

**Q&A to Request for Proposal (RFP) issued on 10/11/06
Amendment 005 to RFP NNJ07157099R**

Q. 340. Reference Section L 6.0 volume II Technical Proposals and “A” Understanding Resources/Technical Approach Page L-26. If “A” asks for a technical approach at the major SOW section level (i.e., 2.0 Maintenance and Repair), is it the JSC desire to have a broad discussion at the 2.0 level, then an amplification of those sublevels where an A, technical approach, is also required. (1.0 and 1.2)

Answer: If an “A” is required with respect to technical approach at the high level WBS (i.e. 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, etc.) the offeror shall have a broad discussion at that level. At the sub levels, then a detailed discussion shall be provided by the offeror with regard to that particular level of WBS.

Q.341. It is unclear how to respond to the “A” designation in the areas where there is an A at the top level, and also at the sub level. Specifically you request a technical understanding discussion for Section 3.0 Operations, and also for Section 3.2 Operations. This is also true for Section 2.0 and 2.3. Since both of these are summary discussions of items at lower levels of the outline, it is not clear how to differentiate our response.

Answer: If an “A” is required with respect to technical approach at the high level WBS (i.e. 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, etc.) the offeror shall have a broad discussion at that level. At the sub levels, then a detailed discussion shall be provided by the offeror with regard to that particular level of WBS.

Q. 342. Reference Section L Attachment 5 pages L-5-1 through L-5-8. Please confirm that our assumptions below concerning the technical workbook and its associated attachments/charts are correct?

For each of the charts, L-5-1 through L-5-3, the first yellow block (1.0, 2.0, and 3.0) are the total staffing for that Annex. This column carries forward to L-5-7 (CF-TRST worksheet) proposed FTE’s CY1.

The “CLIN Total” box at the end for L-5-1 through L-5-3 is only a total for the yellow boxes, and does not carry forward to the L-5-7. This total probably will be less than the total FTE’s for the annex because there are numerous boxes blackened, thus omitting the required FTE’s for the annex.

The CLIN 6.0 and 7.0 total column for L-5-4 and L-5-5 carry forward to the summary chart (CF-TRST worksheet) proposed FTE’s CY1.

On L-5-6, the spill scenario and the construction scenario are totaled in the “Both scenarios total column” in the “Resources table TRT-IDIQ DO&TO” worksheet and the respective totals of each column (TO/DO) carries forward to the summary chart on L-5-8 (IDIQ-TRST) worksheet?

**Q&A to Request for Proposal (RFP) issued on 10/11/06
Amendment 005 to RFP NNJ07157099R**

Answer: The assumptions for the first part of the question are correct except for the assumption that the total FTE's in the CF-TRST would be less than the individual Resources Table 1.0, 2.0, etc. The areas blackened out in the Resources Tables shall not be populated by the offerors; instead only the areas in yellow shall be populated by applicable resources. The total on the CF-TRST shall reflect the cumulative total for all Resources Tables 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 6.0 and 7.0.

The assumption with regard to the question on the spill scenario and construction scenario is correct. The totals on the TRT-IDIQ DO&TO do carry over to the IDIQ-TRST worksheet.

Q. 343. The "Total FTE Prime and All Subs" in worksheets resources table TRT-1.0, resources table TRT-2.0, resources table TRT-3.0 (pages L-5-1 to L-5-3) does not include the subtotal line for "Craft". Is this correct?

Answer: This is not a correct formula on the spreadsheets. The total line for Total FTE Prime and All Subs shall include the total for "Craft" personnel. This has been corrected in Amendment 3 to the Request for Proposal (RFP).

Q. 344. The TRST-IDIQ page L-5-8 references DO 1 resources basis (IGE) in the second column. Is our assumption correct that DO 1 is the spill scenario, which we believe is a TO?

Answer: The offeror shall identify at the top of the appropriate column either the spill scenario or the construction scenario in either series of columns as long as they are identified.

Q. 345. IDIQ workbook. The ICST worksheet requires a direct hourly labor rate for each SLC, the BARE worksheet also requires a direct hourly rate per SLC. The composite hourly labor rates developed for each SLC in the "Other Workbook", worksheets TC (a) and TC (b) would be used for the ICST and Bare? Please confirm.

Answer: The templates in TC (a) and TC (b) are straight time direct labor rates and shall not be loaded on these templates. The loads are accomplished on the ICST templates and the BARE templates and begin with the straight time direct labor determined from the TC (a) and TC (b) template rates and then "loaded" to arrive at the loaded rate per SLC on the ICST and BARE templates.

Q. 346. Section L, paragraph 7.0 standard labor categories. It is possible that when an offeror maps their labor categories to the SLC's, an offeror may have both exempt and non-exempt (SCA, CBA) positions for a one or more SLC? As you know, exempt and non-exempt labor categories usually have different hourly rates, productive hours and fringe benefits. For those few SLC's where there are exempt and non-exempt positions, can offerors create a SLC for exempt only and SLC for non-exempt? If the answer is no, can offerors use another worksheet not

**Q&A to Request for Proposal (RFP) issued on 10/11/06
Amendment 005 to RFP NNJ07157099R**

provided by the Government to develop these composite rates and submit as part of the proposal?

Answer: No. The offeror shall not create any additional SLCs or provide another worksheet containing separate exempt and nonexempt positions when both SCA and CBA positions exist within offeror categories. Instead the offeror shall map these differences in the TC (a) and TC (b) as applicable and provide a composite rate per SLC. The TC (a) and the TC (b) provide for mapping differences.

Q.347. In the Facilities RFP, it is requested that Associate Contractor Agreements (ACA's) are established with the Logistics Operations Contract, Grounds Contract, Custodial Contract, Environmental Contract, ESPC Contract, and MSOC Contractors as well as the JIMMS, JETS, ODIN DO4, PAMMS, NSOC and the Honeywell EBI Sustaining Services Contract. Two questions: To accomplish this, is there a list of contacts for the ESPC Contract, and MSOC Contractors as well as the JIMMS, JETS, ODIN DO4, PAMMS, NSOC and the Honeywell EBI Sustaining Services Contracts to get the process started? Is there a particular reason why the Facilities Contract requires such agreements with ESPC, MSOC, JIMMS, JETS, ODIN DO4, PAMMS, NSOC and the Honeywell EBI Sustaining Services Contracts and the Logistics Operations contract (at this time) does not?

Answer: It is anticipated that the Facilities contract will interface with the twelve respective contracts listed above and therefore an ACA with the listed contracts has been determined to be necessary in the fulfillment of the Facilities contract requirements. Your question related to the Logistics Operations contract should be directed to the Logistics Operations Contract Contracting Officer.

Q.348. The timeframe allotted for Technical Scenario #2 could be adversely impacted by the Logistics and Custodial contracts workload, even with solid Associate Contractor Agreements in place. So the question is, will the FSS Contractor be held accountable for the potential delays resulting from other contractors in the DO time frames provided?

Answer: No. The Facilities Contractor is not accountable for other Contractor delays.

Q.349. Reference Annex 1 Definition of Work Authorization Document (*WAD). A document prepared by the JSC organization customers that initiates facility modifications or new capabilities. The WAD's can be used to initiate studies, designs, construction, maintenance or Requests for Proposals. The work is accomplished via Delivery Order (DO), Task Order (TO), Service Order (SO) or Contract Work Order (WO) with appropriate funding when required. Please add the definitions of delivery order, task order, service order and work order to Annex 1 definitions to clarify the distinctions between these various work types.

Answer: References to Service Orders will be removed from Annex 1 "Definitions." This will be corrected in amendment 005 to the RFP. Refer to Section H, Clause H.2 "Task

**Q&A to Request for Proposal (RFP) issued on 10/11/06
Amendment 005 to RFP NNJ07157099R**

Ordering Procedure (Annex 4), Clause H.3 “ Task Orders – Proposals (Annex 4), Clause H.4 “Method of Placing Delivery Orders (Annex 5) and Clause H.5 “Delivery Orders – Ordering and Proposals (Annex 5) for distinctions between the various work types.

Q.350. Section G.15, Use of Government Owned Property (NFS 1852.245-79). This provision appears to be in the wrong location. Shouldn't this solicitation provision be moved to Section K so it can be completed and submitted, along with the other representations and certification?

(a) Answer: Yes. Clause G.15 “Use of Government Owned Property (NFS 1852.245-79) has been removed from Section G and placed at the end of Section K, “Representations and Certifications.” This was corrected in amendment 004 to the RFP.

Section I, FAR 52.204-2, Security Requirements is listed, but the RFP does not contain a completed DD254. Please provide a completed DD254 for this solicitation.

(b) Answer: You may visit the following URL to obtain Department of Defense forms: <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/infomgt/forms/formsprogram.htm>

Section K does not contain FAR 52.204-8 clause, Annual Representations and Certification. Does the Government not want us to utilize the online representations and certification application? If so, please add the mission clause.

(c) Answer: FAR Clause 52.204-8 “Annual Representations and Certifications” has been added to Section K of the RFP. This was corrected in amendment 004 to the RFP.

Q.351. According to NPR 8553.1A, Section 1.1 (d), page 10, all contracts issued by JSC are required to explicitly reference a requirement for conformance with the JSC Environmental Management System (JPR 8553.1) and therefore JPR 8550.1, which are the procedures developed which implement JPR 8553.1. I can not find a reference within the solicitation.

Answer: The reference to the above is in Annex 1, 1.10.1. JPR's 8550.1 and 8553.1 were added to the Technical Reference Library (TRL) via amendment 003 of the RFP.

Q.352. Reference Annex 6, Table 6-3. The Captaris Alchemy product is listed as a property document management application. This product has extensive document management capabilities. Is it an objective of the Government to employ this product, or can this product be made available to the contractor to satisfy the history maintenance requirement? Are any such uses currently being employed?

**Q&A to Request for Proposal (RFP) issued on 10/11/06
Amendment 005 to RFP NNJ07157099R**

Answer: The Captaris Alchemy software will not be used in the Facilities contract. The reference to this product will be deleted from Table 6-3. This will be corrected in amendment 005 to the RFP.

Q.353. From RFP page L-22 (B) Safety and Health Approach, SA2. The Offeror shall provide the following reports covering their last five years of performance: their days away case rate, total recordable incident rate, days away plus restricted duty plus job transfer rate, OSHA logs, loss runs and experience modification rate from workers' compensation underwriters, and records of OSHA and EPA citations. The OSHA logs have been requested as part of the past performance therefore this is a duplicated request. The loss runs can take up 30 pages or more. Can these be exempted from the page count?

Answer: Yes. Amendment 003 to the RFP deleted SA 2 from Section L, L.25 "Section L – Part II", paragraph 5.0 "Volume I – Management", page L-22, because it is redundant to Section L, L.25 "Section L – Part II", paragraph 9.0 "Volume III – Past Performance, paragraph (c) (i), (ii), and (iii). In addition, amendment 003 of the RFP deleted SA 2 from Section M, paragraph B "Safety and Health Approach." The OSHA logs are still required as part of the Past Performance volume, which has no page count limit.

Q.354. Reference Section L, page L-22 SA2. Subject reference requires loss runs for the last 5 years of performance. Does this mean the company of the referenced contracts? Our company is large and the loss run from the Insurance group is voluminous. Since the proposal is limited to 200 and there is nothing to indicate this data is exempt from the page count, it is creating a problem. Please clarify exactly what is wanted in SA2 and whether or not this information is part of the page count.

Answer: Please refer to the answer to question 353 above. SA2 has been deleted. OSHA data is still required as part of the Past Performance volume (Volume III), which has no total page count limit.

NOTE: The page count limit for Volumes I and II combined remains at 225 pages. See Section L, provision L.19 "Proposal Page Limitation" (NFS 1852.215-81) (FEB 1998) of the RFP.