

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 000002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NASA/ Goddard Space Flight Center Procurement Operations Division Greenbelt, MD 20771	CODE GSFC	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) NASA/ Goddard Space Flight Center Procurement Operations Division Greenbelt, MD 20771	CODE GSFC	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) To All Potential Offerors		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNG1475030R	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 01/20/2015	
		<input type="checkbox"/> 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	<input type="checkbox"/> 10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 5 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

**13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS.
IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.**

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

- 1) This amendment is hereby issued to clarify certain areas of the RFP as identified through questions and answers.
- 2) See page 2, for specific locations of clarifications.
- 3) In addition, further questions and answers are hereby released.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Michelle R. Padfield
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	(Signature of Contracting Officer) <i>Michelle R. Padfield</i>
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED 3/4/2015

- 1) The cover letter is corrected to reflect the correct period of performance and identify the IET Chairperson.
- 2) Page 68, is changed to identify no page limits for Total Compensation Plan, Quality Assurance Plan and Safety & Health Plan.
- 3) Page 70, the RFP is corrected to reflect the validity period for proposals is 270 days.
- 4) Page 75, the Section identifying the Task Ordering Procedure is corrected to Section 1 of the RFP.
- 5) Page 93, the average value of cost/fee for the proposed subcontractor is \$400,000.00.

End of Amendment 2

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD 20771

Reply to Attn of: 210.I

March 4, 2015

TO: All Prospective Offerors

SUBJECT: Request for Proposal (RFP), Solicitation No. NNG1475030R, Environmental Compliance Services for Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD

The work to be performed under this procurement is Environmental Compliance Services for assigned environmental regulatory requirements and environmental stewardship of Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) in Greenbelt, MD.

This acquisition will be conducted as a 100% 8(a) set-aside competition. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 541620 and the small business size standard is \$14M. The GSFC point of contact for Small Business concerns related to this procurement is Gilberto Del Valle on (301) 286-8136.

This competitive procurement will result in a Hybrid Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) Core requirement and an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) requirement with the ability to issue CPFF or Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) task orders. The period of performance and effective ordering period are based upon anticipated contract effective date of February 1, 2016, is as follows:

- Base: February 1, 2016, through September 30, 2017
- Option 1: October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2019
- Option 2: October 1, 2019, through February 28, 2021

The Government intends to issue a separate Fixed Price Purchase order for Phase-In with an anticipated period of performance from January 2, 2016 through January 31, 2016.

Please note that the RFP contains changes from the draft request for proposal (DRFP). The changes are a result of comments received from industry and internal reviews performed at NASA's GSFC. All questions and comments received from Industry were thoroughly evaluated and the RFP was updated as appropriate. The questions and answers received from industry have been posted to the solicitation site. Offerors are encouraged to carefully review the final RFP in its entirety.

Responses to questions/comments that were submitted following the site visit that was held on July 29, 2014, are posted as well.

Offerors are responsible for monitoring the websites for any updates.

This RFP does not commit NASA GSFC to pay any proposal preparation costs, nor does it obligate NASA GSFC to procure or contract for these services. This request shall not be

construed as authorization to proceed with, or be paid for charges incurred by performing any of the work called for in this solicitation.

Below is a list of the Source Selection Authority (SSA) and voting members along with their associated NASA GSFC organizational codes, for the Integrated Evaluation Team (IET). The names provided are for informational purposes only and other than the Contracting Specialist, Dorrence A. Levy, these individuals shall not be contacted regarding this procurement. The Government may change personnel associated with this acquisition at its discretion.

SSA

Raymond Rubilotta, Code 200

Voting Members

Gordon Knoble, Code 581, IET Chairperson
Dorrence Levy, Code 210.I, Contract Specialist
Harvey Walden, Code 581
Joel Donham, Code 250
Lori Levine, Code 250

Offerors are reminded that a "Blackout Notice" for this procurement was distributed to all applicable NASA GSFC personnel concurrently with the release of the Final RFP to Industry. Therefore, all communications pertaining to this procurement shall be directed only to the Contract Specialist listed below.

Any comments or questions regarding this RFP should be submitted in writing, to Dorrence Levy, Contract Specialist, via email at: dorrence.a.levy@nasa.gov on or before February 5, 2015. NASA will respond to applicable comments and questions in writing by posting an electronic response at the same location as this solicitation.

Proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall be submitted by the due date of February 5, 2015, at 3:00 pm ET. Proposals received after this time will be treated as late in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 52.215-1 entitled, "Instructions to Offers-Competitive Acquisitions." Your proposal must be signed by an official authorized to bind the company. It is requested that the proposal offer have an acceptance period of not less than 270 days. However, a different validity period may be proposed by the offeror.

Offerors who intend to submit a proposal in response to this RFP are requested to notify NASA of your company's intention to submit a proposal, within 14 days of the RFP release, so that we may appropriately plan resources for the proposal evaluation phase.

Thank you for your support. We look forward to receiving your proposals.


Michelle R. Padfield
Contracting Officer

requirements of this solicitation, which will be evaluated in accordance with Section M. The proposal content shall provide a basis for evaluation against the requirements of the solicitation. Each volume of the proposal shall specify the relevant evaluation criteria being addressed, if appropriate. The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied (i.e. SOW element versus offeror's proposal page numbers). It is intended that this be a simple matrix that should in no way inhibit an innovative approach or burden the offeror. This proposal matrix is excluded from the page limitations contained in paragraph (b)(1) below.

- (6) Information shall be precise, factual, detailed and complete. Offerors shall not assume that the evaluation team is aware of company abilities, capabilities, plans, facilities, organization or any other pertinent fact that is important to accomplishment of the work as specified in the SOW. The evaluation will be based primarily on the information presented in the written proposal. The proposal shall specifically address each listed evaluation factor and subfactor.

(b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS

- (1) The following table contains the page limitations for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this solicitation. Additional instructions for each component of the proposal are located in the contract provision noted under the Reference heading.

Proposal Component	Volume	Reference	Page Limitations
Offer Volume	I	L.20	No Limit
Mission Suitability Volume	II	L.22	45 pages
Subfactor A			
(a) Program & Technical Management			Included in Mission Suitability limitation
(b) Position Descriptions			1 Page per Position (Excluded from Mission Suitability limitation) *
(c) Total Compensation Plan			No Limit*
(d) Quality Assurance Plan			No Limit*
(e) Safety & Health Plan			No Limit*
(f) Phase-In Plan			10 Pages; excluded from Mission Suitability Limitation
Subfactor B			
(a) Understanding Technical Requirements			Included in Mission Suitability limitation
(b) Representative Task Orders (RTOs)			Included in Mission Suitability limitation
Cost Volume	III	L.23	
(a) Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fee Matrices (Attachment H)			No Limit
(b) Cost Exhibits/Charts			No Limit
(c) Representative Task Orders (RTOs)			No Limit
(d) Basis of Estimates (BOE)			2 Pages per WBS Level
Past Performance Volume	IV	L.24	
(a) Information from the Offeror			30 Pages **

- (1) It is requested that Offerors indicate, in Block 12 of the SF 33, a proposal validity period of 270 days. However, in accordance with paragraph (d) of FAR provision 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisitions," a different validity period may be proposed by the Offeror.
- (2) Provide the names, phone numbers, and email addresses of persons to be contacted for clarification of questions of a technical nature and business nature. Identify any consultants and/or subcontractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort.

The contract schedule refers to TBD and TBP. They are defined as follows:

TBD = TO BE DETERMINED BY THE GOVERNMENT

TBP = TO BE PROPOSED BY THE CONTRACTOR

(b) SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS

Include a statement of acceptance of the anticipated contract provisions and proposed contract schedule, or list all specific exceptions to the terms, conditions, and requirements of Sections A through J of this solicitation, to the Representations and Certifications (Section K) or to the information requested in Section L. Include the reason for the exception, new terms, conditions, and/or clauses, including any proposed benefit to the Government. This list must include all exception(s), deviation(s) and/or conditional assumptions taken.

Offerors are cautioned that exceptions or new terms, conditions, or clauses may result in a determination of proposal unacceptability (NFS 1815.305-70), may preclude award to an Offeror if award is made without discussions, or may otherwise affect an Offeror's competitive standing.

(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED

(1) Business Systems

State whether all business systems, including but not limited to accounting, property control, purchasing, estimating, and employee compensation, which require Government acceptance or approval (as applicable) are currently accepted/approved without condition.

Provide the date of acceptance/approval for each system and the cognizant contract administration office. Explain any existing conditional acceptances/approvals and the compliance status of any systems(s) for which acceptance or approval is currently withheld.

FAR 16.301-3 requires that a contractor's accounting system be adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract prior to the award of a cost-reimbursement contract. The Offeror shall provide evidence of an adequate accounting system as determined by the cognizant administrative office for accumulating and reporting incurred costs. If an Offeror is relying on the accounting system adequacy of a Joint Venture team member, sister company, or any other affiliated company's accounting system, they must demonstrate a convincing basis for using that system as a basis for determining their own adequacy. An adequate accounting system is not an evaluation criterion. It is a basic contract requirement with a pass/fail determination. A contract may only be awarded to the Offeror(s) who are determined to have an adequate accounting system.

Offerors who do not have an adequate accounting system determination shall provide evidence of any independent audit and system approvals as well as documented system ability to segregate and accrue costs by contract.

(2) Contract Administration

and/or non-performance of subcontracted portions of the contract.

The offeror shall describe the independence and autonomy of the Program Manager, clearly stating the Program Manager's reasons for and methods of accessing corporate officials and his/her control over essential resources/functions necessary to accomplish the work, including the Program Manager's authority to utilize and redirect subcontract resources and direct control over personnel, finances, and functions. The offeror shall describe the type and degree of corporate support and resources that are available to the Program Manager in the performance of this contract.

There are several significant permit renewals that will occur during the contract period including air Title V, NPDES industrial discharge, Sanitary Sewer industrial discharge. The Offeror shall describe its approach to supporting NASA's renewal of the permits considering the requirements specified in the SOW. The offeror shall discuss the methodology of the renewal process, any special technical support needs, and methods to maintain ongoing requirements of the SOW.

Task orders will be issued in accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section I of this RFP. The offeror shall detail its process for responding quickly and efficiently to requests for task plans. The offeror shall detail its plans for organizing, assigning staff, tracking, and managing multiple task orders from task initiation to completion, including configuration control, subcontracting, schedule, and cost.

The contract provides for a Core SOW area of ongoing environmental support as well as IDIQ services to accomplish unique, one-time, requirements that are not directly integrated into the daily environmental operations of the GSFC. The offeror shall describe its approach to accomplishing IDIQ task order requirements while simultaneously accomplishing the Core SOW's ongoing environmental support. The offeror shall describe how potential workload impacts will be addressed to assure Core SOW area of ongoing environmental support is not at risk. At a minimum, the offeror shall address resourcing, workload, and personnel responsibilities. The offeror shall explain its approach for identifying the optimum skill mix and matching the skill mix to services/functions in the requirements of the Core SOW and Core requirements.

The offeror shall provide a complete staffing plan that shows how it will fill the staff requirements identified in the Core SOW and IDIQ requirements. The staffing plan shall describe how the offeror intends to staff this effort and how the approach will allow the offeror to meet the Core and IDIQ requirements of this contract. The staffing plan shall include a comprehensive hiring plan which presents the expected number of personnel to be hired from incumbents, those to be transferred from within the offeror's own organization, and those from other sources. The offeror shall describe what effort will be undertaken to recruit staff not currently in the company employ.

The offeror shall provide a Total Compensation Plan (TCP) for all personnel proposed, in accordance with NFS provision 1852.231-71, entitled Determination of Compensation Reasonableness, and FAR provision 52.222-46, entitled Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees. The required professional compensation plan must:

Classify all labor categories proposed as "exempt" or "non-exempt" positions. Briefly define the terms "exempt" and "non-exempt" as used by your organization and correlate your definition with that provided for in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Identify the categories of personnel that are in a bona fide executive, administrative or professional capacity as defined by FAR 22.1102 and 29 CFR 541.

In accordance with the Exhibits 14A and 14B, Fringe Benefit Chart, the offeror and all service subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71) shall provide a

A “recent” contract is a contract that is ongoing or completed less than 5 years prior to the issuance of this RFP. Contracts completed more than 5 years prior to issuance of this RFP will not be considered recent and will not be considered or evaluated.

A “relevant” contract depends on the size and content of the contract with respect to this acquisition.

For a prime contractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least \$400,000.

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$400,000. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.*

For a significant subcontractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10 % of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

If the contract is deemed recent and meets the above minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance - i.e., level of pertinence - of the contract based on size and content. Content is more important than size in the evaluation of relevance. The term “content” means the type and complexity of services, work, or supplies, in comparison to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government may consider past quantities and periods of performance in evaluating overall relevance.

The performance evaluation will be based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or contract data in meeting technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements. Additional performance factors may include contract administration, occupational health, safety, security, subcontracting plan goals and small disadvantaged business participation targets, if applicable, and other contract requirements.

The Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries with previous customers. These contracts (if any) must meet the above “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

As part of the past performance evaluation, the Government may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) to the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s) where the proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company will affect the performance of the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s). The Government will take into consideration whether the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. These contracts (if any) must meet the above “recent” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of “recent” and “relevant” past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a “Neutral” rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures indicated above may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.

Final RFP Questions

Dated: February 24, 2015

1. **Question:** In the Letter to All Prospective Offerors a reference is made to a June 29, 2014 site visit as well as answers to comments/questions. I found the list of site visit attendees, but can we be provided with answers to questions/comments raised during or prior to that visit?

Response: Yes, the questions and answers will be posted on Fedbizopps.

2. **Question:** Pg 68 of the RFP specifies that the Safety and Health plan is “excluded” from the page limitation. Quality Assurance and Total Compensation Plans state they have “no limit”.
 - a. Although the Safety and Health Plan is excluded from the total page limit for Volume II, is there a page limit for the Safety and Health plan itself?
 - b. Are the Quality Assurance and Total Compensation Plans excluded from the total page count limit for Volume II?

Response: a. No page limit for the Safety and Health Plan. b. No page limit for the Quality Assurance and Total Compensation Plans. This will be clarified in the RFP in a forthcoming amendment.

3. **Question:** Although pg 76 of the RFP specifies that we must identify positions we believe are critical to the continuity of performance under this SOW, is NASA-GSFC expecting to see “key personnel” along with names and resumes for the key personnel?

Response: There are no “key personnel” identified by the Government.

4. **Question:** Box 12 of the SF 33 shows 270 calendar days, but Section L.20 on page 70 shows 180 days. Which is correct?

Response: 270 calendar days is the correct amount of time. This will be clarified in a forthcoming amendment.

5. **Question:** Section L.23(w), page 84, refers to the “Supplemental Task Ordering Procedures” clause, which is not included in the RFP. Please include that clause.

Response: Clause 52.216-91 is included in the RFP and can be found in Section B.5, page 3.

6. **Question:** Section L.22.3, page 75, refers to the Task Ordering Procedure in Section H. Should that be Section I?

Response: Yes, the clause Task Ordering Procedure will be moved to Section I and revised in a forthcoming amendment.

7. **Question:** Section L.22.3, page 77, 3rd paragraph, states, "...the offeror shall identify." This seems to be an incomplete sentence. Please clarify.

Response: The offeror shall identify any dependencies upon the incumbent contractor during the phase-in plan. An amendment will be issued to clarify.

8. **Question:** Section L.24(a), page 84, refers to an average annual cost/fee of \$400,000, but Section M.5, page 93, refers to \$350,000. Should these costs be the same in the two sections?

Response: Yes, both areas identified in section L.24(a) and M.5 should read \$400,000. An amendment will be forthcoming to clarify.

9. **Question:** Volume IV, Past Performance request OSHA 300 Logs from the past 3 years. Please confirm that the OSHA 300 Logs are excluded from page count.

Response: OSHA 300 logs are excluded from the page count.

10. **Question:** Volume II Subfactor A(b) Position Descriptions: Please confirm that in addition to providing the position descriptions which includes the qualifications for the Offeror's proposed labor categories, that the Offeror is also required to complete all of RFP Attachment H and submit it with the proposal.

Response: Yes, the offeror is required to submit the completed Attachment H with their proposal.

11. **Question:** The updated solicitation and Amendment 1, posted on February 2, have different versions of Exhibits 1-16 Final.xls and Exhibits 1-16.pdf. Please confirm which is the most current version and that it is posted as an Excel file.

Response: Amendment 1, Exhibits 1-16.pdf, is the most updated version and be submitted with the proposal.

12. **Question:** Section B (pages 2-6) – Will a contract clause equivalent to B.10 in the Draft RFP be added to define the contract type?

Response: Yes, see Section L.7 (52.216-1) Type of Contract.

13. **Question:** Section L.23.2(j) states: "The BOEs are to be submitted ... at the lowest WBS Level only (WBS Level 3)." Please clarify how the Government intends for this requirement to be met for the IDIQ portion of the WBS, where the Level 3 WBS is defined only as "Task by Task." Our assumption is that the Level 3 WBS for IDIQ tasks consists only of the two Representative Task Orders included in the solicitation, is that correct?

Response: Yes. BOEs are required for the Core and the representative task plans.

14. Question: Please indicate if an acronym list provided with each of the volumes would be included/excluded from page count.

Response: Yes, the acronym list is excluded from the page count.

Final RFP Questions
Dated: February 24, 2015

Question Number	Question	Response
1	In the RFP (section F, pg 11), the period of performance is specified to be 20 months starting 2/1/16. Letter to Offerors specifies a 15 month period from 2/1/16 – 4/30/17. Which is the correct period?	The correct period of performance starting 2/1/16 is 20 months. This will be clarified in the RFP in a forthcoming amendment.
2	Section L.24(a) (page 87) – Please confirm that a copy of OSHA Form 300A is required for submittal as a record of the company’s OSHA recordable injuries and illnesses.	Offers shall include a statement describing the company’s OSHA recordable injuries and illnesses for the last three years and Workers Compensation Experience Rating document. Offerors are not required to submit OSHA’s form 300A.
3	Section L.22(a) states: “The signed SF33 and the pages with the required fill-ins must be submitted.” In reviewing the sections, the only “Fill-Ins” (outside of the SF33) appear to be found in Section B.1 and B.8. We based this upon the acronym “TBP” being present in these sections. Is this correct?	That is correct the only fill-in sections are the SF33 and Sections in B.1, B.2 and B.8.
4	In the RFP (section F, pg 11), the period of performance is specified to be 20 months starting 2/1/16. Letter to Offerors specifies a 15 month period from 2/1/16 – 4/30/17. Which is the correct period?	The correct period of performance starting 2/1/16 is 20 months. This will be clarified in the RFP in a forthcoming amendment.
5	Pg 75 of the RFP requests that we develop and submit a staffing plan which includes the expected number of incumbent staff which will be hired. Can we be provided access to the incumbent staff?	The incumbent contractor is Straughan Environmental. The Government cannot provide the information on the expected number of incumbent staff. Offerors must contact the incumbent contractor for access to the incumbent staff.
6	If Attachment H is required to be submitted with the proposal, please clarify where Attachment H should be located in the proposal submission.	On page 68 of the RFP, Attachment H is located in Cost Volume III.
7	Section L.22.2 (page 74) states: "The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission	Yes, the outline of the proposal shall be in accordance with the requirements found in Section L.22.3.

Final RFP Questions
Dated: February 24, 2015

	<p>Suitability Proposal.” This is inconsistent with the outline contained in Section L.22.3 (page 74) for Subfactors A and B and in Section M. Our assumption is that we should outline the proposal in accordance with requirements contained in Section L.22.3 to facilitate evaluation in accordance with Section M, please confirm this is the Government’s intent.</p>	
8	<p>Many of the Workload Indicators (Exhibit 17) are inadequate to define the entire level of effort for a given SOW element. Some SOW elements have no associated Workload Indicators and for other SOW elements only a few Workload Indicators are given which do not wholly cover the scope of work for the SOW element. Please provide complete Workload Indicators reflective of the full scope of all SOW elements.</p>	<p>The items listed Exhibit 16, along with the documents in the electronic library coupled with general knowledge in environmental management and compliance protocol should be sufficient for the offeror to determine an estimate for level of effort.</p>
9	<p>Section L.22.3, page 75, refers to the Task Ordering Procedure in Section H. Should that be Section I?</p>	<p>Yes, that refers to Section I. This will be clarified in a forthcoming amendment.</p>