



**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**  

---

**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**



14 February 2018

SUBJECT: Joint Solicitation DE-SOL-0011530 and N00024-18-R-2130  
**Additional** Vendor Questions and Government Answers/Responses

1. Question: With regard to DFARS 252.242-7005, *Contractor Business Systems*, We assume that the contractor is not expected to develop separate business systems (e.g. purchasing, accounting systems) to meet the differing DOE and Navy requirements. Please confirm.

Answer: Correct. The Contractor is not required to develop separate business systems to meet the DOE and the Navy requirements.

2. Question: Who does the government anticipate will be responsible for administration of DFARS 252.242-7005?

Answer: Naval Reactors Laboratory Field Office will administer the Navy contract on behalf of the Navy.

3. Question: In this regard, we note that the incumbent contract, at Clause H-16 provides that Naval Reactors has the authority to determine that the contractor was compliant with the implementation of the business systems required by the DFARS clauses by developing business systems in compliance with the counterpart DEAR clauses. Is there a plan to add a similar clause to the awarded Navy contract?

Answer: Yes. The Government intends to issue a solicitation amendment to incorporate a *Business Systems Compliance* clause in Navy Section H to clarify this.

4. Question: Given the limited transition period and limited involvement of the parent organization against the risk of cost withholding under DFARS 252.242-7005, there will be limited opportunity for the parent to verify that the business systems currently in use at the NNL are acceptable. Please inform the offerors if this assumption is incorrect.

Answer: This assumption is incorrect. The length of the planned transition period is considered sufficient for the parent to verify that current business systems are acceptable.

5. Question: Joint Solicitation Section L-E.2.c provides for two pages for the Past Performance Information Form and three additional pages for problems encountered, and states that anything over five total will be discarded. Instruction Item 13 to Attachment L-3 states that up to three additional pages are allowed as well, but also states a page limitation of 40 pages, which would be eight per PPIF. Please clarify the page allocations permitted for the PPIF forms.

Answer: See response to Question #7 provided on 1/30/18 and restated here: The Government will remove and discard all pages in excess of five for each PPIF. The Government intends to issue a solicitation amendment to revise the last sentence of Attachment L-3 Instruction Item 13 to replace the last sentence with “The Government will remove, discard, and not count against the page limitation all pages of each PPIF in excess of five pages.”

6. Question: The attachments at L-3 (Past Performance Information Form) and L-4 (Measures of Safety and Health Performance) are called out in both Volume I and Volume II of the RFP. Should they be included in Volume I, II, or both in the proposal submission? Please clarify the location of Attachment L-3 and L-4 in Volume I and II of the response.

Answer: Attachments L-3 and L-4 should be included in Volume II. The Government intends to issue a solicitation amendment to clarify this requirement.

7. Questions: The DOE Section C *Statement of Work* states in part that the Contractor shall perform the work necessary for the efficient operation (i.e. maintenance and repair) and decommissioning (i.e., decontamination and disposal) of the facilities, giving reasonable consideration to an aging infrastructure at the various sites. The Navy Section C *Statement of Work* states in part that the Contractor shall perform technical work necessary to upgrade and modify existing components and plant servicing equipment, prepare for defuelings and refueling, and procure inspection equipment and test hardware. Tasks necessary to perform the above work shall include: Modifying and upgrading existing nuclear propulsion plant components and plant servicing equipment; procuring test hardware; and testing modified plant equipment.
1. Do the above identified scopes include handling/remediating non-radioactive hazardous materials?
  2. Will the Government provide an inventory (e.g., type, location, amount, etc.) of non-radioactive hazardous materials for both the older site facilities and propulsion plants, if available?

Answers:

1. Yes.
2. DOE Section C (g) scope may include handling/remediating non-radioactive hazardous materials. See the 10 year facility plan and site environmental reports in the reading room for characterization of work and site conditions.

8. Question: If a bidder has five DOE and Navy contracts, are we required to use only DOE and Navy Past Performance references? Specifically, if we have non-DOE and non-Navy Past Performance projects that we feel are more relevant to the SOW, can we provide those PPIFs instead of DOE and Navy projects? If the project example is relevant, what is the scoring impact between DOD, DON, and project examples from other DOD agencies, other Federal agencies, state and local Government examples, and/or private sector examples?

Answer: As noted in Section L-2.3 Paragraph E.2 Volume II, Section II: Past Performance subparagraph (a) of the joint solicitation, the preference is for DOE or Navy contracts; however,

if an Offeror does not have five DOE or Navy contracts valued at \$100 million or more that it considers are similar in nature to the work required by this solicitation or that demonstrate its ability to perform the proposed effort, the Offeror may submit information relating to contracts with other DOD agencies, other Federal agencies, state and local Governments, and/or private companies in that order of preference. Such contracts will be judged on the basis of relevancy rather than on the identities of the parties to said contracts.

9. Question: The last sentence in Section L-2.3, Paragraph E.2, Volume II, Section II, Past Performance d) states that Performance assessments and small business achievement are excluded from the 50 page Volume II – Technical Proposal page limitation. Does this mean that an offeror may provide additional information in the Past Performance Volume regarding performance and metrics on the cited contracts which will not be included or counted in the 50 page Volume II page limit?

Answer: Not necessarily. The exclusion in subparagraph d) applies to offerors without Government contract past performance history, and to copies of any award fee determinations, performance evaluation reports, small business achievements or other documentation that reflects the formal performance assessment of the Offeror by its customer on the performance cited in the PPIF. These independent performance assessments and small business achievements are excluded from the 50 page limitations on the technical proposal.

10. Question: Joint Solicitation Section L, Paragraph E.3. b) subparagraph (4) (page 12) states in part that “the Offeror shall summarize all accidents leading to personal injury, fatal accidents and accidents leading to major property damage (greater than \$1,000,000 per event), results of regulatory and/or Department of Energy compliance inspections, whistleblower or employee reprisal complaints and list all fines, penalties, other citations, or comparable regulatory enforcement documents levied by outside organizations (DOE, OSHA, etc.), for calendar years 2006 through 2016.” Please confirm that “whistleblower or employee reprisal complaints” means a request for Part 708 claims submitted to and processed by the DOE for the covered years.

Answer: The term “whistleblower or employee reprisal complaints” should be understood, for purposes of this part of the Solicitation, in relation to environmental safety and health matters; such complaints, if relevant, would comprise those processed under 10 C.F.R. Part 708 or other relevant statutes and regulations.