to relatively small internal and external pages. Additionally, the updates to the information repository web page is limited to the quantity of documentation prepared and submitted to regulatory agencies; historically there are approximately 10-15 formal submittals per month, along with any associated supporting documentation. As for Section 11.b of the same 1.0 Task Order, an annual limit of

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

\$3,000 for minor repairs will be added to the Task Order to define the scope of the repair requirements.

Question 53: Attachment L-3 PWS Section 3.0, TO 1FAENCM:

a. In Section 1p, can the government provide a list of TSD vendors with existing contracts in the TRL?

b. In Section 1q, major repairs require authorization. Does that mean minor repairs are within the scope? If so, what are the criteria for major?

Answer 53 (a): The ECO contractor has the responsibility for researching, evaluating, and procuring TSD vendors for the waste streams, and vendors can change depending on allowable waste streams, location, cost, audit results, or other related issues. There is no requirement to use specific TSD vendors. A list of TSD vendors will not be added to the TRL. However, for general information purposes, the current TSD vendors include Clean Harbors, Veolia, Rinchem, Mesa Environmental, and Stericycle.

Answer 53 (b): As specified by Section 1.q, all Evaporation Tank Unit (ETU) and Fuel Treatment Unit (FTU) maintenance requirements are discussed with the NASA Project Manager prior to implementation. Minor repairs are authorized in the scope of the Task Order. Examples of minor repairs could include paint touch-up, caulking, replacing no-slip tape on the stairs, and other low-cost, easily implemented, simple repairs. Examples of major repairs could include crack sealing the ETU apron, replacing liners and netting, drain line modifications, and other larger-scale changes to the various components of the units. Major repairs will be authorized by the Project Manager on a case-by-case basis.

Question 54: There are 12 Technicians listed in Table L-9 on page L-27, but there are 11 Haz. Waste Comp. Techs listed in Attachment J-15. Please clarify this discrepancy.

Answer 54: The Attachment J-15 list of CBA employees was inconsistent with the IGE in Section L, Table L-9. The 12 technicians listed in Table L-9 have been updated to be consistent with the 11 technicians in Attachment J-15. Note that the 11 technicians are the Government's IGE for those standard labor categories (SLCs) with respect to the work identified in the ECO contract. Attachment J-15 will also be updated at the time of the final RFP.

Question 55: In the Past Performance Questionnaire, Technical item #7 on page 6 of 11, " Particular details of any accidents or industrial illnesses resulting in lost time." and #8 " Particular strong/weak points of contractor's performance." are not consistent with applying an assessment rating. Will the government remove the rating categories from

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

each item?

Answer 55: The intent of the question is to describe the details of any accidents and then discuss how well management handled the situation. The rating categories will remain as-is.

Question 56: In the Past Performance Questionnaire, Technical item #4 on page 5 of 11, "Identification, surveillance, and management of major/critical subcontractors" will the government allow for non-applicability of the item?

Answer 56: Yes, the evaluator can use non-applicable in the narrative.

Question 57: There is overlap between Part 1 and Part 2 of L.19.3.1. The heading of TA1 – Part 1 in L.19.3.1 is "Overall Technical Approach" with a focus on demonstrating an "in-depth comprehensive understanding of the requirements". The heading of TA1-Part 2 is "Specific Technical Understanding and Resources", with the focus being to "detail the technical approach" for each required task. In some cases the work areas identified in the PWS referenced in Part 1 are identical to the work areas listed in the Task Orders contained in Attachment L-3 that are referenced in Part 2, such as for Task Order 1FAENOP. Can the government clarify what information should be provided in the responses to these two sections to avoid duplication within the limited page count?

Answer 57: The intent of Section L.19.3.1, TA1 Part 1, is to obtain an overview narrative describing an overall understanding of the technical requirements of the Performance Work Statement and describe any contract-level interdependencies, efficiencies, risks, and mitigations. For Section L.19.3.1, TA1 Part 2, the intent is to evaluate an offeror's technical approach at the Task Order level with respect to specific resources (FTEs and SLCs) and any Task Order specific risks/mitigations and efficiencies that may affect these resources. Offerors are advised that duplication of TA2 Task Order level information in the contract-level TA1 narrative should only be limited to brief descriptions, where appropriate and relevant. text in Section L.19.3.1 has been modified to clarify the difference between Part 1 and Part 2 responses.

Question 58: A cost estimate is required for the Task Orders, but it is stated that only the Resources Table shown as Table L-5 in L.19.3.1 "shall agree with the narrative discussion in paragraphs A and B above. The tables shall reconcile to the cost volume." Paragraph B is in reference to the required BOE, which includes non-labor resources, but there is no accommodation in Table L-5 for non-labor resources. Please clarify if it would be acceptable to add rows or a separate table for the non-labor resources.

Answer 58: An additional row has been added to Table L-5 for the non-labor

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

resources. Offerors will need to provide a narrative to explain what is in each non-labor resource category.

Question 59: Clause H.15 requires that ALL licenses and permits required for the performance of the work be obtained at no cost to the government. Typically on-site staff would charge their time to the contract, while registration fees are charged to overhead. Can the government clarify whether staff time and/or fees are allowable charges?

Answer 59: The requirements of this clause pertain only to standard business licenses, permits, and certifications required for conducting business with the Federal Government and within the State of NM. This does not apply to any WSTF environmental permits.

Question 60: DRD ECO-017 Environmental Compliance Plan requires offerors to compare company's policy to NASA and OSHA's and discuss any differences. Are these going to be made available in the TRL?

Answer 60: During the pre-proposal conference, links to the NASA and OSHA policies and requirements were included on Slide 44 of the NASA presentation, and this document is currently posted to the ECO solicitation website. The NASA and OSHA documents will not be posted to the TRL; however, the website links from the presentation are also provided as follows:

NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplements (NFS)

<http://nais.nasa.gov/far/>

- NFS 1852.223-70 - Safety and Health
- NFS1852.223-73 - Safety and Health Plan
- NFS 1852.223-75 - Major Breach of Safety or Security

General NASA information

<http://www.nasa.gov/>

Occupational Safety & Health Administration

<http://www.osha.gov/>

JSC Safety and Health handbook (JPR 1700.1)

<http://jschandbook.jsc.nasa.gov/>

Question 61: Attachment J-12, WSTF Training Program Description, the lists of

Questions and Answers
Solicitation NNJ10336475R

Environmental Compliance and Operations (ECO)

courses and estimates is incomplete. Will the government provide an updated, complete listing the in Final RFP?

Answer 61: The J-12 list of training was complete, based on the training database, when the draft RFP was issued. However, it will be reviewed again and updated, if needed, in the final RFP.

Question 62: In the ECO Performance Work Statement, Section 4.0, most of the standards are 100% compliance or 100% regulatory compliance and zero 3rd party findings. While permit requirements and regulatory submittals should always be met, some requirements may not be regulatory requirements. Would the Government consider revising the standard to 95% as a more practical standard for the non-regulatory requirements? Meeting some of these standards may be outside the control and/or authority of the ECO contractor.

Answer 62: Section 4.0 does not have any non-regulatory requirements identified for 100% compliance. The 100% compliance requirement is specific to laws, regulations, permits, and other agency-approved documentation requirements. It is not the intent of Section 4.0 to hold the ECO contractor responsible for non-compliance scenarios or violations caused solely by negligence of the user of those provided services (for example, the TEST contractor collecting oily rags in a maintenance shop). Section 4.0 will be updated to state that 100% compliance is specific to the areas, units, rules, regulations, permits, and associated requirements that are under the direct control and management of the ECO contractor. Additionally, it is expected that the specific roles and responsibilities for environmental requirements between contractors would be clearly defined in the ACA as specified in Section H.7 of the RFP.

Question 63: In L.19.6, "Volume IV - Plans and Other Data", the first heading is "A. Environmental Compliance and Operations Program Management Plan". Should this heading be modified to be only "Program Management Plan", per the outline shown on page L-15, and on the basis that the Environmental Compliance Plan is addressed under heading "C" in L.19.6?

Answer 63: The header will be changed to Program Management Plan in Section L.19.6 (A).