

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Clause B, B.7 Table, page 8 of 28,	<p>The table titled "SACOM CLIN VALUE STRUCTURE (CONTRACT PERIOD 1 &amp; 2)" which covers CLIN 201 includes the footnote "**Includes the Government directed Core Plug of \$10.5M" and the subsequent paragraphs following this table provide the following descriptions/definitions:</p> <p>"Work Description: Non-personal Services: Provides all but not limited to labor, tools, material, and equipment (except as otherwise indicated in the performance work statement (PWS) as government furnished) to perform Contract Management (PWS 1.0), Logistics &amp; Product Data Management (PWS 2.0), Safety, Health &amp; Environmental (PWS 3.0), Engineering, Manufacturing &amp; Test (PWS 4.0) and Facility Operations &amp; Maintenance (PWS 6.0) Cost Reimbursable Incentive fee Award Term."</p> <p>"Core Plug Dollar amount Description: The CORE contains a total of \$7M per year, which represents the historical work requirements for purchases (Direct Buys) (60%) and customer/tenant service requests under \$5,000 (35%). The customer/tenant services requests primarily consists of Facility Operations and Maintenance requirements and purchases, however may include Site Services, Logistics and Property Management, Contract Management, Engineering and Manufacturing Support Services, Safety, Health &amp; Environmental requirements (5%)."</p> <p>Below are questions related to the footnote and statements identified above. A. We understand that the footnote regarding the Core Plug applies to PWS Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, and 6.0. Does the Core Plug numbers also include the cost of offeror tools, materials, and equipment related to performance of work under PWS 5.0 in the fixed price CLINs for each period? B. Does the Core Plug Dollar amount, include offeror miscellaneous tools, PPE, and administrative costs (e.g. paper, copiers), to perform PWS 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, and 6.0. C. Does the Core Plug Number include all the maintenance and repair materials and equipment to perform PWS 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, and 6.0? D. Does the Core Plug Dollar amount include such items as annual certifications of pressure vessels and systems, elevators, pressure testing equipment, cranes and environmental laboratory analysis, industrial and drinking water chemicals, refrigerants, etc?</p>	<p>A. In accordance with the Government Directed Core Plug Description identified in the final RFP Clause B.7 (Total Contract Value), The Core plug Description is only applicable to the Cost Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF) CLINs. B., C., &amp; D. Historically the work performed in support of services request under \$5,000 has been similar to the work performed in the Contract core requirements; therefore miscellaneous tools, PPE, etc. should be already available for use. In the event there is a unique requirement for the service request and the service request is below the threshold of \$5,000 then the service request will bear the cost of the unique item. The Government Directed Core Plug is in addition to the offeror's responsibility to price the SACOM Core Requirements per the PWS. The Government Directed Core Plug represents the unknown amount of work for NASA programs and projects, and tenants. If a NASA program or project, or tenant initiates a service request under \$5,000, that service request would include all cost (i.e. labor, material, etc.) to perform the requested service with the exception of items the Government has provided or required as part of the SACOM Core requirement (i.e. tools, certifications, etc.).</p>
L.II-5. (b) 1) ii. a), p. 25	Should offerors complete Form L.I-24C Staffing Worksheet for all contract years?	The Form L.I-24C Staffing Worksheet shall address all applicable WYEs for each contract year to match the WYEs included in the Cost/Price Proposal. Amendment 02 updates the Staffing Worksheet to incorporate all contract periods.
L.II-6	RFP Section L.II-6 requires Joint Ventures to submit a thorough and clear explanation of why the past performance of Joint Venture partners is predictive of the Offeror's (Joint Venture's) performance and to demonstrate a history of successfully performing Joint Ventures. RFP Section M.6 does not provide criteria for evaluating for this information. Please clarify how the Government will evaluate this data.	The Government has omitted the requirement to submit the information referenced in the question. In addition, language has been added to section M to minimize ambiguity as to how the past performance information of predecessor business entities and joint venture partners will be evaluated. To further clarify, if a new business entity/joint venture has little or no past performance, that entity/JV may submit the relevant past performance of a predecessor business entity or of a joint venture partner. This past performance is then treated just like any other past performance. Under L., the Offeror is required to explain why it considers that past performance relevant to the work to be performed by the new business entity, or Joint Venture partner, for whom the past performance is provided. If reasonable to attribute the performance of the past efforts to the proposed effort, and when the proposal clearly demonstrates the resources of the predecessor entity or joint venture partner will meaningfully affect performance of the instant acquisition, the Government will consider such past performance. If the Government determines that the past performance is relevant (and recent), the Government will go on to evaluate that past performance.
PWS 2.1.2, Workload Data, Page 45 of 230	Shipping and Packaging workload indicates all shipments from SSC. Given the language in A. Scope, this appears to be an error. If not, could you please provide workload data for shipping and packaging that offerors should include in cost estimates?	The requirement stated in the Final RFP indicates SSC only, which is in error. The estimated workload data is a SACOM representation, which includes both MAF and SSC. Amendment 2 corrects the PWS.
Section L.II-7, paragraph vi on page 51/79; L-8 (MCT) Material Cost Template	<p>This section requires "...complet[ion] of L-8 for SSC marked as L-8a and one L-8 for MAF marked as L-8b) Offeror shall identify, to the specific PWS level, all material it will furnish to perform services. Note: IDIQ materials will be priced with individual work/task orders and are included in the Government provided IDIQ plug number. Material as a direct cost along with its applied indirect rate shall be non-fee bearing..."</p> <p>Q: Please confirm that offerors are required to provide a BOM only for FFP CLIN, as the USG has provided the plug number for the CPIF CLIN. Requiring a BOM for the CPIF CLIN strongly favors the incumbent, because the incumbent knows EXACTLY what has been purchased.</p>	Offerors are required to provide material costs on L-8 a (SSC) and L-8b (MAF) for any material the contractor determines will be necessary for it to perform to the PWS standards of the FFP Core CLIN as well as the CPIF Core CLIN. See Section B, paragraph B-3 (b)1)i, page 2 of 28.
L.I-13 and L.I-19; Proposal Submission Instructions, (p. 5 of 58) and Contract Phase-In (p. 11 of 58)	<p>Sections state that the OCI Plan should be provided in Vol. II Past Performance. However, L.II-3(c) Additional Documentation (p. 22 of 58) states that the OCI Plan should be submitted in Vol. IV Model Contract, although L.II-8 Model Contract (p. 57 of 58) instructions provide no mention of the OCI Plan.</p> <p>Q: Can the government clarify if the OCI Plan should be provided in Vol. II Past Performance or Vol. IV Model Contract?</p>	The OCI Plan is part of Volume II, not part of Volume IV. Amendment 2 omits the reference to Volume IV in Clause L.II-3.
PWS 1.3.2.B.1.f, page 30/231; General Requirements / Work Control	<p>Section states: "...NOTE: The Contractor shall utilize the Government-provided CMMS and Maximo to the maximum extent practicable when entering, managing, and tracking work requirements..." However, Maximo is itself a CMMS.</p> <p>Q: Are there two systems that must be utilized? If so, are both provided by the Government?</p>	Maximo is the primary software utilized for CMMS. Refer to attachment J-9 for a complete list of government provided IT software.
PWS 6.0.D.1, page 204/231 General Requirements / SSC and MAF Requirements (Work Types)	<p>Section lists the following work types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Operations (OPS)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Programmed Maintenance (PGM)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Planned Maintenance (PLM)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Preventive Maintenance (PM)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Proof Load (P/L)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Repair (RP)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Predictive Testing and Inspection (PTI)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Predictive Testing and Inspection Repairs (PTIR)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Replacement of Obsolete Items (ROI)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Trouble Calls (TC)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Service Requests (SR)</li> </ul> <p>Assumption is made this is not a new requirement, and therefore historical workloads for each type of work exist.</p> <p>Q: Please provide historical quantities for each type of work required to be tracked in the CMMS.</p>	See the existing FY13_Work_Orders file in the SACOM-Hist_Ref folder in the SACOM Reference Library for FY13 work order data.
PWS 6.0.D.2, page 204/231; General Requirements / SSC Only Requirements	<p>Section states: "...The Contractor is responsible for maintaining the SSC System Operations and Maintenance Responsibility Database (SOMRD) in accordance with SSTD-8070-0010-CONFIG, Maintenance of the SSC System Operations and Maintenance Responsibility Database (SOMRD)..."</p> <p>Q: Is the SORMD used in addition to Maximo, or in lieu of Maximo?</p>	The SOMRD is populated with data from Maximo. See Figure 1 in existing SSTD-8070-0101-CONFIG for a description on how the two databases are updated.
DD254	In what volume does the DD254 need to be submitted?	DD254 is not to be submitted with the proposal. The successful offeror will complete the DD254 during phase-in.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Copies of a redacted version of the U. S. Department of Labor OSHA Log of Work Related Injuries and Illnesses – OSHA Form 300, and the Summary of Work Related Injuries and Illnesses-OSHA Form 300A. Provide a statement and explanation of all OSHA citations provided.	What years of OSHA logs are to be submitted? Recommend the last three years -- 2011-2013	Amendment 2, RFP Section L.II-6 (f)(2)(iv) has been revised to read, Copies of a redacted version of the U. S. Department of Labor OSHA Log of Work Related Injuries and Illnesses – OSHA Form 300, and the Summary of Work Related Injuries and Illnesses-OSHA Form 300A for the last three (3) years of reference contract(s). Provide a statement and explanation of all OSHA citations provided.
OCI Plan	L.II-3.(a) lists the OCI Plan as additional required documentation for the Model Contract Proposal - Volume IV submission. L.II-8.(a) does not list the OCI Plan as part of the Model Contract Does the Government want the OCI Plan submitted as part of the Past Performance Volume and the Model Contract Volume?	The OCI Plan is part of Volume II, not part of Volume IV. Amendment 2 omits the reference to Volume IV in Clause L.II-3.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM)	Section L, page 45, instructs Offerors to complete the L-4 LH-RT templates to include the Prime and "all subcontractors". Is it the Government's intent that minor subcontractor are to be included in the Prime's LH-RT? This would appear to be contradictory to Section L, page 42, direction that "the EPM templates/forms are required for each prime Offeror, major subcontractor, teaming partner, and joint venture partner". Contractor recommends that Section instructions for the L-4 LH-RT should read "all major subcontractors".	Section L, page 45, states in part: "All Offerors (prime and subcontractors) meeting the criterion for submission of a Total Compensation Package under FAR provision 52.222-46 and supplemented by NFS provision 1852.231-71 shall complete this form." Section L, page 42 direction states in part: "Electronic Pricing Forms (EPM): (See L.II-7 Attachment 1). Unless stated otherwise, the EPM templates/forms are required for each prime Offeror, major subcontractor, teaming partner, and joint venture partner (in accordance with joint venture agreement)." The Section L, page 45 states otherwise of the instructions on page 42 as intended. If a subcontractor meets the requirement of FAR provision 52.222-46 supplemented by NFS provision 1852.231-71 for submission of a Total Compensation Package, then Form L-4 LH-RT is to be completed by the subcontractor.
Section L.II-7, b	Section L directs that the Offeror shall propose all costs in "real year dollars". Please define "real year's dollars".	"Real Year's Dollars" are dollars that have been adjusted for inflation.
H.12 Associate Contract Agreements	H.12 specifies that an ACA is required with MFSC Information Technology Services (MITS). What relation does the SACOM contractor have with MITS?	MITS is the MSFC subcontractor responsible for IT related services at MAF. They are responsible for cable plant, cable infrastructure, security cameras, etc. They interface with MSFOC when issue with these systems arise. They may also attend design reviews to understand if there are any requirements associated with their contract.
H.32, DRD PC 18-1.1, L.1-19	H.32 and DRD PC 18-1.1 specify the delivery date of the Strike Plan to be 60 days preceding the Phase-in start date. L.1-19 states that the Strike plan will be submitted during the Phase-in. Will the strike plan be required as a phase-in deliverable?	Amendment 2 revised DRD PC18-1.1 to state, "Initial submission to be made no later than 60 days after award of contract."
Historical Reference Data/Workload data, and RFP Attachments	Final RFP Historical Reference Data/Workload data, and RFP Attachments does not provide information needed to determine Preventive Maintenance on dynamic equipment such as Generator KW/HP, Air Conditioning Tonnage, Pump or Compressor HP/GPM, etc. Please provide information on the Equipment to be PM that identify the equipment size or capacity.	A comprehensive list of the information requested is not available. The equipment manufacturer, model and serial numbers provided in Attachment J-1 provide the most comprehensive information on the equipment to be maintained.
Attachment J-1, PWS 3.4.5, Waste Management, p. 76	Municipal waste (refuse) collection and disposal is not specified in the PWS. Is this service performed by other contractors? The answer provided in the final RFP was stated as ..."Management and Disposal of Municipal solid waste commonly known as trash, garbage, refuse or rubbish is a service to be performed by the SACOM Contractor. This scope is identified in PWS 3.4.5, Waste Management PWS Sections 3.4.5(6) and 3.4.5(7)." A review of the RFP PWS, Historical Reference Data/Workload data, and RFP Attachments does not provide locations or quantity of dumpsters nor frequency for service. Please provide information on the waste (refuse) collection and disposal locations, quantity/size of dumpsters and frequency for service.	Refer to the SACOM Reference Library, under the historical & reference Data folder, see the Environmental Monthly Report (includes MAF hazardous waste history). Also, see the SACOM Reference Library, under the historical and reference data folder, for a representative list of both MAF and SSC refuse containers.
Attachment J-1 PWS - APPENDIX C ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS	Definition - 'Staff and Operate' - This term is used for systems that require continuous staffing during the operational period. Personnel may also operate other systems within the immediate vicinity. A Search of the Attachment J-1 Performance Work Statement (PWS) document finds no reference to the term 'Staff and Operate'. Please clarify the areas of the PWS that have a Staff and Operate requirement. The answer provided in the final RFP was stated as ..."All requirements for the SACOM contract are outlined in the Performance Work Statement. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure appropriate staffing is available and adequate to meet the PWS requirements." A review of the RFP PWS, Historical Reference Data/Workload data, and RFP Attachments does not clarify where the continuous staffing is required. Please provide information in the PWS as to the Staff to Operate requirements.	Staff and operate requirements are found in PWS 5.7 A.
Historical Reference Data/Workload data IDIQ ROM Historical ESTIMATE	Final RFP Historical Reference Data/Workload data IDIQ ROM Historical Estimate provides that an amount of IDIQ work will be initiated during transition to the Offeror. The information does not discern if the IDIQ work will be fully developed with the requirement to execute or will the IDIQ work require development of estimates and negotiation. Please provide expanded PWS description and requirements that will allow the Offeror to staff and manage these requirements.	All IDIQ work will be initiated utilizing the procedures identified at Clause H.7. During transition, the IDIQ workload will primarily consist of the on-going requirements that are in execution. Please refer to the referenced historical information provided for the estimate of IDIQ work by PWS during transition.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
6.0 FACILITY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, D General Requirements, Page 202 Of 230	<p>RFP requirements states in part ...  O&amp;M requirements shall be recorded in the CMMS for the purposes of identifying discrepancies and tracking the history of all O&amp;M for FSEU. The CMMS shall have the following minimum capabilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Storing equipment records. (Reference PWS Section 2.2)</li> <li>Storing job plans/instructions for all recurring work (i.e., inspections, preventive maintenance, etc.).</li> <li>Tracking and scheduling O&amp;M activities/work orders. Work order records shall collect the following data at a minimum:</li> <li>Attaching photos, documents, reports, etc. to an equipment or work order record.</li> <li>Routing work orders for review/approval.</li> <li>Accessing existing historical maintenance data for trending and reporting.</li> <li>Providing accessibility to the Government.</li> </ol> <p>Without access to the Government CMMS (MAXIMO) during Phase-In the Offeror will not be able to have the stated requirements in place and functional at Contract Start.. Request the Contracting Officer identify a period of time in days during the Phase-in Period when the Government CMMS (MAXIMO) will be available for the Offeror to enter the following so work can be scheduled at the start of contract Performance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to equipment records so that Offeror can enter asset number, description, and other pertinent data.</li> <li>Access to Job Plans so the Offeror can enter their proposed job Plans for PM.</li> <li>Access to MAXIMO so the Offeror can enter tracking and scheduling requirements.</li> <li>Access equipment/work order records in MAXIMO so Offeror can update requirements.</li> <li>Access to MAXIMO so the Offeror can test routing, review, and approval processes.</li> <li>Access to existing historical record maintenance data to ensure trending and reporting requirements are in place and functional.</li> <li>Access to MAXIMO to ensure the Government accessibility is in place and functional.</li> </ol> <p>In addition those requirements the Offeror will need access to Maximo to update Offeror Organization Numbers and Names, employee information, and other pertinent data that will allow the CMMS to be functional.</p>	The Maximo CMMS systems will be operational with all maintenance work scheduled by the current contractors at the end of the Phase In period. The SACOM Contractor will have access to Maximo at MAF and SSC during the Phase-In period, but will not be able to make any changes to the "live" version until May 1, 2015. The SACOM Contractor will have 60 days after the Contract start date to make the changes required per the PWS.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 1.2.5	The section states a Micro-Purchase threshold. Please provide the threshold.	<p>In accordance with FAR 2.101, Micro-purchase threshold" means \$3,000, except it means—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For acquisitions of construction subject to 40 U.S.C. chapter 31, subchapter IV, Wage Rate Requirements (Construction), \$2,000;</li> <li>For acquisitions of services subject to 41 U.S.C. chapter 67, Service Contract Labor Standards, \$2,500; and</li> <li>For acquisitions of supplies or services that, as determined by the head of the agency, are to be used to support a contingency operation or to facilitate defense against or recovery from nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological attack as described in 13.201(g) (1), except for construction subject to 40 U.S.C. chapter 31, subchapter IV, Wage Rate Requirements (Construction) (41 U.S.C. 1903)--</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$15,000 in the case of any contract to be awarded and performed, or purchase to be made, inside the United States; and</li> <li>\$30,000 in the case of any contract to be awarded and performed, or purchase to be made outside the United States.</li> </ol>
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 1.2.5	Davis Bacon Act Workload Does the historical information reflect 60 IDIQ D/B projects per year that are greater than \$350K still accurate? It was mentioned at the site visit that construction will not be the same as in the past. Please provide updated information.	Amendment 2 reduces PWS section 1.3.3, Davis-Bacon Act Work, Estimated Workload Data to ten (10).
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 2.1.1	Receiving and Inspection Workload Is the receiving and inspection workload of 80160 items for both MAF and SSC ? Please clarify source and content of receiving and inspection workload data.	The receiving requirement provide in the Final RFP for the estimated workload data is a SACOM representation, which includes both MAF and SSC.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 2.1.2	Packaging and shipping Workload Is the packaging and shipping workload indicated for both MAF and SSC ? Please clarify source and content of packing and shipping workload data.	The package and shipment requirement provide in the Final RFP for the estimated workload data is a SACOM representation, which includes both MAF and SSC.
Attachment J-9	Government Furnished Property Please provide the number of licenses for the software systems and applications that contractor may use.	The Government will provide the number of licenses for the software systems and applications that the contractor may use in Attachment J-9.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 2.2	Supply and materials Management Is the workload data shown included for MAF and SSC ?	The package and shipment requirement provide in the Final RFP for the estimated workload data is a SACOM representation, which includes both MAF and SSC.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 4.1.2	Facility Planning Is there workload data for facilities planning ? Please provide work load data	The last sentence in the last paragraph in PWS 4.1.2 states "Workload indicators in performance of this section are referenced in Section 1.2, Technical Management, Table 1.2, Formulation Task."
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 4.1.3	Facilities Design Please confirm \$50k limit includes both design and the cost to construct or install. Please clarify the content of the \$50K limit.	The description of the \$50K is provided in PWS 6.2.2.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 4.1.3	Facilities Design Workload data Is the estimated workload data the number expected for "core" services under \$50K or IDIQ over \$50K	All estimated workload data documented in Section 4.1.3 are considered to be "core" services.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 4.4.4	Technical Systems Design Is the estimated workload data the number expected for "core" services under \$50K or IDIQ over \$50K	Section 4.4.4 is listed as Construction not Technical Systems Design and is IDIQ only. Estimated workload data for Section 4.1.4 Technical System Design are "core" services and the description of the \$50,000 is provided in PWS 6.2.2.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 4.5	Testing Services and Support Is there any historical workload and estimated workload data for IDIQ Testing Services ? Please provide historical data and any Government estimates for IDIQ testing services.	Historical data is located in the existing SACOM Reference Library in folder SACOM_HIST_IDIQ file name IDIQ_ROM_Estimate

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 2.1.1	Receiving and Inspection Is the Receiving and Inspection described and workload provided, for both the contractor's "Core Services" and IDIQ procurements as well as other NASA and tenants procurements. We recommend NASA clarify and adjust workload data such that this section applies only to NASA and other tenant procurements.	The receiving and inspection requirement provide in the Final RFP for the estimated workload data is a core requirement.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 6.1	Facilities Operations: Some parts of this section do not have a meaningful description of workload data that can be estimated and level of effort identified to "operate" these facilities. Request that NASA provide additional specific workload data for the various level three sections of operations. In particular please provide hours of expected service/operation and any other information that will help contractor to define the level of effort expected for Core services to operate: High Pressure Gas System Operations, High Pressure Industrial Waste Plan Operations, Industrial Waste Water Treatment Facilities, Marine Operations, Fluid Component Processing Facility. We recommend that NASA provide additional operations information for the systems noted.	Per PWS 6.1, the details of operating the High Pressure Industrial Water Plant can be found in SRD-RPT-0001, in SACOM Reference Library, folder SACOM-6.0. This document also provides operational information for the High Pressure Gas facility and the Cryogenic Propellant Storage Facility. Additional information is found in existing SSTI-8080-0013 and the other operational documents found in SACOM Reference Library, folder SACOM-6.0. Workload data for the Fluid Component Processing Facility can be found in table 6.1.9 FCPF.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 6.0	Facilities Operations and Maintenance General Requirements: Page 179 of Section 6.0 "General Requirements" states that Operations, Programmed, Planned, and Preventive Maintenance work types shall be recorded. In the rest of section 6.0 only Sections 6.1 "Operations, Sections 6.2.1 "Preventive Maintenance", 6.2.2 "Corrective Maintenance", and 6.2.3 "O&M Engineering" work types are discussed. Please provide further descriptions of services in this section on "Programmed Maintenance" and Planned "Maintenance and their associated workload data similar to section 6.1, 6.2.1, 6.2.1, and 6.2.3. We recommend Programmed and Planned Maintenance descriptions and workload data be provided.	The definitions for Programmed Maintenance and Planned Maintenance can be found in Attachment J-1, Appendix C Acronyms and Definitions. See the existing FY13 Work Orders file, WORKTYPE PG, for referenced Programmed Maintenance in FY13. The FY13 Work Orders file is located in the SACOM Reference Library, folder SACOM-Hist_Ref.
Attachment J-1 PWS File 1 of 4 Section 6.2.3	O&M Engineering Please clarify that the workload data for 1/3 or all FCA' annually is referring to the list of FSEU in PWS J-1 Appendix A and PWS J-9. We recommend that NASA specify what specific FSEU is to have FCA performed on.	One third of all the facilities found in the Facility Services identified in the Attachment J-1, PWS (file 2 of 4) (App A (File 1 of 2) must by assessed per year. The FCA shall be done in accordance with the PWS and DRD FA08-6.2.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT	RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), and RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Elements are not in alignment with the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). Examples included are but not limited to - 1) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT have Superscript Numbers PWS 1.0 (1), and PWS 5.0 (4) that are not included in the PWS, and not fully explained in the RFP PWS, Sections or Final RFP Q&As. 2) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2.3 Technical Risk Management are provided for in RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) as 4.2.3 Technical Data Management. 3) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2.4 Technical Data Management are provided for in RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) as 4.2.4 as Knowledge Management. 4) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2.5 Knowledge Management are provided for in RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). as PWS 4.2.4 Knowledge Management. Please provide clarification for - 1) Superscript number in PWS 1.0 (1), and PWS 5.0 (4) , to include adding content or explanation of the Superscript to the PWS or the RFP Sections. 2), 3), 4) Alignment of Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Numbers for PWS 4.2 with Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4).	1) PWS 1.0 (1) and PWS 5.0 (4) superscript numbers denote footnotes that provide instructions in completion of Form L-4 LH-RT, therefore you will not find any reference to them in Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). 2) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT, Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2.3 Technical Risk Management has been revised in Amendment 2 to read Technical Data Management. 3) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT, Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2.4 Technical Data Management has been revised in Amendment 2 to read Knowledge Management. 4) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT, Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2.5 Knowledge Management has been revised in Amendment 2 to read "RESERVED."
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT	RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), and RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Elements are not in alignment with the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). Examples included are but not limited to - 1) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both include PWS 5.4.4 Wellness and Physical Fitness Program, however RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) provides PWS 5.4.4 Wellness Center and Physical Fitness Program (SSC Only). Please provide correction for or clarification for Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both including PWS 5.4.4 Wellness and Physical Fitness Program	EPM alignment of PWS numbering with RFP Attachment J-1, PWS has been updated in Amendment 2.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT	RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), and RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Elements are not in alignment with the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). Examples included are but not limited to - 1) 1) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both include PWS 5.5.2 NASA Visitor Center Support, however RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) provides PWS 5.5.2 NASA Visitor Center Support (SSC Only). Please provide correction for or clarification for Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both including PWS 5.5.2 NASA Visitor Center Support.	EPM alignment of PWS numbering with RFP Attachment J-1, PWS PWS has been updated in Amendment 2.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT	RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), and RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Elements are not in alignment with the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). Examples included are but not limited to - 1) 1) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both include PWS 5.5.6 History Office, however RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) provides PWS 5.5.6 History Office (SSC Only). 2) RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) provides PWS 5.5.6 History Office (SSC Only) includes a Performance Standard - Tasks are to be coordinated with the OC and reported on DRD MA03-5.5. Attachment J-2, DRD MA03-5 states in Block 11. Preparation Information: The report shall be separated by Center (SSC and MAF) and address the following information regarding Contractor activities. Please provide correction for or clarification for .. 1) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both including PWS 5.5.6 History Office. 2) RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), and RFP PWS 5.5.6 History Office (SSC Only) when the Preparation Information in DRD MA03-5.5 requiring - The report shall be separated by Center (SSC and MAF) and address the following information regarding Contractor activities.	EPM alignment of PWS numbering with RFP Attachment J-1, PWS has been updated in Amendment 2. In accordance with PWS section 5.5.6, The History Office requirement is SSC only. DRD MA03-5.5 is an activity report, the Contractor shall report what activities were performed at SSC and MAF in support of the 5.5 (Internal & External Communications) requirement to include the SSC only requirements.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), Attachment J-2, DRDs	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.7.2 Energy Management and Water Conservation, item 11. Provide energy consumption data in accordance with DRD GA08-5.7.</p> <p>Attachment J-2 DRDs - Data Requirement (DR) DRD GA08-5.7 Block 7 – Initial Submission Follow Stated Schedule - #8, As of Date.</p> <p>The RFP PWS nor the DRD provide sufficient information to understand</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The Total Number of Metering Devices to collect data from monthly.</li> <li>2) If all energy consumption data is remotely read at the EMCS Center, or if local Metering for Water, Electrical, Gas, etc. must be read, accumulated and reported.</li> <li>3) Eight (8) bills monthly to the Government, and how those utility bills are routed to the Offeror.</li> </ol> <p>Please provide expanded detail as to the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A listing of monthly consumption of utilities (water, natural gas and electricity, etc.) devices. This information will allow the Offeror to understand routing requirements for gathering the data.</li> <li>2) A listing of energy consumption devices remotely read at the EMCS Center, or local Metering for water, natural gas and electricity, etc. that must be read, accumulated and reported.</li> <li>3) Identification of the providers for Eight (8) bills monthly to the Government, and an explanation of how the monthly utility bills are received by the Offeror; and record retention requirements for the Governments Utility Bills.</li> <li>4) Request the Contracting Officer consider making the requirement to provide monthly energy consumption data IDIQ as the RFP does not provide details to allow estimation, and the Incumbent has superior knowledge by their current contract requirements.</li> </ol>	Historically, 289 electric and 63 gas meters have been read and processed by the incumbent contractor and forwarded to NASA for payment. Amendment 2 updates the Reference Library to include file SWI-8830-0014, Utility Billing, in the SACOM Reference Library, in the SACOM-5.0 folder.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT	<p>RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Elements are not in alignment with the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4). Examples included are but not limited to -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both include under PWS 5.8 Fire Protection Services PWS 5.8.1 thru PWS 5.8.6, however RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) provides only PWS 5.8 Fire Protection Services.</li> <li>2) RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) Table page 182 of 230 is not given a PWS Number or Title that agrees with the PWS 5.8.1 thru PWS 5.8.6 items in Section L EPM.</li> <li>3) Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT contains PWS 5.8.1 thru PWS 5.8.6 even though some of PWS Scope is related to SSC Only. Please provide correction or clarification for the following ..</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide agreement between the Section L EPM for PWS Elements 5.8 Attachment J-1 PWS.</li> <li>2) Provide RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) Table page 182 of 230 with PWS Number and Title that agrees with the PWS 5.8.1 thru PWS 5.8.6 items in Section L EPM.</li> <li>3) Provide clarification in PWS 5.8 Elements in the RFP Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) Table page 182 of 230, the Section L EPM for those PWS elements that are SSC Only.</li> </ol>	EPM alignment of PWS numbering with RFP Attachment J-1, PWS has been updated in Amendment 2. PWS 5.8 identifies which requirements are applicable to "SSC only" and which requirements are applicable to "SSC & MAF".
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 1.0, D. Limitations, Restrictions, and/or Special Conditions, 3.Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ)	<p>Final RFP Q&amp;A, and Changes Document did not highlight the additional information provided in 3. Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ). The changes are principally Services provided in support of IDIQ only work will also be provided on an IDIQ basis, and are not included in the Core, unless specifically stated otherwise.</p> <p>They do however illuminate that the Support to initiate IDIQ work, which includes, but is not limited to, business and technical management, shall be Core and fall within PWS Section 1.</p> <p>Core PWS 1.2 Technical Management includes within PWS 1.2 Provide technical management for the integration of PWS functions and activities, perform production support and task order formulation functions for all work within this contract to include all IDIQ task order work.</p> <p>PWS 1.3 Business Management includes requirements for Resources and Financial Management and Work Control Management.</p> <p>Please clarify if all IDIQ Technical and Business Management is to be included in the Offerors BOE and EPM at PWS 1.0; or Only that not included in Core Work PWS 1.2 Technical Management and PWS 1.3 Business Management.</p>	The only IDIQ Technical Management included in the Offerors BOE as part of Core Work for PWS 1.2 is the integration of PWS functions and activities for the task order formulation functions. For Business Management, monthly financial data requirements and work control management for all IDIQ work is included in Offerors BOE as part of Core Work in PWS 1.3.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), 3.0 SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL, 3.0 Table Page 62 of 230	<p>PWS Table provides descriptive information as to PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards.</p> <p>The Table does not denote three (3) Plans with Performance Standards the Offeror is required to develop, maintain, and ensure the following deliverables are accurate and timely as defined in the specific DRD(s) listed below:</p> <p>DRD SA01-3.0 - Safety and Health Plan,  DRD SA02-3.0 - Safety and Health Awareness Annual Plan,  DRD SA03-3.0 - Contractor Safety and Environmental Health Program</p> <p>It is noted however that Other PWS Elements have a Stated Performance Standard for Plans to include but not limited to:</p> <p>DRD LS01-2.1. PWS Table for 2.1.1 Receiving and Inspection, has a Performance Standard on One (1).  DRD LS03-2.1. PWS Table 2.1.3 Transportation, Moving, Hauling and Mail Service Transportation, has a Performance Standard on One (1).  DRD LS07-2.2. PWS Table 2.2.1 Supply and Material Management has a Performance Standard on One (1).</p> <p>The Offeror only address this for clarification/consistency.</p> <p>Please clarify why The PWS Table for 3.0 SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL, 3.0 Table Page 62 of 230 has the Plan and Performance Standard omitted.</p>	The plan and performance standard is identified in Section 3.0, B.1, paragraphs 1, 3 and 5. There was no need to repeat this requirement in the table.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), 3.0 SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL, 3.0 Table Page 62 of 230	<p>PWS Table provides descriptive information as to PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards. The Workload consists of issuing all permits such as hot work, dig, confined space entry, energy, etc. The Offeror finds an absence of Estimated Workload for permit requirements in PWS 1.3.2 Work Control, PWS 4.0 Engineering and Manufacturing Support Services, and PWS 6.0 Facility Operations and Maintenance.</p> <p>As many of the permits require more than administration prior to issuance such as:</p> <p>Hot work Permits requires established safety barriers around the area of work, it is not clear if the effort in PWS 3.0 for Permit Issue includes the administrative effort to issue the permit ,or does it include all the Labor to include craft to make the hot work area ready.</p> <p>Dig Permits requires the area of work to be flagged (marked), it is not clear if the effort in PWS 3.0 for Permit Issue includes the administrative effort to issue the permit ,or does it include all the Labor to include engineering time to pull drawings and craft to flag or mark the area ready.</p> <p>Confined Space Entry requires areas/equipment to be removed from service, and penetrations to be opened for sampling, it is not clear if the effort in PWS 3.0 for Permit Issue includes the administrative effort to issue the permit ,or does it include all the Labor to include craft time to remove equipment from service, and open penetrations to make area ready for testing.</p> <p>Please clarify if the Estimated workload in PWS 3.0 for issuing all permits is inclusive of administration effort, or does it include all effort to include installation of Safety Barriers, Flagging/Marking of buried Utilities Systems, and making areas/equipment ready for Gas Testing.</p>	The estimated workload data provided is the estimated number of permits issued annually.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), 3.1 Safety and Risk Management, 3.1 Table Page 64 of 230	<p>PWS Table provides descriptive information as to PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards. The Workload for Safe Atmospheric Verification of 2,420 atmospheric verifications. The Offeror is uncertain if the Estimated workload data is inclusive of PWS 3.0 workload of 307 Confined Space permits. Additionally the workload does not identify the location SSC_MAF.</p> <p>As the RFP does not provide requested details to allow estimation, and the Incumbent has superior knowledge by their current contract requirements then clarification is essential. Please clarify the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) If PWS 3.1 Safe Atmospheric Verification of 2,420 atmospheric verifications is inclusive of PWS 3.0 workload of 307 Confined Space permits.</li> <li>2) The Qty of Atmospheric Verifications by Location (SSC_MAF)</li> <li>3) Of the Historical Workload provided in the Final RFP does FY13 work order history include PM or CM work orders that are within the requirement of 2,420 atmospheric verifications, or PWS 3.0 workload for permits.</li> </ol>	The estimated workload data is the estimated number of atmospheric verifications performed annually. The number of atmospheric verifications listed include, but is not limited to atmospheric verifications required to issue confined space permits and perform PM and CM work orders identified in the existing historical data located in folder "SACOM-Hist_Ref", document "FY13_Work Orders." In the spreadsheet there is a tab for SSC and a tab for MAF.
<p>Section L - L.II-5. MISSION SUITABILITY (VOLUME I), ii. TECH 2 – Staffing Plan: a) Page 25 of 58.</p> <p>Section M- M.5. MISSION SUITABILITY (VOLUME I) ii. TECH 2 – Staffing Plan: a) Page 25 of 58.</p> <p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 1.0, A. Scope.</p> <p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT\</p>	<p>Section L and Section M references require Staffing in WYE at the PWS level where the work is performed. Attachment J-1 (File 1 of 4) PWS provides workload within the PWS Scope, General Requirements, Reporting Requirements; and the PWS Table providing PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards.</p> <p>It is evident that there is workload in Attachment J-1 (File 1 of 4) PWS at PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS). The Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS are Blocked Out at the PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS).</p> <p>With Section L - EPM Tabs L-4a SSC LH-RT and L-4b MAF LH-RT have PWS Rows blocked out indicating no workload at the following PWS Elements.</p> <p>Examples include but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)Section L - EPM PWS 2.0, PWS 2.1 are blocked out, however the Offeror determines based on the Att J-1 PWS that that their Management and Administration would be at the PWS 2.0 or first level; and DRD development and reporting would be at PWS 2.1 or Second Level.</li> <li>2) Section L - EPM PWS 2.2 is blocked out, however the Offeror determines based on the Att J-1 PWS that that their Management and Administration would be at the PWS 2.2 or Second Level.</li> <li>3) Section L - EPM PWS 3.0 is blocked out however the Offeror determines based on the Att J-1 PWS that that their Management, Administration and DRD development, and reporting would be at the PWS 3.0 or first level,</li> <li>4) Section L - EPM - Similar instances exist in PWS 3.3 Environmental Health, and PWS 3.4 Environmental Services where the EPM PWS Line Item is Blocked out, and the Att J-1 PWS has requirements or workload.</li> <li>5) Section L PWS 4.0 and PWS 4.1 are blocked out however the Offeror determines based on the Att J-1 PWS that that their Management, Administration, and DRD development and reporting would be at the PWS 4.0 (first level), and PWS 4.1 (second Level).</li> </ol> <p>The instances discussed above are prevalent in nearly all PWS Elements where the Management, Administration, Supervision, and DRD development and reporting are at a First and Second Level of the PWS.</p> <p>The Offeror is very concerned that with the Section L and Section M Staffing Plan requirements, and Section L EPM not being aligned with the Workload in Att J-1 PWS that a negative evaluation could be determined. Please review and advise how the instruction can be modified to allow workload from the Attachment J-1 PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sublevel (2nd level PWS) to flow consistently to the Section L EPM, and Staffing Plans.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 2.0 and 2.1 examples provided as "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; they are "grayed out" as an indication that they could be used as subtotal/total rows should the offeror choose to make them subtotal/total rows. PWS 2.0 was intended to be the total row for all 2.0 sublevels (e.g. 2nd level PWS 2.1, 2.2, etc.) PWS 2.1 was intended to be the subtotal row for all 2.1 sublevels (e.g. 3rd level PWS 2.1.1, 2.1.2, etc.) Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 2.0 level that is not applicable to the 2nd levels or to PWS 2.1 level that is not applicable to the 3rd levels; rows may be added below 2.0 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs or below 2.1 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 2.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 2.0.</li> <li>2) In section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS The 2.2, 2nd level section example, provided as being "blocked out" is not intended to be "blocked out"; it is grayed out as an indication that it could be used as a subtotal row. PWS 2.2 was intended to be the subtotal row for all 2.2 sublevels (e.g. 3rd level PWS 2.2.1, 2.2.2, etc.) Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 2.2 level that is not applicable to the 3rd levels, rows may be added below 2.2 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 2.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 2.0.</li> <li>3) In section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 3.0, 1st level section example provided as being "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; it is grayed out as an indication that it could be used as a total row for sublevels PWS 3.1, 3.2, etc. Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 3.0 level that is not applicable to the 2nd levels, rows may be added below 3.0 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs.</li> </ol>

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Continuation of above question		<p>The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 2.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 2.0. 4) In section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 3.3 and 3.4, 2nd level section examples provided as being "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; they are grayed out as an indication that they could be used as a subtotal row for all 3.3 and 3.4 sublevels (e.g. PWS 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and PWS 3.4.1, 3.4.2, etc.). Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 3.3 and 3.4 sublevels that is not applicable to the 3rd levels, rows may be added below PWS 3.3 and PWS 3.4 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 3.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 3.0. 5) In section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.0 and 4.1, 1st and 2nd level section examples provided as being "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; they are grayed out as an indication that they could be used as a total rows for all 4.0 sublevels (e.g. PWS 4.1, 4.2, etc.) and subtotal rows for all 4.1 sublevels (e.g. PWS 4.1.1, 4.1.2, etc.) Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 4.0 and 4.1 sublevels that is not applicable to the 2nd and 3rd levels, rows may be added below PWS 4.0 and PWS 4.1 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 3.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 3.0. This stands true for all areas where this situation may occur. Also, it should be noted that worksheets L-1a SSC PWS and L-1b MAF PWS indicate by example that 1st level PWS (e.g. 1.0, 2.0, etc.) are summary tables for 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) and that 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) are subtotal tables for 3rd level PWS (e.g. 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, etc.); these tables will need to be adjusted to include any workload not identified in the sublevels. The Offeror may add tables to incorporate the hours/costs that were not identified in the sublevel roll-ups.</p>
Continuation of above question		It is the Offeror's responsibility to determine the best method for ensuring that all costs are included in the L-1a SSC PWS and the L-1b MAF PWS.
L.II-2.(b) Computerized Proposal Instructions	In the Draft RFP, it stated that safety information was exempt from electronic submission. Did the Government omit this from the final RFP, with expectations that safety information and OSHA logs will be submitted electronically with the Past Performance Volume?	In accordance with final RFP Section L.II-2 (b), the paper copies and the electronic copies of the proposal shall be identical.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4), 3.1 Safety and Risk Management, 3.1 Table Page 64 of 230	<p>PWS Table provides descriptive information as to PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards. The Workload for Safe Atmospheric Verification of 2,420 atmospheric verifications. The Offeror is uncertain if the Estimated workload data is inclusive of PWS 3.0 workload of 307 Confined Space permits. Additionally the workload does not identify the location SSC or MAF.</p> <p>As the RFP does not provide requested details to allow estimation, and the Incumbent has superior knowledge by their current contract requirements then clarification is essential. Please clarify the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) If PWS 3.1 Safe Atmospheric Verification of 2,420 atmospheric verifications is inclusive of PWS 3.0 workload of 307 Confined Space permits.</li> <li>2) The Qty of Atmospheric Verifications by Location (SSC or MAF)</li> <li>3) Of the Historical Workload provided in the Final RFP does FY13 work order history include PM or CM work orders that are within the requirement of 2,420 atmospheric verifications, or PWS 3.0 workload for permits.</li> </ol>	The estimated workload data is the estimated number of atmospheric verifications performed annually. This includes, but is not limited to atmospheric verifications required to issue confined space permits and perform PM and CM work orders identified in the historical workload data. The historical workload data is identified for both SSC and MAF separately.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4, Departing Requirements, Page 77 of 230 PWS 3.4 Environmental Services Table, Page 88 of 230 Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Items 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8	<p>Attachment J-1 (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 provides workload within the PWS Scope, General Requirements, Reporting Requirements; and the PWS 3.4 Table providing PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards.</p> <p>PWS 3.4 provides workload within the PWS Scope, General Requirements, of 34 DRDs to be developed and maintained.</p> <p>The Section L EPM is Blocked out for PWS 3.4.</p> <p>PWS 3.4 Table Page 88 of 230 provides the PWS Title, Requirements, Estimated Workload and Performance Standards. The PWS 3.4 Table provides Requirements and Estimated Workload for 16 different Reports, Audits, Certifications, Waivers, CERCLA Oversight and System Operation.</p> <p>The Section L EPM is Blocked out for PWS 3.4.</p> <p>It is evident that there is workload in Attachment J-1 (File 1 of 4) PWS at PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS); where the Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS are Blocked Out at the PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS).</p> <p>The instances discussed above are prevalent in nearly all PWS Elements where the Management, Administration, Supervision, and DRD development and reporting are at a PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS).</p> <p>The Offeror is very concerned that with the Section L and Section M Staffing Plan requirements, and Section L EPM not being aligned with the Workload in Att J-1 PWS that a negative evaluation could be determined.</p> <p>Please review and advise how the instruction can be modified to allow workload from the Attachment J-1 PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sublevel (2nd level PWS) to flow consistently to the Section L EPM, and Staffing Plans.</p>	<p>In section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 3.4, 2nd level section examples provided as being "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; they are grayed out as an indication that they could be used as a subtotal row for all PWS 3.4 sublevels (e.g. PWS 3.4.1, 3.4.2, etc.). Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 3.4 sublevels that is not applicable to the 3rd levels, rows may be added below PWS 3.4 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 3.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 3.0. This stands true for all areas where this situation may occur. Also, it should be noted that worksheets L-1a SSC PWS and L-1b MAF PWS indicate by example that 1st level PWS (e.g. 1.0, 2.0, etc.) are summary tables for 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) and that 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) are subtotal tables for 3rd level PWS (e.g. 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, etc.); these tables will need to be adjusted to include any workload not identified in the sublevels. The Offeror may add tables to incorporate the hours/costs that were not identified in the sublevel roll-ups.</p>

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4.1 Thru 3.4.8 Workload Page 78 thru 86 of 230 PWS 3.4 Environmental Services Table, Page 88 of 230</p> <p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS Items 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8</p>	<p>Attachment J-1 (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8 provides narrative description in Section B General Requirements, But no Table is provided to indicate by 3rd level designating PWS Title, Requirement, Estimated Workload or Performance Standard.</p> <p>It was noted that some of PWS 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8 General Requirements are not included in 3.4 Environmental Services Table Page 88 of 230.</p> <p>Some of the Environmental Services Table items Page 88 of 230 PWS 3.4 Environmental Services are not included in Scope, and General Requirements narrative description in PWS 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8. Examples Include but not limited to:</p> <p>1) Title V Air Permit State Summary Fee Report (SSC) &amp; Annual Emission Cap Compliance Report (MAF) are identified in the PWS 3.4 Table, but not included in the narrative description in PWS 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8.</p> <p>2) Air Program is identified in the PWS 3.4 Table, but not included in the narrative description in PWS 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8.</p> <p>3) NASA Environmental and Energy Functional Review (EEFR) and Corrective Action Report is identified in the PWS 3.4 Table, but not included in the narrative description in PWS 3.4.1 thru 3.4.8.</p> <p>It is evident that there is workload in Attachment J-1 (File 1 of 4) PWS at PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS), where the Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS are Blocked Out at the PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sub-PWS number and Title (2nd level PWS).</p> <p>The instances discussed above are prevalent in nearly all PWS Elements where the Management, Administration, Supervision and DRD development, and reporting are at a First and Second Level of the PWS.</p> <p>The Offeror is very concerned that with the Section L and Section M Staffing Plan requirements, and Section L EPM not being aligned with the Workload in Att J-1 PWS that a negative evaluation could be determined.</p> <p>Please review and advise how the instruction can be modified to allow workload from the Attachment J-1 PWS number and Title (1st level PWS) and Sublevel (2nd level PWS) to flow consistently to the Section L EPM, and Staffing Plans.</p>	<p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model Worksheet Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Worksheet Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT 1st and 2nd level sections provided as being "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; they are grayed out as an indication that they could be used as a total or subtotal row for all PWS sublevels (e.g. PWS 3.0 is "grayed out" as it would be a total for PWS 3.0; PWS 3.4 is "grayed out" as a subtotal for PWS 3.4 for PWS 3.4.1, 3.4.2, etc. that would roll up to the PWS 3.0 total). Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 3.0 level or 3.4 sublevels that is not applicable to the 2nd or 3rd levels, rows may be added below PWS 3.0 or 3.4 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 3.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 3.0. This stands true for all areas where this situation may occur. Also, it should be noted that worksheets L-1a SSC PWS and L-1b MAF PWS indicate by example that 1st level PWS (e.g. 1.0, 2.0, etc.) are summary tables for 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) and that 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) are subtotal tables for 3rd level PWS (e.g. 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, etc.); these tables will need to be adjusted to include any workload not identified in the sublevels. The Offeror may add tables to incorporate the hours/costs that were not identified in the sublevel roll-ups.</p>
<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 1.2.2, PWS 4.1.2, Estimated Workload</p>	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 1.2.2 Task Order Formulation, and PWS 4.1.2 Facility Planning for Construction of Facilities, Estimated Workload is referenced to be tied together by the informational note at WPS 4.1.2 NOTE: Effort in PWS Section 4.1.2 is Core. Workload indicators in performance of this section are referenced in Section 1.2, Technical Management, Table 1.2, Formulation Tasks.</p> <p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS includes both PWS 1.2.2 Task Order Formulation, and PWS 4.1.2 Facility Planning.</p> <p>In review of Table PWS 1.2 Technical Management on Page 26 of 230, PWS 1.2.2 Formulation Tasks we find no differentiation in the Workload of 200 Formulations between SSC &amp; MAF, nor a means of calculating Basis of Estimate (BOE) between PWS 1.2.2 and PWS 4.1.2.</p> <p>The Offeror is not able to determine how to split the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) Core Workload between SSC and MAF, and ensure that for representation and evaluation for the Offerors Basis of Estimate (BOE), and Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT is consistent with all Offerors.</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 1.2.2 Task Order Formulation being substantiated as Core, designated to a single PWS, and identified by location, then the incumbent(s) have superior knowledge and therefore causing a distinct disadvantage to other Offerors.</p> <p>Please review the Core Workloads designated in the PWS Table(s) being substantiated as Core, designated to a single PWS, and identified by location,</p>	<p>Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 1.2.2 may be performed at either site. All workload estimates identified in this section are CORE work.</p>
<p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS includes both PWS 4.1.2 Facility Planning.</p>	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) designated PWS 4.1.2 as Facility Planning for Construction of Facilities.</p> <p>Facility Planning is also designated in PWS 1.3.2 Work Control Management, g. Input Construction, Facility Maintenance, and Modernization Projects .....to be used as a basis for integrating the facility planning DRD submissions, and 4.0 ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING SUPPORT SERVICES paragraph 3 - as site-wide facility planning.</p> <p>To eliminate a cross utilization of the Facility Planning tasks the Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS includes both PWS 4.1.2 Facility Planning, should state PWS 4.1.2 as Facility Planning for Construction of Facilities.</p> <p>Please consider changing the PWS designation in the Section L - EPM to PWS 4.1.2 Facility Planning, should state PWS 4.1.2 as Facility Planning for Construction of Facilities.</p>	<p>PWS designation on L-4 LHRT template has been changed to state 4.1.2 Facility Planning for Construction of Facilities is revised in Amendment 2.</p>
<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.3, PWS 4.1.4, PWS 4.1.5, PWS 4.1.6 Core Workload.</p>	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.3 Facility Designs, PWS 4.1.4, PWS 4.1.5, PWS 4.1.6 Core Workload has no differentiation in the Workload between SSC &amp; MAF. The Offeror is not able to determine how to split the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) Core Workload between SSC and MAF, and ensure that for representation and evaluation for the Offerors Basis of Estimate (BOE), and Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT is consistent with all Offerors.</p> <p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 4.1.3 Facility Designs, PWS 4.1.4, PWS 4.1.5, PWS 4.1.6</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.4, PWS 4.1.5, PWS 4.1.6 being substantiated as Core, and identified by location, then the incumbent(s) have superior knowledge and therefore causing a distinct disadvantage to other Offerors.</p> <p>Please review the Core Workloads designated in the PWS Table(s) being substantiated as Core, and identified by location,</p>	<p>Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.1.3, PWS 4.1.4, PWS 4.1.5, PWS 4.1.6 may be performed at either site. All workload estimates identified in these sections are CORE work. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.</p>

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Environmental Services -Hazardous Waste Collection Shipments and Disposal Activities - Estimated Workload Data - MAF	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Table Page 90 of 230 Table 3.4 Environmental Services - Hazardous Waste Collection Shipments and Disposal Activities - designates that Estimated Workload DATA MAF: See Attachment J-10, Reference Library, for metrics.</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) RFP PWS Table(s) designation of a Specific Folder, Sub-Folder, File Name, or Section within a File, the Offeror spends an inordinate amount of effort searching the Reference Library data. After searching the Attachment J-10, Reference Library, for metrics we are unable to locate the information that designated Estimated Workload DATA for PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - Hazardous Waste Collection Shipments and Disposal Activities at MAF. Please consider expanding the Estimated Workload information in the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS Table(s) to include reasonable Estimated Workload DATA; and when search of the SACOM Technical Library is required provide in the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS Table(s) with information as to the SACOM Technical Library - Specific Folder, Sub-Folder, File Name, or Section information.</p>	Refer to the SACOM Reference Library, under the historical & reference Data folder, see the MAF Environmental monthly Report, which includes the Solid and Hazardous Waste history.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - TSD Audit Reports SSC and MAF	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Table Page 90 of 230 PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - TSD Audit Reports - Provides Requirements and Estimated Workload Data for a TDSF at each site.</p> <p>In reviewing the RFP PWS we only find clear reference to a TDSF at MAF. Please review the Core Requirements and Estimated Workload Data in Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Table Page 90 of 230, PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - TSD Audit Reports, and provide clarification as to the requirement.</p>	The requirement as reference by the table in Attachment J-1 page 83 of the Final RFP is to conduct an audit of the Off-Site Treatment, Storage and Disposal Facilities per DRD EN15-3.4. Refer to the DRD EN15-3.4 for additional clarification.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - Permits and Waivers	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Table Page 90 of 230 PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - Permits and Waivers - Provides Requirements and Estimated Workload Data. However the information does not designate which site the Permits and Waivers are for.</p> <p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both include PWS 3.4 Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) 3.4 Environmental Services - Permits and Waivers being identified by location, then the incumbent(s) have superior knowledge and therefore causing a distinct disadvantage to other Offerors. Please review the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - Permits and Waivers, and identify by location,</p>	The workload data in Amendment 2 has been revised to include the following breakout: MAF: Permit/Wavier - 2/1; SSC Permit/Wavier - 2/1
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Environmental Services, Quarterly Surveillance Inspections for cultural and historical sites, Environmental Facility Inspection Implementation Report, Landfill Inspections and Report (SSC Only)	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.4 Table Page 90 of 230 PWS 3.4 Environmental Services - Quarterly Surveillance Inspections for cultural and historical sites, Environmental Facility Inspection Implementation Report, Landfill Inspections and Report (SSC Only) - Provides Requirements and Estimated Workload Data.</p> <p>In reviewing the SACOM Technical Library - Historical Reference Data - FY-13 Work Orders we are not clear if the Surveillance Inspections, Facility Inspections, and Landfill Inspections or other Core Work outside of PWS 6.0 are already represented. Please review the Core Requirements and Estimated Workload Data and indicate if the requirements are already included in the FY - 13 Work Orders by Site.</p> <p>If they are not provide in SACOM Technical Library - Historical Reference Data - FY-13 Work Orders Data the Offeror requests available FY- 13 Historical Workorder information that represents the Requirements and Estimated Workload Data in the PWS outside of PWS 6.0.</p>	Refer to DRD EN22-3.4; Cultural/Historical Resource Management Plan, as well as the Reference Library under the Historical & Reference Data folder, Environmental Permits.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 3.7 Contamination and Foreign Object Debris Program	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) 3.7 Contamination and Foreign Object Debris Program - provides narrative description in PWS 3.7 - Section A. Scope and Section B General Requirements, But no Table is provided to indicate by 2nd level designating PWS Title, Requirement, Estimated Workload or Performance Standard for the Core work at MAF.</p> <p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT both include PWS 3.7 with the Core work being at MAF, and Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT contains PWS 3.71.</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) 3.7 Contamination and Foreign Object Debris Program being identified by 2nd level with PWS Title, Requirement, Estimated Workload Data or Performance Standard for the Core work; the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>This situation is repeated through-out the RFP Attachment J-1 PWS ...being narrative description in the PWS Section A. Scope, Section B. General Requirements, or Section C Reporting Requirements; but no Table is provided to indicate by 1st, 2nd, or 3rd level designating PWS Title, Requirement, Estimated Workload and Performance Standard. Without clearly defined requirements for the Core 1st, 2nd, or 3rd PWS, Requirement, Estimated Workload Data and Performance Standard - then the advantage is the incumbents. Please review the RFP Attachment J-1 PWS ...being narrative description in the PWS Section A. Scope, Section B. General Requirements, or Section C Reporting Requirements; but no Table is provided - to indicate by 1st, 2nd, or 3rd level designating PWS Title, Requirement, Estimated Workload and Performance Standard.</p> <p>Additionally request you define further what Scope and Workload Data applies to 3.71.</p>	The PWS identifies the governing document for the FOD program which outlines the requirements.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.3 Facility Designs, Project Plans	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.3 Facility Designs, Project Plans - Table Page 104 of 230 - Requirements - provides that Project Plans for all designs for SSC and designated designs for MAF, prepared per Section 4.1.2, #3.</p> <p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.2 #3, 5th bullet • Design/Construction Cost Estimates and Schedules Workload is identified as having workload indicators in Table 1.2.2 Formulation Tasks of 200 Formulations. The Offeror is concerned that the Estimated Workload Data 90 in PWS 4.1.3 Facility Design - Projects Plans, is already included in Table 1.2.2 Formulation Tasks of 200 Formulations. Please verify if the Estimated Workload Data 90 in PWS 4.1.3 Facility Design - Projects Plans, is within the Table 1.2.2 of 200 Formulations, or is this additional Estimated Workload Data.</p>	PWS 4.1.3 Facility Design Estimated Workload Data of 90 Project Plans is in addition to the 200 Formulation Task identified in Table 1.2.2 Formulation Tasks

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.4 Technical System Design	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.4 Technical System Design - Table Page 105/106 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.4 Technical System Design - Table Page 105/106 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF). The Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP removed the SSC Only from the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.4 Technical System Design 'statement'. However we find that the Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.1.4 is missing.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 4.1.4 Technical System Design by location, and add to the Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.1.4</p>	Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.1.4 may be performed at either site. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.5 Analysis and Modeling	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.5 Analysis and Modeling - Table Page 108/109 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.5 Analysis and Modeling - Table Page 108/109 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF), the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 4.1.5 Analysis and Modeling, without the Att J-1 PWS Estimated Workload Data indicating the Location, the Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 4.1.5 Analysis and Modeling by location.</p>	Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.1.5 may be performed at either site. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.6 Drafting	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.6 Drafting - Table Page 109/110 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.1.6 Drafting - Table Page 109/110 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF), the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 4.1.6 Drafting, without the Att J-1 PWS Estimated Workload Data indicating the Location, the Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 4.1.6 Drafting by location.</p>	Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.1.6 may be performed at either site. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 4.2 Product Data and Lifecycle Management, C. Reporting Requirements - DRDs Page 111 of 230	<p>Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT PWS 1) PWS 4.2 Product Data and Lifecycle Management is blocked out indicating there is no Workload.</p> <p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2 Product Data and Lifecycle Management, C. Reporting provides ..The Contractor shall develop, maintain, and ensure the following deliverables are accurate and timely as defined in the specific DRD(s) listed below:</p> <p>DRD CM01-4.2 PDLM Plan DRD CM02-4.2 PDLM Metrics DRD PT01-4.2 Capability Handbooks</p> <p>With Section L EPM Blocked out at PWS 4.2, the Offerors BOE Staffing by WYE will not tie to the Section L EPM.</p> <p>The Offeror is very concerned that with the Section L and Section M Staffing Plan requirements, and Section L EPM not being aligned with the Workload in Att J-1 PWS that a negative evaluation could be determined.</p> <p>Please review and advise how the instruction can be modified to allow workload from the Attachment J-1 PWS Sub-PWS number and title (2nd level PWS) to flow consistently to the Section L EPM, and Staffing Plans.</p>	In Section L, Electronic Pricing Model Worksheet Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and Worksheet Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT 1st and 2nd level sections provided as being "blocked out" were not intended to be "blocked out"; they are grayed out as an indication that they could be used as a total or subtotal row for all PWS sublevels (e.g. PWS 4.2 is "grayed out" as it would be a subtotal for PWS 4.2.1, 4.2.2, etc. that would roll up to the PWS 4.0 total). Should Attachment J-1 provide for workload at the PWS 4.2 level that is not applicable to the 2nd or 3rd levels, rows may be added below PWS 4.2 for the labor categories and hours/rates/costs. The offeror should ensure that these hours/rates/costs are captured in L-1a SSC PWS 4.0 and L-1b MAF PWS 4.0. This stands true for all areas where this situation may occur. Also, it should be noted that worksheets L-1a SSC PWS and L-1b MAF PWS indicate by example that 1st level PWS (e.g. 1.0, 2.0, etc.) are summary tables for 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) and that 2nd level PWS (e.g. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, etc.) are subtotal tables for 3rd level PWS (e.g. 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2.1, etc.); these tables will need to be adjusted to include any workload not identified in the sublevels. The Offeror may add tables to incorporate the hours/costs that were not identified in the sublevel roll-ups.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.1 Requirements Management	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.1 Requirements Management - Table Page 112 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.1 Requirements Management - Table Page 112 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF), the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 4.2.1 Requirements Management, without the Att J-1 PWS Estimated Workload Data indicating the Location, the Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 4.2.2 Configuration Management by location.</p>	Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.2.1 may be performed at either site. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.2 Configuration Management	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.2 Configuration Management - Table Page 113 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.2 Configuration Management - Table Page 113 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF), the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 4.2.2 Configuration Management, without the Att J-1 PWS Estimated Workload Data indicating the Location, the Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 4.2.2 Configuration Management by location.</p>	Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.2.2 may be performed at either site. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.3 Technical Data Management	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.3 Technical Data Management - Table Page 115 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 4.2.3 Technical Data Management - Table Page 115 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF), the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 4.2.3 Technical Data Management, without the Att J-1 PWS Estimated Workload Data indicating the Location, the Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 4.2.3 Technical Data Management by location.</p>	Due to consolidation of operations and the synergist nature of the Performance Work Statement any work identified in PWS 4.2.3 may be performed at either site. Amendment 2 provides Historic workload in the SACOM Reference Library, folder name SACOM HIST_Ref, file name SACOM_Historical_Engineering.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.7 Energy Management, Controls and Operations	Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.7 Energy Management, Controls and Operations Scope of Work has been changed ... removing The Central System Host, along centralized operations of the EMCS, shall be located at SSC. Please confirm if this is an omission, or if the two systems are stand-alone at Contract Start.	As indicated in the Final PWS, the Central Host for each system ( Johnson Controls at MAF and Siemens Building Technology APOGEE at SSC),as well as ancillary components; will remain at each site. However, the Contractor shall staff and operate the systems via a centralized location at SSC.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.7.2 Energy Management and Water Conservation - Table Page 177/178 of 230	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.7.2 Energy Management and Water Conservation - Table Page 177/178 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at which site (SSC or MAF).</p> <p>Example includes but limited to:  Program Plan  Create and Maintain Energy Records  Support NASA Energy Manager  Maintain Documentation  Support Design Review  Data Entry and Analysis  Consumption Records</p> <p>Without the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.7.2 Energy Management and Water Conservation - Table Page 177/178 of 230 - providing Estimated Workload Data designated by site (SSC or MAF), the Offeror may be at a disadvantage to the incumbent(s) having superior knowledge as to requirements.</p> <p>Additionally we noted that the Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 5.7.2 Energy Management and Water Conservation, without the Att J-1 PWS Estimated Workload Data indicating the Location, the Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 5.7.2 Energy Management and Water Conservation - Table Page 177/178 of 230 by location.</p>	Amendment 02 has revised PWS 5.7.2 to provide the core workloads by location.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.8 Fire Protection Services - Table Page 180 of 230	<p>Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 5.8 Fire Protection Services - Table Page 180 of 230 - provides Estimated Workload Data without designating at 3rd Level PWS and title.</p> <p>Final RFP Section L, Electronic Pricing Model - Workbook Tab L-4a SSC LH-RT , Workbook Tab L-4b MAF LH-RT includes PWS 5.8 Fire Protection Services ,3rd Level PWS and title.</p> <p>The Offeror may be at risk for obtaining a reasonable evaluation of the BOE and Cost/Price.</p> <p>Please provide the Core Workloads designated in the PWS 5.8 Fire Protection Services ,3rd Level PWS and title.</p>	The pricing model has been updated to align with the PWS.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and tab L-1a SSC PWS 5.0	EPM tab L-4a SSC LH-RT requires cost data to the 3rd level PWS for 5.0; however, the L-1a SSC PWS 5.0 tab does not contain templates for the 3rd level. Please clarify the template	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. PWS 5.4; 5.5; and 5.7 are broken down to the third level. Cost is expected on both SSC templates and MAF templates down to the third level except where a PWS level is designated as site specific e.g. SSC only or MAF only or designated as IDIQ only.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and tab L-1a SSC PWS 4.0	EPM tab L-4a SSC LH-RT requires cost data to the 3rd level PWS for 4.2.5; however, the L-1a SSC PWS 4.0 tab does not contain templates for 4.2.5.. Please clarify the template	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. PWS numbering and titles of 4.2.3, 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 have been changed to read: 4.2.3 Technical Data Management; 4.2.4 Knowledge Management and 4.2.5 RESERVED. Templates have been updated and aligned accordingly and is reflective in Amendment 2.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a SSC LH-RT and tab L-1a SSC PWS 3.0	L-4a template not included for subsection 3.7; however, this subsection is included in L-4a SSC LH-RT. Is subsection 3.7 to be included by Offeror? Please clarify the template	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. Subsection 3.7 is not included in SSC templates L-1a and L-4a because the work is MAF only and is reflected on L-1b and L-4b.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 3.0	L-4a templates for 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7 are provided at 2nd level PWS. L-4a shows to the 3rd level, 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.5.1., 3.6.1., and 3.7.1.,respectively. Is it the Government's intent that the Offeror prices to the 2nd or the 3rd level?	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. The L-4 templates have been updated to align with L-1 templates for both SSC and MAF.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 4.0	L-1-a templates for 4.0 contain a 4.1.4 level: however, the L4-a LH-RT have omitted 4.1.4. from 4.0. Is it the Government's intent that the Offeror cost PWS 4.1.4?	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. These templates now reflect 4.1.4 on each of the L-1 and L-4 forms.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 4.0	There appears to be some inconsistencies between templates L-1a MAF PWS 4.0 and L-4a MAF LH-RT for PWS subsections 4.2 as well as 4.5. The L-1a templates do not match the L-4a templates. The L-1a templates are not provided for the 3rd level. Please clarify the template	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. Templates have been aligned and is reflective in Amendment 2.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 5.0	L-4a templates for 5.2, and 5.3 are provided at 2nd level PWS. L-4a shows to the 3rd level, 5.2.1, and 5.3.1, respectively. Is it the Government's intent that the Offeror prices to the 2nd or the 3rd level?	SSC L-4a templates and MAF L-4b templates have been updated to reflect 5.2 and 5.3 at the 2nd level and is reflective in Amendment 2.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 5.0	L-1a MAF PWS 5.0 does not include 5.3.4: however, the L4-a LHRT MAF does? Is it the Government's intent for the Offeror to include 5.3.4?	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. In both templates 5.3.4 has been deleted and will read 5.3 in Amendment 2.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 5.0	L-1a MAF PWS 5.0 does not include 5.5.2 and 5.5.6: however, the L4-a LHRT MAF does? Is it the Government's intent for the Offeror to include 5.5.2 and 5.5.6?	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. L-4b MAF LH-RT has deleted 5.5.2 and 5.5.6 as these are SSC only. This is reflective in Amendment 2.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-4a MAF LH-RT and L-1a MAF PWS 4.0	There appears to be some inconsistencies between templates L-1a MAF PWS 5.0 and L-4a MAF LH-RT for PWS subsections 5.8. The L-1a templates do not match the L-4a templates. The L-1a templates are not provided for the 3rd level.	L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. The numbering has been corrected and PWS 5.8 subsections have been deleted on L-4a SSC LH-RT and L-4b MAF LH-RT and is reflective in Amendment 2.
Tech Library 6.0 Maximo Specs	Requesting more detail for Maximo implementations. Please verify if Maximo subscriptions fees are up to date	Both MAF and SSC license Fees are up to date. MAF has 294 EAM licenses and 27 other licenses. SSC has 130 EAM Licenses and 36 other Licenses. Total cost for MAF licenses is \$80,000 and is funded/paid by the Government. Total cost for SSC licenses is \$ 36,000 and is funded/paid by the Government.
PWS 1.3.2 Work Control Management	1.3.2 B f. states that the contractor shall utilize the CMMS to the maximum extent possible. Please provide the Maximo modules being used at SSC and MAF	Maximo module details are provided in the reference library under Section 6.0 in the existing folder titled "MAXIMO Architecture".
Tech Library 6.0 Maximo Specs	Requesting more detail for Maximo implementations. Please provide the number and type of Maximo licenses that MAF and SSC	The Government will provide all licenses required.
PWS 1.3.2 Work Control Management	1.3.2 B f. states that the contractor shall utilize the CMMS to the maximum extent possible. Can we copy data from Maximo to off-site servers for use in other support systems?	Yes, however, refer to Section 1.1.3 of the PWS for the Information Technology requirements for IT Security, Desktop and Mobile Computer Hardware/Software, Applications/Software Support and Hosting/System Administration.
Section L MGMT 5 Phase-In Plan, v.a)	v.a) requires contractor to assume on-going work. Can we have read-only access to Maximo during phase-in?	The Maximo CMMS systems will be operational at MAF & SSC with all maintenance work scheduled by the current contractor's at the end of the Phase In period. The SACOM Contractor will have access to Maximo at MAF and SSC during the Phase-In period, but will not be able to make any changes to the "live" version until May 1, 2015. The SACOM Contractor will have 60 days after the Contract start date to make the changes required per the PWS.
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 6.1.7 Utility Operations, 2. Natural Gas Operations	Attachment J-1, PWS (File 1 of 4) PWS 6.1.7 Utility Operations, 2. Natural Gas Operations ...states in part "The operation of the natural gas systems shall include, but is not limited to, ...identifying above ground markers. Final RFP File: !Government Response to Industry Questions indicated in response to question on J-1, PWS .6.1.7; The energy reduction requirements are found in the SACOM Reference Library, SACOM-5.0 Site Services. Requirement to locate ground markers has been removed. Please provide confirmation that the requirement has been removed.	The requirement to locate ground markers has been removed in Amendment 02.
L.I-22	The provision states in part, "If the Offeror identifies a synergy, Consolidation, Enhancement, and/or Innovation that affects IDIQ, the Offeror shall provide all the descriptive information with the exception of the cost/price information". This would seem to imply that if the synergy, consolidation, enhancement, and/or innovation applies to core services then we should include cost/price information. Specifically what descriptive , cost/price information is the Government requiring to evaluate the synergies, consolidations, enhancements, and/or innovations? If cost/price information is required where should it be located? In addition Section M has no mention of how the Government will evaluate any synergies, consolidations, enhancements, and/or innovations identified. Can the Government explain how it will evaluate these items, and what type of weight it will place on them?	Amendment 2, RFP Section L.I-22 omitted the following sentence: "If the Offeror identifies a synergy, Consolidation, Enhancement, and/or Innovation that affects IDIQ, the offeror shall provide all the descriptive information with the exception of the cost/price information." In its place, Amendment 2, RFP Section L.I-22 added the following sentence: "The Offeror shall provide a thorough description of each identified synergy, consolidation, enhancement, or innovation under the appropriate Mission Suitability subfactor. Any costs or savings associated with an identified synergy, consolidation, enhancement, or innovation should be reflected in the Offeror's proposed price." Offerors shall adhere to Section L.II-7 regarding what cost/price information to provide. Section M.5(b)(1) and (2) have been updated to state the following: "For each proposed synergy, consolidation, enhancement, or innovation, the Government will evaluate the appropriateness and its potential for effective and efficient implementation in the contract."
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-5a SSC_MAF FBAT	The column headers in row 11 contain descriptions of the contract years of the proposal. The title in L-5a does not match the descriptions of the contract years of the RFP and the rest of the EPM. The headers show 8 award terms instead one 2-year option and six 1-year award term options.	Corrected and is reflective in Amendment 2.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM), tab L-5a SSC_MAF FBAT	L-5a SSC_MAF FBAT displays the elements of fringe benefits for SSC and MAF separately. Can the Offeror amend the L-5a template to conform to their disclosed practices, specifically proposing fringe benefits as a single pool?	There are 6 CBAS and 2 SCA WDs affecting fringes. Considering the various fringes dictated within the CBAs and WDs, any consolidation of fringe benefits into a single pool shall be explained to the level that illustrates that allocation of the fringe rate does not disproportionately allocate a site paying more for fringe benefits than it would have if two separate fringe pools were established for each site.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014																																		
Attachments J-1, Appendix A, Additional Workload Data	<p>Final RFP Q&amp;A referenced numerous times that the information Offerors were seeking was included in the FSEU described in PWS Section 6.0 (i.e., 'System and Facility Descriptions'), or included in Attachments J-1, Appendix A, Additional Workload Data</p> <p>During our search we discovered numerous line items where facility information was provided as ea., Cubic Feet Ft3, KGD, GLL, MBH, etc. Examples include but are not limited to:            SSC 2210 Hazardous Waste Handling Facility - 1 ea.            SSC 9110 NAVY HUMAN RESOURCES ADMIN BLDG. - 41600 FT3            SSC 1000 Navy Data Handling Center - 42602 FT3            MAF 207 Boiler House - 2070 MBH            MAF 421 Boiler and Chiller House - 1 MBH            MAF 451 Pneumatic Test Facility 1 ea            Please provide all Facility and Structure Unit of Measure in Sq Ft (FT2).</p>	<p>The square footage (FT2) unit of measure isn't applicable to all of the items in the referenced list. Replace all references to FT3 with FT2. The following descriptions to the abbreviations shall be used to clarify the units of measure in the Facility Services Table:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Unit</td> <td>Description</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ACR</td> <td>Acre</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BX</td> <td>Box</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EA</td> <td>Each</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FT2</td> <td>Square Foot</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FT3</td> <td>Cubic Foot</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GLL</td> <td>Gallon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GAM</td> <td>Gallons Per Minute</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KGD</td> <td>Thousand Gallons Per Day</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KVA</td> <td>Kilovolt-Ampere</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LF</td> <td>Linear Foot</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LFB</td> <td>Linear Feet of Berthing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MBH</td> <td>Millions BTU Per Hour</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MI</td> <td>Mile</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SY</td> <td>Square Yard</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TH</td> <td>Tons per Hour</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TR</td> <td>Tons of Refrigeration</td> </tr> </table>	Unit	Description	ACR	Acre	BX	Box	EA	Each	FT2	Square Foot	FT3	Cubic Foot	GLL	Gallon	GAM	Gallons Per Minute	KGD	Thousand Gallons Per Day	KVA	Kilovolt-Ampere	LF	Linear Foot	LFB	Linear Feet of Berthing	MBH	Millions BTU Per Hour	MI	Mile	SY	Square Yard	TH	Tons per Hour	TR	Tons of Refrigeration
Unit	Description																																			
ACR	Acre																																			
BX	Box																																			
EA	Each																																			
FT2	Square Foot																																			
FT3	Cubic Foot																																			
GLL	Gallon																																			
GAM	Gallons Per Minute																																			
KGD	Thousand Gallons Per Day																																			
KVA	Kilovolt-Ampere																																			
LF	Linear Foot																																			
LFB	Linear Feet of Berthing																																			
MBH	Millions BTU Per Hour																																			
MI	Mile																																			
SY	Square Yard																																			
TH	Tons per Hour																																			
TR	Tons of Refrigeration																																			
RFP Section L.II-3	RFP Section L.II-3 states that the specified Additional Documentation (Government Property Management Information and Safety & Health Plan) will not be evaluated as part of the Mission Suitability Factor. Even though this information is not evaluated, will it be available to the evaluators of Mission Suitability Subfactor TECH-1 responding to the PWS, in particular PWS Section 2.2 Property Management and PWS 3.1 Safety & Risk Management? Clarify whether the Additional Documentation will be available to the evaluators of Subfactor TECH-1.	In accordance with RFP Section L.II-3, The Government will review the Government Property Management Information to determine whether or not the Offeror's proposed industry leading standards and practices and/or voluntary consensus standards are sufficient to manage property, from planning through disposition, under the circumstances of the contract. Also in accordance with L.II-3, The Government will review the submitted information to verify the Offeror's compliance with the applicable safety and health requirements. In accordance with L.II-3, This documentation will not be evaluated as part of the Mission Suitability Factor.																																		
RFP File - Equipment_depreciated-to-FOSC, Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A, Attachment J-9 GFP,	<p>RFP File - Equipment_depreciated-to-FOSC provides listings of Grounds Equipment without Asset Numbers. Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A In reviewing this Grounds Equipment we are uncertain if they are indeed the same Grounds Equipment provided on RFP File - Equipment_depreciated-to-FOSC.</p> <p>The RFP is unclear if the Grounds Equipment on both lists will be available to the Offeror at contract start, and what the condition of the equipment is - as the information available is only a Status of In Service. Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A - the Offeror is also uncertain if the Equipment on Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A is Government Provided, as the Asset information is not on the Attachment J-9 GFP List.</p> <p>Attachment J-9 GFP List 'As is" Grounds Equipment is identified in the Table of Contents as "List 2 - SSC &amp; MAF IAGP "As Is" (The Government Will Not Repair or Replace). AS this equipment can be used on CPIF Work, IDIQ and FFP the Offeror is uncertain what the Government is intending by placing such restrictive language on not repairing the GFP. Please clarify the following.</p> <p>RFP File - Equipment_depreciated-to-FOSC - please provide Asset Numbers so the Offeror can confirm if it is on two or more RFP Attachments. Additionally indicate a Condition Code for Grounds Equipment, and if the Asset will be available at Contract Start. Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A - indicate a Condition Code for Grounds Equipment, and if the Asset will be available at Contract Start. Attachment J-9 GFP List 'As is" Grounds Equipment - request the Government Clarify when the Grounds Equipment or other "As-is" Assets can be utilized by the Offeror on CPIF Work, IDIQ and FFP that the Government would not be responsible repair or replacement.</p>	<p>Equipment identified in the file titled, "Equipment depreciated to FOSC" is property of the incumbent contractor. This property is not identified on the Lists of GFP (attachment J-9). If Offerors plan to utilize the grounds equipment on the file titled, " Equipment depreciated to FOSC" the current FOSC contract does include a clause that states the incumbent Contractor agrees to transfer title to undepreciated equipment to the successor Contractor for an amount not to exceed the applicable residual balances, subject to reasonable terms and conditions regarding payment and other matters to be agreed upon by the parties.</p> <p>Attachment J-9 List 1-4 identifies the Property the Government will make available to the SACOM Contractor, List 4 includes the grounds equipment. This Property (list 4) will be available at the start of the contract in an as-is conditions (as identified in Clause G.5), this property was available for inspection during the preproposal conference conducted March 19-21, 2014 and currently is in-service. List 4 property is not mandatory to utilize. If List 4 property is utilized and becomes unserviceable, the Government will update List 4.</p> <p>In accordance with RFP Section L.I-18, List of Available Government Property (NFS 1852.245-81), Attachment J-9, Lists 1-3 is available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-1, Government Property. In accordance with FAR 52.245-1(d)(2)(iii), The Government may, at its option, furnish property in an "as-is" condition. In such cases, the Government makes no warranty with respect to the serviceability and/or suitability of the property for contract performance. Any repairs, replacement, and/or refurbishment shall be at the Contractor's expense. The Government is furnishing the property identified at list 2 in an as-is condition as identified in FAR 52.245-1.</p> <p>In accordance with RFP Section L.I-18, List of Available Government Property (NFS 1852.245-81), Attachment J-9, List 4, available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-2, Government Property Installation Operation Services. In accordance with FAR 52.245-2, This Government Property listed in paragraph (e) of this clause is furnished to the Contractor in an "as-is, where is" condition. The Government makes no warranty regarding the suitability for use of the Government property specified in this contract.</p> <p>The GFP identified in Attachment J-9 List 4 is applicable to the PWS requirements identified in PWS 5.0 Site Services (Core &amp; IDIQ) and would not be required to perform work in other PWS sections.</p>																																		
RFP Clause G.4 INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE Government PROPERTY, (c), (7), Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A, Attachment J-9 GFP,	RFP Clause G.4 INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE Government PROPERTY, (c), (7) - states - Installation service facilities: (Fuels, oils, & lubrications for vehicles and equipment) (Does not include Firm Fixed Price Services). Equipment provided the Offeror on Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A, Attachment J-9 GFP can be utilized across multiple types of work on the SACOM Hybrid Contract for CPIF, IDIQ, and FFP work. As the Fueling for the Equipment can one day can for CPIF, IDIQ or FFP how can the Offeror account for meeting the requirements of RFP Clause G.8, (c), (7). As the Government has restricted the Equipment use to the SACOM Contract, and bears the cost for Fuels, Oil & Lubricants whether in CPIF, IDIQ, FFP work; then removing/modifying the restrictive statement in RFP Clause G.8 will ensure compliance.	The Government will provide fuels, oils, & lubrications for GFP identified on Attachment J-9, List 1, 2, 3. The Government will not provide Fuels, oils, & Lubrications for GFP identified on Attachment J-9, List 4. Offerors shall include the cost of fuels, oils, & Lubrications in its proposal. The GFP identified in Attachment J-9 List 4 is applicable to the PWS requirements identified in PWS 5.0 Site Services (Core & IDIQ) and would not be required to perform work in other PWS sections.																																		
Attachment J-1, PWS (File 2 of 4) (App A (File 1 of 2))_Additional Workload - Page 3 of 977	Attachment J-1, PWS (File 2 of 4) (App A (File 1 of 2))_Additional Workload - Page 3 of 977, SSC Lawn Road Maintenance Map is not legible when increasing the Map size to extract Legend Details to include Text and Table for Codes, Mowing Cycle, and Area Acers. Please provide a more readable document.	The original document has been added to the J-10, Reference Library, subfolder titled "SACOM - 5.0 Site Services," and can be manipulated for viewing purposes.																																		

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 153 of 230, Attachment J-1, PWS (File 2 of 4) (App A (File 1 of 2))_Additional Workload - Page 3 of 977	Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 183 of 230 provides Mowing Acreage at SSA different than the Attachment J-1, PWS (File 2 of 4) (App A (File 1 of 2))_Additional Workload - Page 3 of 977. Please provide one set of acreage totals for the workload data.	Amendment 02 omits the acres identified and replaces with "Reference MAF area Mowing Schedule & SSC Lawn/Road Maintenance Maps."
RFP Clause G.4 INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE Government PROPERTY, (c), (7), Attachment J-1, PWS Appendix A, Attachment J-9 GFP,	RFP Clause G.4 INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE Government PROPERTY, (c), (7) - states - Installation service facilities: (Fuels, oils, & lubrications for vehicles and equipment) (Does not include Firm Fixed Price Services). The RFP is unclear what cost the Government will charge the Offeror for Fuels, Oils and Lubricants used for equipment utilized for Fixed Price Services. Please provide a listing of Cost for Fuels, Oils and Lubricants for equipment utilized for Fixed Price Services.	The Government will provide fuels, oils, & lubrications for GFP identified on Attachment J-9, List 1, 2, 3. The Government will not provide Fuels, oils, & Lubrications for GFP identified on Attachment J-9, List 4. Offerors shall include the cost of fuels, oils, & Lubrications in its proposal.
Section J Attachment J-9 List of Government Property and Section L.1-18 List of Government Available Property	There is a conflict between Section J Attachment J-9 List of Government Property and Section L.1-18 List of Government Available Property. Att J-9 provides 4 lists. List 1 and 3 are controlled and List 2 and 4 are As-Is indicating Contractor is responsible for replacement and repair. This conflicts with L.1-18 which states that Lists 1-3 are for contractor use IAW FAR 52.245-1 (controlled by Government and Government responsible for repair and replacement) and List 4 is for contractor use IAW FAR 52.245-2(As-Is, Where-Is Contractor is responsible for repair and replacement). Please clarify which lists are responsibility of Government or contractor to repair and replace. Government should clarify and deconflict the Government Furnished Property Lists with Section L	<p>In accordance with RFP Section L.I-18, List of Available Government Property (NFS 1852.245-81), Attachment J-9, List 1, 2, &amp; 3 is available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-1, Government Property. In accordance with FAR 52.245-1(d)(2)(iii), The Government may, at its option, furnish property in an "as-is" condition. In such cases, the Government makes no warranty with respect to the serviceability and/or suitability of the property for contract performance. Any repairs, replacement, and/or refurbishment shall be at the Contractor's expense. The Government is furnishing the property identified at list 2 in an as-is condition as identified in FAR 52.245-1.</p> <p>In accordance with RFP Section L.I-18, List of Available Government Property (NFS 1852.245-81), Attachment J-9, List 4, available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-2, Government Property Installation Operation Services.</p> <p>A noticeable different between the responsibility of the contractor for the property identified in the as-is conditions status between list 2 and list 4 is the method of disposal. List 2 as-is property shall be submitted to the SEMO for disposal requirements in accordance with the approved Contractors Property Management plan. List 4 as-is property, shall be disposed in accordance with FAR 52.245-2 (c) "Unless the Contracting Officer determines otherwise, the Government abandons all rights and title to unserviceable and scrap property resulting from contract performance. Upon notification to the Contracting Officer, the Contractor shall remove such property from the Government premises and dispose of it at Contractor expense."</p>
Section J Attachment J-1, paragraph D.1	This paragraph indicates that all FSEU barcodes must be scanned prior to maintenance, which reasonably indicates that all FSEU has a barcode attached that identifies the asset number and other relevant equipment information. Please confirm the FSEU list in attachment J-1 file 2 of 4, Appendix A, Equipment List has a barcode attached. If not what percentage of FSEU has a barcode for MAF and SSC?	Approximately 90% of all assets at MAF have barcodes. Subsequently, at SSC approximately 100% of the asset in which maintenance is perform has bar codes.
Section J Attachment J-1 6.1.7 (2 & 3) Natural Gas and Potable Water Operations	This PWS requires natural gas and potable water meters to be read. Please provide a list of meters with locations and if the meters can be read remotely, or indicate where the list is in the RFP.	Historically the 63 gas meters have been read and processed by the incumbent contractor and forwarded to NASA for payment. Amendment 2 provides additional information in the file SWI-8830-0014, Utility Billing, in the SACOM Reference Library, in the SACOM-5.0 folder. The locations of the meters will be provided to the successful offeror.
Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 155 of 230, SACOM Technical Library - Historical Reference Data	Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 155 of 230 provides an undefined amount of work and lacks clarity for the complete requirement. Examples include but are not limited to: ..sand bag preparation and distribution. The requirement does not state how many sand bags, the location for delivery, nor does it state how the sand bags are removed after the storm and their disposition. ....how many buildings ....is it one building or 50% of the SSC Buildings. In reviewing the SACOM Technical Library - Historical Reference Data we find no information that would allow Workload Data to be identified. Please provide expanded information in the Table to allow the Offeror to estimate the requirement. If the Contracting Office is unable to provide the detail, request that the PWS element be changed to IDIQ.	Amendment 2 removes the requirement for Emergency Preparation and Clean Up from PWS 5.3 as this scope is covered by PWS 1.1.4, Emergency Management.
Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 155 of 230, Attachments J-1, Appendix A, Additional Workload Data	Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 155 of 230 provides a defined amount of estimated workload data for LF of Fence at SSC and MAF. The Amounts of LF of Fence does not agree with the additional workload data in Attachment J-1, Appendix A. Examples include but are not limited to: SSC - PWS 5.3 Table provides workload of 1,015 LF. Att J-1, App A - SSC provides a Total of 173,366 LF PERIMETER FENCING, 82149 LF Fencing. (Note: SSC Att J-1, App A - the Fence Property Number appears twice for both properties.) MAF - PWS 5.3 Table provides workload of 12,00 LF perimeter. 8,000 LF interior Att J-1, App A - MAF provides workload of 13,275 Fence LF (Perimeter), 9,500 LF. SECURITY SYSTEM (FENCE & GATE). Please provide expanded information in the Table to allow the Offeror to estimate the requirement.	The workload data in the reference PWS table shall be utilized for workload information.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 156 of 230, Attachments J-1, Appendix A, Additional Workload Data	Attachment J-1, PWS 5.3 Grounds Maintenance and Integrated Pest Control, Table 156 of 230 - does not provide a defined amount of estimated workload data for Young or Mature Hedges and Scrubs at either SSC or MAF. Our review of Attachments J-1, Appendix A, Additional Workload Data additionally provides not workload data. Please provide expanded information in the Table to allow the Offeror to estimate the requirement.	For MAF there are 2800 LF of mature shrubs/hedges and 300 LF of young shrubs/hedges. For SSC, there are 2100 LF of mature shrubs/hedges and 300 LF of young shrubs/hedges. Amendment 2 revises the PWS.
Section L, Electronic Pricing Model (EPM)	The EPM does not include the cost for the Food Services PWS 5.1 element. When executing the contract, will companies be allowed to take small business credit for food service if a small business is providing that service?	In accordance with PWS 5.1 Food Services at SSC and MAF is a "No Cost Contract" business that covers the cost of operation with food sale revenue. Because there is no appropriated funds used to pay for Food Service Small Business Credit cannot be received.
Electronic Pricing Model (EPM) Cost Volume	Due to the size, detail and 8 pt. font size limitation for the EPM (specifically Tabs L-4a and L-4b SSC and MAF Estimated Labor Hours - Rates Template spreadsheets that are 132 columns wide and 143 rows long without data) which makes publication difficult, will the Government consider allowing Offerors to submit the EPM in electronic format only (no hard copies)?	The hard copy is the copy of record, therefore, we cannot allow Offerors to submit in electronic format only.
Section L.II-4, Para (b)/Page 23 of 58	The RFP states that 11 x 17 Foldouts count an equivalent number of 8½" x 11" pages and the front of the foldout shall have a page number for each equivalent 8½" x 11". As Microsoft Excel does not allow for double page numbering (e.g., page 1/2), will the Government consider allowing Government-provided Cost Forms to count as only one page? This will allow the Cost Forms to be page numbered directly in the Excel file, allowing for easier review of multiple 11 x 17 Cost Forms.	In accordance with Amendment 2 RFP Section L.II-4, Foldouts (except foldouts for Cost/Price Volume III) count as an equivalent number of 8 ½" x 11" pages and shall be printed on one (1) side only.
Section B; PAGE 8 OF 28, CLAUSE b.7, Total Contract Value Q&A	In the Q&A the Government indicates that column E (Maximum Cost Fee) is the cost incentive fee portion plus the calculated amount of fee earned by the share ratio applied to cost underruns. The cost incentive portion is 25% of the total target fee pool and that's clear and objective. However, the cost underrun value and performance ratings are unknown at the time of bidding. The example offered in the Q&A indicates a performance score resulting in the contractor taking 40% times an amount equivalent to the fee pool (\$500K), which is arbitrary. Per the attachment J-3, Attachment A example, the share of the underrun is calculated by taking the performance-based contractor share times the total amount of the underrun. The maximum performance underrun contractor share (40%) is known, but the maximum underrun is unknowable. Theoretically, the work could be accomplished for free in which case the maximum cost incentive would be equivalent to the target cost incentive plus 40% of the total value of the contract. Therefore, how can the offeror determine the maximum cost fee?	Column E is the amount of incentive fee associated with cost control, which is 25% of Column C. After all the costs (less fee) have been calculated in the EPM workbooks to include the Government Directed Core Plug, the amount is reported in Column B. As an example, \$20,000,000 is reported in Column B. A fair incentive fee is proposed in Column C. For this example, a business strategy decision is made on a fee of 4% and it is stated in Column C. Column D is \$0.00 as there is no minimum cost fee in this procurement. Target cost incentive fee is 25% of the Total Cost Target Incentive Fee Pool (Column C * 25%) or \$200,000. Next Column G, Performance Incentive Fee or 75% of the Total Cost Target Incentive Fee Pool (Column C * 75%) or \$600,000. The Contract value at the target cost and target performance incentive fees is then calculated and inserted in Column I ( Column B + Column C) less reimbursables which are unknown and are a \$0.00 for now. Column I calculated for this example equals \$20,800,000. Now the business decision strategy for the maximum cost fee requires calculation. One way, not the only way, the maximum cost fee is calculated for this example is as follows. The \$200,000 cost incentive fee proposed is 1% of the proposed cost of \$20,000,000. The \$600,000 performance incentive fee proposed is 3% of the proposed cost of \$20,000,000; when combined cost and performance incentive fees equal 4%. In this example a total fee of 7% is desired and still remain competitive, \$1,400,000. 7% minus the performance incentive fee percentage of 3% is 4% maximum cost incentive fee or \$800,000 which is inserted in Column F. Column J calculates the total contract value at the maximum cost fee and target performance fee or \$21,400,000.
Section B; PAGE 9 OF 28, CLAUSE b.7, Total Contract Value Q&A	Per the RFP and the Q&A, 60% of the core plug is for direct purchases for any customer/tenant on SSC or MAF and 40% is for customer/tenant service requests below \$5000. What portion of these plugs is the offeror to assume are for non-labor and what portion will be for labor? What sort of materials and ODC's for the Core are included in the plug and what type of materials and ODC's for the Core are not included in the plug if any?	The Core Plug Number is \$7M in the CPIF CLIN for a normal 12 month period; it is prorated for periods less than 12 months. Of that \$7M, 60% are direct purchases for any customer/tenant on SSC or MAF. The offeror's labor costs for direct purchases is covered under the core PWS 1.0 and has all burdens and fees/profit applied. No G&A or fee is applied to the 60% of the plug number as the purchases are subject to the Limitation on Pass-Through Charges. (See 52.215-22 and 52.215-23) The remaining 40% of the \$7M is for customer/tenant service requests below \$5000. Offeror's labor costs for Customer/tenant service requests are costed out of the associated PWS area core labor where the work is performed with all burdens and fees/profit applied. The offeror's ODCs approximately, the whole 40% for customer/tenant service requests are subject to G&A in accordance with Offeror's accounting system but no fee may be applied on either the ODCs or the G&A applied upon the ODCs.
L-II-7 General, Cost/Price (Volume III) Q&A	The Q&A says: 'If an offeror is planning to utilize a subcontractor to support only IDIQ work identified under pWS 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.62 and 5.5.7, proposed labor classifications are strictly limited to the labor classifications and rates proposed in the Core CLINS L-4 LHRT.' Does this mean every classification used in the above IDIQ PWS's must have hours against them in the Core?	Yes
Section L L-22-7(a) Q&A, Q&A	In the Q&A it says 'classifications proposed which are not included in the firm-fixed price CLINS or the Cost Plus Incentive Fee CLINs will be evaluated for reasonableness and realism.' What sort of classifications would offerors propose which don't apply to any particular FFP or CPIF CLIN?	Section L.II-7(c)(6) page 49, 2nd paragraph discussing Form L-14 IDIQ EXHIBIT B, Fully Burdened Labor Rates. "For those "IDIQ only" labor classifications associated with PWS 1.4 Business Development, 2.1.4 Marine Transportation, Handling and Maintenance, and 5.6 Education, not already included in the Core Firm-Fixed Price or CPIF CLINs, Offeror is required to identify the proposed classifications and base rates on the appropriate L-4." These PWS areas may or may not have classifications already proposed in other PWS areas that would be utilized under any IDIQ work in the above mentioned PWS identified areas." Offerors would have to determine whether there are classifications that may be utilized in those IDIQ only areas of PWS 1.4 Business Development, 2.1.4 Marine Transportation, Handling, and Maintenance, and 5.6 Education that have not already been proposed in the Core.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
<p>L.II.7.a.2.ii.d, Detailed cost and pricing information is considered all completed Excel Pricing Model (EPM) Workbooks and respective templates/forms traceable to the CLIN level in Section B pricing. It includes all the Cost/Price Proposal Content identified in Section L.II-7(iii). Offerors are to price the phase-in, basic period and all potential option years (including Award Term Options) in the EPM workbooks.</p>	<p>When completing the Government provided cost model template, should all Subcontractors provide their own cost information in the sections labelled "Prime"?</p>	<p>Subcontractors shall fill out the forms with their own information in the EPM workbooks in the Prime sections, but identifying themselves as a subcontractor to the prime. On the Prime's EPM form submission, it will include its subcontractor's data in the areas identified as subcontractor. The Prime's proposal and its supporting data becomes the basis for the contract which encompasses all the costs. The subcontractor's submission of the EPM workbooks becomes the supporting data for the Prime's proposal in the areas in which the Prime indicates subcontracting will perform.</p>
<p>L.II.7.a.2.iii.k.2.vii, and Government Provided Cost Model Template, Calculated annual costs and total summary cost. All data is itemized to the PWS 3rd level as indicated on the L-4 (LH-RT) Template. The Prime Offeror's LH-RT template and summary shall include all subcontractor(s) information segregated and identified by prime name and subcontractor's name. Offerors are to insert rows in the worksheet for each proposed labor classification corresponding to its appropriate PWS level.</p>	<p>The RFP indicates that Offerors are to include subcontractor's name where applicable next to each labor category on the L-4 tabs in the Government Provided Cost Model, however, those 2 tabs only include a column which instructs the offeror to enter "P" for Prime or "S" for Subcontractor. Where should the offeror enter the name? Should Major Subcontractors list themselves as "P" in their own models?</p>	<p>Forms L-4 have been changed to read: Insert Offeror's Name with P for prime or S for subcontractor.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>We understand that we are in a blackout period related to the RFP. Is it possible to get entry access to the base see the Dining areas in MAF (added since the site visit) and to drive by some of the grounds and builds?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, we are in a blackout period and we will not be providing additional tours or granting access to prospective offerors .</p>
<p>Clause H.27</p>	<p>Are Offeror's supposed to complete this clause by inserting proposed Key Personnel?</p>	<p>No, the Contracting Officer will complete this clause after award utilizing the information the offeror provides in its proposed Management Approach subfactor.</p>
<p>Clause H.32 and DR PC18-1.1</p>	<p>The requirement indicates offerors are required to submit a Strike Plan "no later than 60 days preceding the phase-in start date" as stated in the referenced clause and Data Requirement. Is this supposed to state rather to submit the Strike Plan within 60-days after phase-in start rather than preceding phase-in start?</p>	<p>Amendment 2 revised DRD PC18-1.1 to state, "Initial submission to be made no later than 60 days after award of contract."</p>
<p>Clause I, 52.246-23 LIMITATION OF LIABILITY (FEB 1997)</p>	<p>Question: A) Will the SACOM contractor be tasked by the U.S. Government to handle or transport 3rd party owned hardware on site? For example, moving hardware for Boeing? B) If the answer to A) is yes, the contract covers limits of liability for government property but does not address 3rd party liability. 52.246-23 LIMITATION OF LIABILITY (FEB 1997) 52.246-25 LIMITATION OF LIABILITY – SERVICES How will the U.S. Government's address this liability if the SACOM contractor is tasked to handle or transport 3rd party hardware? Would insurance coverage be allowable within the Task Order scope of work?</p>	<p>The SACOM Contractor could be tasked to handle or transport 3rd party owned hardware on site. The SACOM Solicitation incorporates FAR 52.228-7 (Insurance – Liability to Third Persons) in Section I.1. If a task order requires insurance the cost of the insurance would be an allowable cost.</p>
<p>Clause I.23</p>	<p>Is the checklist to be completed and submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal and, if so, should it take the form of the completed I clause in the Model Contract proposal volume?</p>	<p>Clause I.23 (Proposal Adequacy Checklist) is only applicable to actions that require certified Cost and/or Pricing Data. Offerors are not to use the checklist in developing its proposal in response to the SACOM Solicitation. Clause I.23 (Proposal Adequacy Checklist) shall be utilized for applicable task orders or modifications.</p>
<p>Clause I, 52.237-7 INDEMNIFICATION AND MEDICAL LIABILITY INSURANCE (JAN 1997), p. 5</p>	<p>The clause indicates the Contracting Officer will write in the insurance liability cap. What should this value be?</p>	<p>Amendment 2 revised FAR 52.237-7 to read \$1,000,000.</p>

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
L.II-3(c) L-II-4 (a), (b) and (f)	Please clarify: (1) in what proposal volume NASA would like the OCI Plan included; (2) is the OCI Plan to be printed two-sided or single-sided; (3) is the OCI Plan is to be submitted along with the Past Performance Volume; and 4) is the OCI Plan excluded from the Past Performance Volume 40 page limit?	In accordance with RFP Section L.II-4, the OCI plan shall be submitted with Volume II (Past Performance). The OCI plan is to be printed two-sided and the OCI plan is not included in the Past Performance page count of not to exceed 40 pages.
L.II-6. (e), p. 35	Is the "written consent" for each major subcontractor excluded from Volume 2 page count? Some offerors may have significantly more major subcontractors than others, leading to a discrepancy in the amount of past performance response information you may receive from offerors.	In accordance with RFP Section L.II-4, Past Performance Information is limited to a not to exceed amount of 40 pages. The exceptions identified include OSHA form 300 and 300A, Past Performance Questionnaires, and section dividers. All other pages shall be included in the 40 pages.
Technical Library, Historical and Reference Data	In the WYEs Length of Service spreadsheet, does the WYE information include core and IDIQ WYEs? If so, what is the breakout of WYEs for each contract by percentages for core and IDIQ WYEs? For example, 666 employees are listed for the FOSC contract. How many are for core and how many are allocated for IDIQ work?	The WYE information in the WYEs Length of Service spreadsheet identifies the total WYEs applicable to the current contracts. All current contracts are not structured as SACOM.
Government Property	<p>Reference from the Original RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section L.I-17, Government Property Management Information System, the customer requested that the Offeror "identify the industry leading or voluntary consensus standards, and/or the industry leading practices, that it intends to employ..."</li> <li>Section L.II-3.(a), Government Property Information System, required "the Offeror shall submit the information required by NFS 1852.245-80, Government Property Management Information, AND DRD LS07-2.2 (which wasn't due until 60 days after award).</li> </ul> <p>Reference from Amendment 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section L.1-17: No change.</li> <li>Section L.II-3.(a), Government Property Information System, now requires compliance with DRD LS07-2.2, Government Property Management Plan, which has been amended from a delivery date of 60 days after award to "With Proposal".</li> </ul> <p>Question/Comment: The "standards and practices" requested in L.I-17 is consistent with the type of information that is typically requested in a RFP and allows the customer to determine the ability of the contractor to perform that scope of work. The detailed information required for the DRD would typically be accomplished after contract award when the contractor has access to existing software systems and existing policies. None of the references identified for Government Property or Real Estate provide the specific details that would be required to be compliant with DRD LS07-2.2. Can the DRD remain due after phase in? If due with the proposal, can the Government furnish the current property management plans and related procedures?</p>	The Government Property Management Plan is required with proposal in accordance with NFS 1852.245-80, <i>Government Property Management Information</i> . The current plan was written by the current contractor and cannot be released.
Page Count for Volume II	<p>In NASA's response to questions regarding page count from May 30, 2014, NASA indicated that the table of contents, acronym/key terms and the RFP matrix (which includes Section L and M and the PWS) are included on the Volume II page count. This requirement adds up to 10 or more pages that are included in the page count. None of this material seems scoreable, this approach prevents an offeror using those pages for a substantive response to the RFP.</p> <p>Question: (a) Would the Government reconsider this requirement for Volume II and exclude the table of contents, acronym/key terms and the RFP matrix from the Volume II page count? OR (b) If NASA still wants to include the TOC, acronym/key terms and RFP matrix within the page count, would NASA consider increasing the page count for Volume II to 60 pages?</p>	The page count for Volume II increased from 25 pages in the draft RFP to 40 pages in final RFP; this is adequate to cover all requirements.
Page Count for Volume I – Mission Suitability	<p>Reference: Amendment 1 clarifications on page count for Volume II regarding table of contents, cover pages, RFP reference matrix, and Key Terms/Acronym listings.</p> <p>Question: It is unorthodox for federal proposals to count the above items in the volume page count as none of this material is scoreable and much of it is outside the control of the offeror to manage the content. It is typical for offerors to number these up front reference sections with roman numerals but to start page counting with page 1 being the first page of scoreable content. Will the Government consider excluding these elements from the page count?</p>	The page count for Volume I increased from 180 pages in the draft RFP to 250 pages in final RFP; this is adequate to cover all requirements.
PWS, 1.1.3, Section 4. Applications/Software Support, Attachment J-9	<p>Issue: This section states that ITS will provide development, modification, installation, IT security, and database management support for all NASA mandated software as designated in attachment J-9.</p> <p>Question 1: In attachment J-9, it does not list ITS as supporting Maximo for SSC or MAF, although it is indicated as mandated. Which contractor will be responsible for supporting Maximo?</p> <p>Question 2: Is "corporate data" defined as data other than NASA data? Please clarify.</p> <p>Question 3: Is the answer to Question 1 is "yes," will the Government allow the Offeror to run the corporate systems remotely?</p> <p>Question 4: If the answer to Question 2 above is "yes," please specify the access requirements and firewall restrictions that will attend remote use of corporate systems in support of NASA SACOM.</p> <p>Question 5: Will the Government or the SACOM contractor support/maintain non-mandatory software?</p> <p>Question 6: What applications will the Government permit the Offeror to run and store off premises, temporarily (i.e., if someone emails about an issue to a corporate email address to allow for corporate reach back)?</p> <p>Question 7: What applications will the Government permit the Offeror to run and store off premises, permanently?</p>	<p>1: The SACOM contractor will be responsible for supporting Maximo.</p> <p>2: Yes, it is data owned by the Contractor for internal corporate use.</p> <p>3: Corporate systems can be run remotely.</p> <p>4: Required ports, protocols and firewall modifications must be submitted to the Office f the CIO for approval. The adherence to NPR 2810.1 and supplemental material is mandatory.</p> <p>5: The SACOM contractor will not be required to support/maintain non-mandatory software.</p> <p>6: Refer to section 1.1.3 of the PWS for the Information Technology requirements for IT Security, Desktop and Mobile Computer Hardware/Software, Application/Software Support and Hosting/System Administration.</p> <p>7: Refer to section 1.1.3 of the PWS for the Information Technology requirements for IT Security, Desktop and Mobile Computer Hardware/Software, Application/Software Support and Hosting/System Administration.</p>

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Electronic Pricing Model, Tab L-1a SSC PWS 2.0 and Attachment J-1, Section 2.2.2, Office Furnishings	<p>Issue: There is no table for pricing PWS 2.2.2, Office Furnishings for SSC. In Attachment J-1, Section 2.2.2, there is no indication that this PWS is MAF Only.</p> <p>Question: Does pricing for PWS 2.2.2 only apply to MAF?</p>	The number is a representation of SACOM workload data which includes both MAF and SSC.
Pricing Table for PWS 4.6, Manufacturing & Fabrication Support	<p>Issue: There is no table for pricing PWS 4.6, Manufacturing &amp; Fabrication Support for SSC. In Attachment J-1, Section 4.6, there is no indication that this PWS is MAF Only.</p> <p>Question: Does pricing for PWS 4.6 only apply to MAF?</p>	This is a MAF only requirement. PWS Section 4.6. is revised in Amendment 2.
PWS 5.5 Internal and External Communications Services to the SSC and MAF. 5.5 B.1 Multi-Media Services and Attachment J-1, TAB MAF Equipment Information	<p>Issue: PWS 5.5 states the Contractor shall interface with the third-party contractor that has the requirement to provide multi-media services, and Attachment J-1 states Multimedia equipment (digital video cameras, still cameras, lenses, tripods, light meter, microphones, McIntosh computers, etc.) is included in this list.</p> <p>Question: Will the third-party contractor provide multimedia services for both SSC and MAF? Please clarify.</p>	A third party contractor(s) will provide multimedia services for SSC and MAF.
RFP Attachment J-1, Appendix A and Attachment J-9, Government Furnished Property	<p>Issue: These two lists do not specify whether the identified vehicles and heavy equipment are GSA or NASA-owned assets.</p> <p>Question 1: Please identify which assets are GSA-provided and which assets are NASA-owned.</p> <p>Question 2: Will the Government please identify whether there are other categories of vehicles and heavy equipment other than these two categories?</p>	<p>1: The vehicles listed in attachment J-9 are NASA owned assets. The maintenance of the GSA vehicles are the responsibility of GSA and their identified "vendors". Operators of GSA vehicles have the responsibility to transport the leased vehicle to the identified GSA vendor or service center for repairs and maintenance.</p> <p>2: All government equipment currently subject to requirements of this contact are listed in attachment J-9.</p>
PWS Section 2, J-1 PWS 2.1.3, Page 42 of 202, Attachment J-9, and previously asked question	<p>Reference: PWS Section 2, J-1 PWS 2.1.3, Page 42 of 202, Attachment J-9, and previously asked question "The Contractor shall operate and manage all vehicles identified in Attachment J-9. Is the intent to operate only the vehicles listed in J-9 and not operate the vehicles in J-1 Appendix A? Does operate include maintain? If so please provide the workload in servicing the vehicles."</p> <p>NASA's response: The answer provided was "They shall operate, manage, and maintain the vehicles identified in Attachment J-1 Appendix A and Attachment J-9, Government Furnished Property. See the data in SACOM-History Reference folder in the SACOM Reference Library for workload data."</p> <p>Issue: This Offeror understands that some, if not most, of the assets are GSA-provided (although they are not specifically identified in the referenced files).</p> <p>Question 1: Is the SACOM contractor required to fully maintain all assets to include GSA-provided assets?</p> <p>Question 2: If the answer to question 1 is "only partial maintenance of some assets," please clarify what level of support is to be provided to GSA-provided assets, such as vehicles? For instance, full maintenance, preventive maintenance, shuttle to vendor, etc.?</p> <p>Question 3: If some assets are to be maintained by GSA vendors outside of the installation, would the Government please identify which assets are in this category.</p>	The vehicles listed in attachment J-9 are NASA owned assets. There are additional provided GSA vehicles. The maintenance of the GSA vehicles are the responsibility of GSA and their identified "vendors". Operators of GSA vehicles have the responsibility to transport the leased vehicle to the identified GSA vendor or service center for repairs and maintenance.
PWS Section 5.8, Performance Standard Matrix	<p>Issue: The requirement is unclear with regard to the notification of need (i.e., 911) of the need for emergency response services 24/7/365 and the reference to "the contractor shall furnish all personnel, supervision, and management necessary to provide emergency response and fire protection services..."</p> <p>Question 1: Please clarify whether the SACOM Contractor is required to provide the notification system/center as part of "all" personnel, supervision, and management necessary to provide emergency response....</p> <p>Question 2: If the answer to Question 1 is "no," please clarify how the notification center integrates with the fire services required under the SACOM contract.</p>	The Offeror is not required to provide the notification system to meet the requirements of the PWS. When a fire alarm is activated in a building, the security dispatcher receives the alarm and notifies the fire department. The security dispatcher is not a requirement of the SACOM Contract.
Section 5.8, Subparagraph A, "Scope", Attachment J-1, Appendix A, and Attachment J-9	<p>Issue: Clarity is requested. Section 5.8 states "The Contractor shall furnish all personnel, supervision, and management necessary to provide emergency response and fire protection services on a twenty-four (24) hour per day, seven (7) days per week, fifty-two (52) weeks per year basis, including holidays." "Equipment provided by the Government is indicated in Attachment J-1, Appendix A, Additional Workload Data and Attachment J-9, Government Furnished Property. In accordance with PWS 5.8, the Government will provide the required and approved Equipment with the exception of the fire trucks identified as "Fire/ Rescue Vehicle" and "2009 E-one HP 78 78' AERIAL LADDER"..."</p> <p>The section further states: "In the event additional equipment, material, tools or supplies are needed to accomplish the work described below in section B, General Requirements, the contractor shall submit the request to the NASA Fire Protection Manager."</p> <p>Question 1: This Offeror assumes that only Labor (personnel, supervision, and management) and the depreciation value of the two pieces of apparatus should be included in the cost proposal for Section 5.8. Is this assumption correct?</p> <p>Question 2: We also assume that no equipment (excepting apparatus depreciation), materials, tools, or supplies are to be proposed as a part of the fixed price portion of the proposal for PWS Section 5.8. Please confirm</p>	The Offeror shall include the cost of firefighter PPE in their proposal. The PPE provided shall be in accordance with NFPA and NASA Standards.

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
RFP Section G.4(c) property and services provided...	<p>Issue: Clarity is requested on property availability.</p> <p>Question: This Offeror assumes that the property and services listed in Section G.4(c) will be made available to the SACOM Contractor during Phase-In? Please confirm.</p>	<p>In accordance with L.I-19, Contract Phase-In, Office space will be provided by the Government during the Phase-In period. During this time, the Contractor shall not be responsible for performance of the effort described in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). It is understood that during Phase-In the predecessor Contractor will be performing the work described in the PWS. Therefore, the items at Clause G.4 paragraph (c) - (3) Property listed in Attachment J-9, (4) Supplies from store stock, (5) Publications and blank forms, (7) Installation service facilities, &amp; (11) Moving, hauling, and delivery of supplies, will not be available to the SACOM Contractor until the start of performance.</p>
Section Attachment J-1, B.1.F NOTE	<p>Issue: This section states: "The Contractor shall utilize the Government-provided CMMS and Maximo to the maximum extent practicable when entering, managing and tracking work requirements." This Offeror understands that MAF is currently using Maximo as its procurement automation tool and SSC is using MICS as an element of CMMS.</p> <p>Question: This Offeror understands that MICS was developed for the Government under another contract. If it is required to be used by the SACOM contractor, will the Government provide it as GFE?</p>	<p>The Government will not provide MICS. Please refer to PWS section 1.4 for purchasing system requirements that shall be provided by the Contractor.</p>
Section L – Electronic Pricing Model, Tab L-1a SSC PWS 5.0 and Tab L4a SSC LH-RT	<p>Issue: Tab L-1a SSC PWS 5.0 aligns with the structure provided within subsection 5.8 of the PWS. Specifically, the PWS is not broken out below the second tier (i.e., 5.8). However, Tab L4a SSC LH-RT calls out a cost breakout to the third tier (5.8.1 through 5.8.6), a breakout that is not included in the PWS. We assume that since the PWS only goes to the Second Tier that a further breakout is not required.</p> <p>Question 1: In the pricing sheet for 5.8, is pricing required for 5.8.1 through 5.8.6?</p> <p>Question 2: If Question 1 answer is "yes," please provide a further breakout of PWS 5.8 to the third tier to make it possible to cost the various subsections in the same manner within all proposals.</p>	<p>L-1a and L4a LHRT are both SSC templates. MAF templates are L-1b and L4b LH-RT. The numbering has been corrected and PWS 5.8 subsections have been deleted on L-4a SSC LH-RT and L-4b MAF LH-RT and has been revised in Amendment 2.</p>
Section SACOM Technical Resource Library, file titled Operations_and_Maintenance_Workload.docx and SACOM Technical Resource Library, file titled Sample_Annual_Workorder_Historical.Xls	<p>Issue: The Workload file contains a listing of work type and quantities for each work type grouping. The Workorder Historical file provides an extended listing of each of the work orders to include a title for each type of work and generally corresponds to the data provided in the Workload file. However, neither of the files provide any labor hour data for execution of the specific tasks</p> <p>Question: Will the Government please provide additional information in the Workorder Historical file to include labor hours per work order.</p>	<p>Current Labor hour data will not be provided.</p>
Section SACOM Technical Resource Library, file titled Operations_and_Maintenance_Workload.docx	<p>Issue: The Workload file contains a listing of work type and quantities for each work type grouping. However, this document does not indicate whether this workload history was limited at the same \$50,000 per work order level required by the PWS in Section 6.2.2.</p> <p>Question 1: This Offeror assumes that the workload provided was subject to a \$50,000 cap. Please confirm.</p> <p>Question 2: If the answer to Question 1 is "No, it was not," please clarify what the work order cap was on the contract for which this data is representative?</p>	<p>The workload files contains all workorders performed inclusive of workorders below \$50,000. This data is presented for reference only.</p>
Section SACOM Technical Resource Library, file titled WYEs Length_of_Service_CBA_SCA.xls	<p>Issue: This file includes a historical total count of CBA, SCA, and Exempt personnel associated with the existing contracts. However, there is no indication whether the staffing reflects just core work or whether it includes other IDIQ and demand related work.</p> <p>Question 1: Do these numbers include only personnel performing core work?</p> <p>Question 2: Do these include IDIQ and other demand work as well as core work?</p> <p>Question 3: If these numbers include more than core work, please advise what portion of the historical staffing levels performs core work.</p>	<p>1: No, this is the total number of WYEs applicable to the current contracts</p> <p>2: Yes, this is the total number of WYEs applicable to the current contracts</p> <p>3: All current contracts are not structured as SACOM.</p>
Section I.1.I, Section M.7	<p>Issue: Section I does not include FAR 52.222-46 Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees. However, the RFP does require a detailed total compensation plan, as well as additional information on retention, labor relations, etc. as mentioned in the above referenced FAR clause. The requirement for this specific employee related information appears that the Government is concerned with the quality and stability of the work force to be employed on this contract and that Offerors should be cautioned that lowered compensation for essentially the same professional work may indicate lack of sound management judgment and lack of understanding of the requirement. In addition, Section 7 discusses that the Government will perform reasonable and realism analyses of the Cost/Price Volume.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government consider adding this clause as a requirement within Section I and as an element of the Section M criteria.</p>	<p>In accordance with RFP Section L.I-1 FAR Provision 52.222-46 is included in the solicitation. The evaluation will be in accordance with RFP Section M.</p>

RFP CONTRACT REFERENCE	QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	ANSWERS 6/16/2014
Section L.II-2(a)(4), (5), (6), and (8), L.II-4(b) "All pages within volumes will be counted..." L.II-4(f)..no exclusions are provided from page limitations in section L.II-4 Table 1 above, except for section dividers.....	<p>Issue: The sections referenced (Section L.II-2(a)(4), (5), (6), and (8)) are unevaluated content including cover pages, tables of contents, RFP Reference Matrix, Key Terms and Acronyms. These documents are standard documents as are Section Dividers. All of these documents are meant to provide assistance to the evaluators for efficiently navigating the written proposal.</p> <p>With the requirement as stated that includes Section L.II-2(a)(4), (5), (6), and (8) documents within the volumes page count, they are likely to represent very high level summaries in order to preserve page count for the evaluated content within the respective volume; thus reducing their usefulness as rapid navigation tools for the evaluators, similar to the Section Dividers.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government consider placing these items (Section L.II-2(a)(4), (5), (6), and (8)) in the same category as the Section Dividers (L.II-2(7)) that are already outside the page count. Please add these requirements to the L.II-4(f) requirement and reinforce the statement that no content contained in these documents will be considered as evaluated material?</p>	RFP Section L.II-4(f) identifies what pages are excluded from the page count.
Attachment J-4, Appendix B	<p>Reference the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) dated September 11, 2010 between Jacobs Technology Inc. and Sierra Lobo, Inc. and the UAW Local 1921. This CBA covers production support and maintenance employees at the Michoud Assembly Facility. Schedule A of this CBA lists the "Logistics Support" classification as the only labor category clearly identifying logistics in the title to cover property control coordination, property disposal, shipping and receiving, and warehousing. A two part question:</p> <p>A) Can the Government please provide the job description for the Logistics Support (Specialist?) position? We contacted the union but they would not provide the description.</p> <p>B) Will the Government provide confirmation that the logistics activities identified above are covered under the CBA and are currently covered by the "Logistics Specialist" classification?</p>	The Government does not have the job description associated with Logistics Support or Logistics Specialist. The classification covered by the CBA is "Logistics Specialist".
Attachment J-4, Appendix B	We understand the renegotiated CBA between Jacobs and the UAW Local 21 was recently ratified. Would you please provide a copy if the newly ratified CBA? It may change offerors' staffing titles and fringe benefit calculations.	The CBA between Jacobs and the UAW Local 21 has not been recently ratified.
L.II-7 (c) 6) ii	In the EPM spreadsheet provided, on sheets "L-4a SSC LH-RT" and "L-4b MAF LH-RT," column "Productive Labor Hours" is given. Productive Labor Hours will vary for each contract period, so there will be 10 different values for each labor category (a different value for each contract period). Which value should be included in that column? Or, should we modify the spreadsheet to add the additional columns needed?	If the offeror sees a need to add columns to address the productive labor hours for each contract period, the offeror should do so. The forms are meant to be flexible so that the offeror can provide the most accurate information.
Attachment J-1, PWS 2.1.3.B.1.k Marine Logistics	Given the names of the watercraft in these sections, we assume PWS 2.1.4 applies to MAF only and is IDIQ and that PWS 2.1.3.B.1.k applies to SSC only and is part of the Core work. Is this understanding correct?	PWS 2.1.4 is related to transportation and handling services and as indicated in Final PWS is IDIQ. The two watercraft references in this section of the PWS are MAF assets. PWS 2.1.3.B.1.k in the Final PWS is a core function relating to Marine logistics. The watercraft reference in this section of the PWS is a SSC asset. Also the Offeror should refer to PWS 6.1.8 for other Marine Operations.
Attachment J-1, PWS section 3.4.5.B.6, 3.4.5.B.7 Waste Management	Government answers to questions regarding Municipal Waste Services clarified that refuse collection and disposal is in the scope of the contract. However, there is no workload (i.e., number of dumpsters/frequency of pickups, monthly CY of refuse delivered to the Landfill/sent off post) or equipment such as number of refuse collection trucks provided in the RFP attachments. Please clarify workload.	Refer to the SACOM Reference Library, under the Historical & Reference Data folder; see the MAF Environmental Monthly Report. Also, see the SACOM Reference Library, under the Historical and Reference Data folder, for a representative list of both MAF and SSC refuse containers.
Attachment J-2, DRD SA15-5.4	PWS Section 5.4 and DRD SA15-5.4, "Occupational Health Services Pricing Manual and Status Report," requires the contractor to "Prepare and submit and initial Medical Service Pricing Manual." Since this PWS support is fixed price, will the requirement for a medical service pricing manual and subsequent reporting be excluded from this DRD?	No
Attachment J-2, DRD SA15-17-5.4	PWS Section 5.4 and DRD SA15-17-5.4, "Wellness and Fitness Center Status," requires that the quarterly report, "include an operating profit and loss statement to include utility and maintenance costs." Since PWS 5.4 is a firm fixed price scope of work, is profit and loss tracking applicable. Will the requirement for P&L reporting be excluded from this DRD?	Amendment 2 removes the DRD requirement for a profit and loss statement.