

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

Number	Final RFP Section	Final RFP Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Question	DOE Response
1	L.9		Factor 3: Past Performance	L-17	This is the first factor listed within the Section L Volume II instructions, however it is titled Factor 3. Will DOE revise this title to Factor 1 in order for the for the factors to be listed in numerical order?	Text describing the factors have been reordered in Sections L and M consistent with the order of importance listed in Section M.6. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors has not changed.
2	L.11		Factor 1: Past Performance	L-19	This is the third factor listed within the Section L Volume II instructions, however it is titled Factor 1. Will DOE revise this title to Factor 3 in order for the for the factors to be listed in numerical order?	Text describing the factors have been reordered in Sections L and M consistent with the order of importance listed in Section M.6. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors has not changed.
3	Cover Letter and L.5	L.5.(g)	Questions	Cover Letter 1 and L-16	The Cover Letter states that "questions pertaining to the Final RFP shall be submitted in writing to by 11:59 PM Eastern Time on May 22, 2023", however Section L.5.(g) states "questions regarding this solicitation must be submitted no later than eight (8) calendar days after the original solicitation issuance date", which is May 20, 2023. Please confirm the correct deadline for questions.	May 20, 2023 falls on a Saturday. Where due dates (measured by Calendar Days) fall on weekends or federal holidays, they will be moved to the next business day. Questions were therefore due May 22, 2023.
4	Deadline for Questions				Due to the large amount of information to be digested to understand the task order and prepare a comprehensive bid. We respectfully request, at a minimum, a one week extension to the deadline for questions.	The due date for questions will not be extended.
5	Section L	Attachment L-8	Task Order #1 - ETEC	NA	The link for this document at https://emcbc.doe.gov/SEB/SBNDNR/FinalRFP is broken - would DOE please provide access to this document?	The link to attachment L-8 has been repaired.
6	H & L	H.33 & L.9	Key Personnel	H-28 & L-17	L.9(a)(2) requires offerors to confirm the availability of key personnel as full-time assigned to the contract with a permanent duty station located in the surrounding area of ETEC. H.33(c)(1) establishes contract fee reductions for changes to the Program Manager if removed, replaced, or diverted within three years of being placed in the position. Please confirm that the Program Manager requirement for the ETEC task will not be considered the Program Manager for the IDIQ, and will therefore be exempt from the H.33(c)(1) fee reduction.	There are no Key Personnel, and therefore no Program Manager designated or assigned at the IDIQ Contract-level. The Key Personnel provisions in Sections L and M have been revised to clarify that they pertain only to the Program Manager being proposed for the ETEC Task Order. The contract fee reductions pertain to any Key Personnel designated to any Task Orders (including the ETEC Task Order) issued against the SB Nationwide DD&R IDIQ Contracts.
7	L	L.9	Key Personnel	L-17	Is it acceptable for key personnel to be employed by teaming subcontractors? If they must be employed by the prime, can the prime second key personnel from teaming subcontractors?	Key personnel may be employed by teaming subcontractors.
8	L	L.5.(e)(3); L.6(b); L.12(a)	Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volumes I and III	L-5; L-7; L-24	Please confirm that the fully completed Table B-1 should be provided in both Volume I and Volume III.	Table B-1 should be provided in both Volume I and Volume III of the proposal.
9	L	L.8(c)	Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II - Technical and Management Proposal - General	L-16	L.8(c) states "Offerors shall not simply offer to perform work in accordance with the PWS stated in the ETEC Task Order, rather Offerors shall provide their specific approach and capabilities to perform the PWS of the ETEC Task Order." The reference to providing a specific approach to performing the PWS suggests a technical approach is requested. However, subsequent L and M sections only provide detail for three factors: key personnel, organization and staffing approach, and past performance. Will DOE please clarify if a technical approach is desired? If offerors are to provide a technical approach, will a page limitation and evaluation criteria be established?	No Technical Approach is requested or required. Offerors will only be evaluated against the evaluation factors of the solicitation, which includes Past Performance, Organization and Staffing Approach, and Key Personnel.
10	M	M.7	DOE-M-2012 Basis for Award	M-7	M.7 indicates that evaluation factors in M.7 will be adjectivally rated. Will the Government provide the adjectival rubric that will guide this evaluation?	An adjectival rubric will not be provided.
11	I & L	I.52 & L.6.(b)(3)(iii)	Post-Award Small Business Program Re-representation	I-4 & L-8	Section L requires offerors to fill in information for FAR 52.219-28, Post-Award Small Business Program Re-representation, found in Section I.52. The FAR clause suggests that this requirement needs to be completed post award. Will the Government please advise what information offerors should provide to satisfy this Volume I requirement?	FAR 52.219-28 has been removed from the list of Volume I requirements, as it is applicable to the post-award environment.
12	K & L	K.4 & L.6.(k)	Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)	K-9 & L-12	Section L.6.(k) requires offerors to provide a fully executed Section K.4, Organizational Conflicts of Interest Disclosure. However, Section K.4 appears to address Violation of Arms Control Treaties or Agreements-Certification. Should offerors provide a fully executed K.9 instead of K.4?	Section L.6(k) has been amended to reference Section K, Organizational Conflicts of Interest Disclosure.
13	L	L.6.(m)(2)	Former DOE Employees	L-13	Item (iii) in L.6.(m)(2) appears to be omitted. Will the Government please clarify?	L.6(m)(2) item (iv) should be (iii). Section L has been amended to reflect this revision.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

14	L	L.8(d)	Teaming Subcontractors	L-16	If an offeror has a teaming subcontractor at the IDIQ level with no planned scope for the ETEC task, will the Government clarify what information should be provided with the proposal? Specifically, is past performance information desired?	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
15	Attachment L-8	C.3.4.4.3	Management of Demolition Materials and Waste Disposal	L-8-56	Considering that the waste generated from the D&D activities will include hazardous and radioactive waste, will utilization of a DOE Motor Carrier Evaluation Program (MCEP)-approved carrier be required for transportation of waste to disposal facilities?	Selected transporters shall be qualified, fully licensed, and insured to transport wastes generated. For transportation of hazardous wastes, the selected transporter shall be a registered hazardous waste hauler. Task Order Section C.3.5, Waste Management and Removal, paragraph 3.b.iii, says: "Waste disposal shall comply with all applicable DOE, Department of Transportation (DOT), and disposal site waste acceptance requirements." RFP Section J, Attachment J-2 lists DOE O 460.2B, Departmental Materials Transportation Management, as the requirement that includes Contractor requirements for the MCEP.
16	L	L.13	DOE-L-2014 Date, Time, and Place Offers are Due (OCT 2015)	L-25	This section indicates offers are due no later than TBD. Would the Government please confirm the solicitation due date?	Consistent with the extended proposal due date, Section A, page 1, as well as section L.13 have been updated to reflect a date of proposals are due July 10, 2023 by 1700 Eastern.
17	C & Attachment L-8	C.2.3.4	Nuclear Safety	C-7 & L-8-23	C.2.4.3 of the Mater IDIQ requires a nuclear safety program. Section C.2.4.3 of Attachment L-8 states that there are no additional nuclear safety requirements for the ETEC task beyond those provided within the Master IDIQ. Does this mean a nuclear safety program is required for the ETEC task order?	The ETEC Task Order is required to comply with Master IDIQ requirements, 10 CFR 830, Nuclear Safety Management, including Subpart A, Quality Assurance Requirements, (the Subpart A Quality Assurance shall be part of C.2.4.4) and Subpart B, Safety Basis Requirements. Requirements are identified in Section J, Attachment J-2 of the RFP.
18	C & Attachment L-8	C.2.4.5	Conduct of Operations	C-8 & L-8-24	C.2.4.5 of the Master IDIQ requires establishing and implementing a Conduct of Operations (CONOPS) Program in accordance with DOE O 422.1, Conduct of Operations. Section C.2.4.5 of Attachment L-8 states that Conduct of Operations may be addressed by the contractor within the QAP outlined in Section C.2.4.4, Quality Assurance. Does this mean a CONOPS Program and matrix is required in addition to the QAP? Or can the QAP be credited in place of the CONOPS Program?	The Contractor is required to meet all requirements of DOE O 422.1, Conduct of Operations, and DOE O 414.1, Quality Assurance. The Conduct of Operations Matrix in DOE O 422.1, Attachment 2, Appendix A compliments Quality Assurance Program (QAP) requirements and may be addressed through the QAP.
19	Section H	H.4	Workforce transition	H-2	Section H requires the preferential hiring of Incumbent Employees. Please confirm whether this requirement is applicable to the ETEC TO. If so, how many employees are potentially available for hiring? Please provide the number of incumbent contractor staff that are currently supporting DOE at ETEC and their functional roles.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
20	Section H	H.4	Workforce transition	H-2	What is the current number of incumbent staff that are providing Program Support Services?	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
21	Section L	L.11 (b)	Past Performance	L-20	Section C.3.3 states, "DOE anticipates the remainder of the soil remediation will be a logical follow-on task from this task order". Should bidders consider this future TO requirement in their selection of past performance projects that are similar in scope, size, and complexity to the ETEC project?	Potential future requirements should not be considered in selection of past performance projects for inclusion in the proposal. Offerors are to bid based only upon the work contained in the PWS provided.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R- FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

22	Section L, Attachment L8	C.3.4.4.1	Asbestos Abatement	L-8-51 and L-8-53	On page L-8-51, the RFP states, "The abatement and deactivation have been completed for all of the DOE buildings in preparation for demolition". On page L-8-53, the RFP includes the requirements for asbestos abatement and management. Please clarify whether asbestos abatement and management are required.	Planning for Asbestos abatement of remaining property is required. The statement on p. L-8-51 is a follow-on sentence and clarifies abatement was completed for all of the DOE buildings in preparation for demolition. Under the same heading, the statement on p. L-8-53 refers to plans for demolition and disposal of remaining property (see Master Section C.2.4.7) with examples provided, such as all asbestos containing materials (ACMs), universal waste (e.g., mercury in electrical equipment), and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) that may be found in gaskets, structural supports, and concrete slabs.
23	Section J	Attachment J-7	List of Facilities for D&D Scope	L-8-89	RMHF Yard Asphalt is missing the approximate footprint (ft2). Please revise the table to include the approximate footprint of this facility.	Attachment J-7 to be revised. The RMHF storage yard asphalt is approximately 7500 ft.2. Further details regarding the RMHF can be found in the Document Library, or at this link: www.etec.energy.gov > Library > RMHF-Closure-Plan
24	Section C	C.3.3.2 Work Conducted Under the Administrative Order on Consent (AOC)	Regulator review of draft plans	L-8-48	The section states, "Draft plans shall be submitted for DTSC review upon DOE approval". Are plans required to be approved by DTSC prior to commencing work? If so, what is the duration we should assume for DTSC to review plans?	No. Plans and subsequent implementing actions must be approved by DOE prior to commencing work activities. Time and extent of reviews by DTSC will be bilaterally determined between DOE and DTSC based on urgency and complexity of the activity for which planning is required.
25	L.12	L.12(a)	Attachment L-8 Table B-1	L-24	Will the government provide the native file for the Table B-1: Task Order Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) Structure Offerors are to complete as part of the Volume III, Price Proposal requirements?	The native file will not be provided for Table B-1.
26	L.11	L.11 (a.2)	Attachment L-3 Past Performance Information Form	L-3-1	Due to the amount of required information, would the Government consider expanding the page limit for project descriptions to 7 pages? Currently the page limit is 4.	The page limit will not be expanded and remains at 4 pages.
27	L.5	L.5(g)	Questions	L-20	Will the government consider extending the Q&A deadline from May 22 to May 30 to allow time for offerors to review and evaluate requirements to ensure a thorough and competitive proposal response?	The due date for questions will not be extended.
28	L.9	L.9(c)	Letter of Commitment	L-18	Please confirm that key personnel will need to commit to 3 years on the contract.	Key personnel shall commit to the 32 month Period of Performance on Task Order #1. The text of the Letter of Commitment has been amended consistent with this requirement.
29	L	L.9	DOE-L2005 Evaluation Factor - Key Personnel (OCT 2015)	L-17	The requirement for key personnel for an IDIQ task award prior to the IDIQ award presents an undue burden on small businesses. We do not maintain a large "bench" of available staff to wait during the DOE selection process which is assumed to be 270 days since that is the duration our bid is to be valid. We understand the value of naming and committing key personnel but during the bid phase for the IDIQ is extremely difficult for small business. The current incumbent small business contractor has a significant advantage in bidding because they already have the local qualified staff. We request that this criteria be removed from evaluation for the IDIQ award and only be applicable to the evaluation and award of the ETEC Task Order.	After consideration, the Key Personnel factor has been amended to reduce the quantity of Key Personnel from three (3) down to (1). DOE would also note that the RFP includes factors for Organization and Staffing Approach, Past Performance, and Price that will be considered in the evaluation and selection process.
30	L	L.9 (b) (2)	DOE-L2005 Evaluation Factor - Key Personnel (OCT 2015)	L-18	Item 2 states that current DOE employees shall not be identified as key personnel references but can current DOE employees be bid as key staff?	Current DOE employees may be bid as key staff, provided that no conflict of interest concerns or limitations on post-federal employment would prevent such an employee from performing on the contract.
31	L	L-8 Section J	Section J - List of Documents, Exhibits, and Other Attachments	L-8-75	Please provide all the required J attachments for J-2, J-3, J-5, and J-6. They are all marked not required but we are unsure how to respond with fixed pricing without knowing what is being provided by the government.	Attachment J-2 of the Master IDIQ Contract is incorporated into the L-8 Task Order #1 ETEC, as well as the Task Order itself including the Implement Document titled "Landowner Access Agreement". See L-8, Attachment J-2. Amendment 1 has resulted in a revised L-8, Attachment J-3 Wage Determinations. Per L-8 Attachment J-5, "GFS/I are not applicable for the performance of this Task Order." Per L-8 Attachment J-6, the Pricing Schedule is "Not applicable for this Task Order." Instead, Offerors shall fill in Table B-1.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

32	L	L-8 Section J-5	Attachment J-5	L-8-86	Are no facilities or equipment available for performance of the task? If not, do we need to provide 100% of the equipment needed in the performance of the task?	Attachment L-8, B.1 of the RFP states "The Contractor shall furnish all personnel, facilities, equipment, material, supplies, and services (except as may be expressly set forth in this Contract as furnished by the Government) and otherwise do all things necessary for, or incident to, the performance of work as described in Section C, <i>Performance Work Statement (PWS)</i> , under this Task Order." Additionally, Section J, Attachment J-5 Government Furnished Services/Items (GFS/I) states " GFS/I are not applicable for the performance of this Task Order."
33	L	L-8 Section B.2	Table B-1	L-8-5	Table B-1, CLIN 01000, 01001, and 02001 have offeror fill in. There is no detailed information on the existing staff to transition, what their roles are, if they are exempt, non exempt, SCA, etc. How are we to price this work on a firm fixed price basis with no details on the incumbent staff? The incumbent contractor has a significant unfair advantage in providing firm fixed pricing for this work based on the level of detail currently provided by the DOE in the RFP.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
34	H	H.33	DOE-H-2070 Key Personnel - Alternate I (c)(1)(2)	H-28	Section H.33 has the penalty clause for changing the program manager at \$500,000 and section 2 other key positions at \$250,000 each and every occurrence. This language places an extreme risk an burden on a small business to manage an maintain key staff with the fee for an entire task potentially exceeded by this dollar amounts. We request H.33 be eliminated as a requirement in this solicitation.	In an effort to reduce the burden on small businesses, DOE has lowered the values in Section H.33 to \$50,000 and \$25,000, for Key Personnel.
35	L	L-8 Section B and Section J	CLIN 01001 and Attachment J-6	L-8-5 and L-8-87	Section B, Table B-1 states offeror fill in for CLIN 01001 but Attachment J-6 Pricing Schedule says not applicable for this task order. Are we to provide pricing or just a technical approach?	Offerors shall fill in Table B-1. No additional pricing is required to be submitted.
36	M	M.3	Evaluation Factor - Organization and Staffing Approach (b)	M-4	This evaluation factor says we will be evaluated on items include retaining the incumbent contractor employees. In order to ensure we can retain them, we need to understand the number of staff, type of staff, duration on the project, and current salary and benefit structure. Can you please provide this information.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
37	L	L-8 Section C.3.4.4.1 (g)	Pre-Demolition	L-8-52	Can you please expand on the intent of a CA PE statement certifying if radiological activities took place in a facility and how that is relevant to the safe demolition of said facility?	The intent of a California Professional Engineer statement is to assure the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is provided an assessment consistent with and comparable to the practices of engineering and land surveying in the state of California.
38	L	L.9	DOE-L2005 Evaluation Factor - Key Personnel (OCT 2015)	L-17	How does DOE justify evaluating a Nationwide IDIQ 10-year contract on the basis of a small business' ability to produce 3 very specific key personnel in a specific location who will commit to a 3-year timeline (plus proposal validity) with less than 2 months' notice?	After consideration, the Key Personnel factor has been amended to reduce the quantity of Key Personnel from three (3) down to (1). DOE would also note that the RFP includes factors for Organization and Staffing Approach, Past Performance, and Price that will be considered in the evaluation and selection process.
39	H	H.48	Legal Management	H-44	Please confirm the applicability of H.48, for the small business to have a Litigation Management Plan for the overall IDIQ contract, as opposed to developing such Plan on a task order basis, as specified in the task order request.	The Legal Management Plan is a requirement of the overall Master IDIQ contract.
40	H	H.54	Organizational Conflict of Interest - Affiliate(s)	H-53	This question pertains to H.54 regarding affiliates. In the event that an unpopulated small business joint venture (such as a mentor/protégé) is awarded this contract, along with teaming subcontractors, please confirm that it would be able to subcontract work to its immediate parent companies	The Section H Organizational Conflict of Interest – Affiliate clause allows for CO approval to subcontract to affiliates/parent companies. In the case of an unpopulated JV, DOE anticipates approval of such an arrangement.
41	H	H.54	Organizational Conflict of Interest - Affiliate(s)	H-53	This question pertains to H.54 regarding affiliates. Since each task order is competitively bid among any awardees for this IDIQ contract, it seems that subcontract arrangements with affiliates or affiliates of partners should be permitted, as this would have been judged to present the best value to the government. Please confirm that inclusion of affiliates in proposals, and task order proposals, is acceptable, and award of those task orders would constitute CO consent.	The Section H Organizational Conflict of Interest – Affiliate clause allows for CO approval to subcontract to affiliates/parent companies. In the case of an unpopulated JV, DOE anticipates approval of such an arrangement.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

42	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security	L-8-28	Reference is made to an "Exhibit A - Map of the Property." The map seems to be missing from the RFP documents. Please provide this map.	The reference at C.2.5, Safeguards and Security, is found posted on the Documents Library page and within the link to the Access Agreement. Note the title of the link omits the word 'Landowner'. The link is: https://www.emcbc.doe.gov/SEB/Files/SBNDDR/DocLib/Access%20Agreement.p df
43	Attachment L-8	C.1.1	Task Order Implementation	L-8-16	Item Number 5 states that the Transition Plan is due within 15 days after NTP. In other parts of Attachment L-8, the RFP states that the Transition Plan is due no later than 7 days after NTP (page L-8-14, 5th full paragraph) and L-8-80, Deliverables Table). Please clarify when the Transition Plan is due.	L-8 C.1.1.5(a) bullet 2 has been revised to state, "Within seven (7) days after NTP". Amendment 1 will reflect this revision.
44	Attachment L-8	C.2.4.4	Quality Assurance	L-8-23	Item number 1 says that the Contractor shall "Submit an updated QAP to DOE for review and approval prior to the commencement of D&D activities or whenever a significant change or addition to the QA program is made." However, the Deliverables Table (Attachment L-8, Section J-4 on page L-8-80) states that an updated QAP must be submitted for approval "90 days prior to the commencement of D&D activities." Please clarify when an updated QAP is to be submitted for approval.	L-8 C.2.4.4, Quality Assurance bullet 1 has been revised to state, "Submit an updated QAP plan to DOE for review and approval 90 days prior to the commencement of D&D activities or whenever a significant change or addition to the QA program is made." The Deliverables Table (Attachment L-8, Attachment J-4 on page L-8-80) has been revised to state "Updated Quality Assurance Program(QAP) Plan" in the Deliverable column and "90 days prior to the commencement of D&D activities, or whenever a significant change or addition to the QA program is made" in the Deliverable Due column. Amendment 1 will reflect this revision.
45	H.21	(a)	Diversity Program	H-19	H.21 states that the Diversity Plan is submitted to the CO for approval within 60 calendar days after the NTP. However, the Deliverables Table (Attachment L-8, Section J-4 on page L-8-84) says the Diversity Plan is due "within 30 days after NTP." Please clarify when the Diversity Plan is to be submitted for approval.	Section H.21 has been revised to be consistent with the 30 days listed in Attachment L-8.
46	Attachment L-8	Section J-4	Deliverables Table	L-8-85	For the Salary-Wage Increase Expenditure Report, the content of the Deliverable Due column of the Deliverables Table appears to be a duplicate of the content in the Reference column. Please provide the due date(s) for the Salary-Wage Increase Expenditure Report.	L-8 has been revised to correct the deliverable due dates column.
47	Attachment L-8	C.1.1	Task Order Implementation	L-8-16	Item 5.a states that the Workplace Substance Abuse Plan is due within 30 days after NTP. However, the Deliverables Table (Attachment L-8, Section J-4 on page L-8-80) states that the Workplace Substance Abuse Plan is due "Before the end of TO Implementation Period and when revised." Please clarify when the Workplace Substance Abuse Plan is to be submitted for approval.	L-8, Section J-4 on page L-8-85 Workplace Substance Abuse Plan deliverable due date has been revised to state, "Within 30 days after NTP and when revised."
48	Attachment L-8	C.1.1.1	Task Order Implementation	L-8-14	Please provide an effective start date that can be used to support transition planning and estimating.	For proposal purposes, Offerors are to assume an initial Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of 12/06/2023.
49	L	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security	L-8-28, 29	provides the Boeing hours of operations from 6:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily. What are the standard days and hours of operations for the EM work at the ETEC site? Are they on four ten-hour days? Alternate Friday work schedule (9 days with every other Friday off) or traditional 5 days a week schedule? Or is it up to the successful Offeror to determine the work schedule within the stated Boeing hours of operation?	The work schedule shall be determined by the Awardee and reviewed for concurrence by DOE within the stated Boeing hours of operation.
50	L	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security	L-8-28, 29	Will there be a site tour of the ETEC site and facilities/ systems or can Offerors request one?	A site tour will not be provided. Additional information has been added to the documents library to provide offerors with a more complete understanding of the work contained on Task Order 1.
51	H	H.4	Workforce Transition and Employee Hiring Preferences	H-1	In order to determine the level of Contract Human Resource Management staffing needed to manage the transition, can DOE provide the incumbent staffing level/number of incumbent employees?	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

52	L	L.11 Criterion 1	DOE-L-2010 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	L-19-L-20	If the Offeror is a qualifying joint venture (JV) set up in conjunction with an SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé Agreement/arrangement, is the Offeror permitted to submit up to three past performance projects for the small business protégé (majority in JV) and the large business mentor (minority in JV) or is it a total of three for the JV in its entirety?	Past Performance information shall be submitted for each member of the JV, as well as for each Teaming Subcontractor.
53	L	L-18	DOE-L-2021 GUIDANCE FOR PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS - IMPACT OF TEAMING ARRANGEMENTS ON SMALL BUSINESS STATUS (OCT 2015)	L-26	In the case if the Offeror is a qualifying joint venture (JV) set up in conjunction with an SBA approved Mentor Protégé Agreement/arrangement, is the Offeror permitted, pursuant to 13 C.F.R. § 121.103, to submit the DOE facility clearance of the small business that is the lead company in the JV, versus a new and separate facility clearance for the SBA-qualifying JV?	Joint Ventures must submit a FOCl package as its own entity, in addition to each JV member as a parent organization. The JV will be registered with its own facility code.
54	L	L.9-L.11	DOE-L-2005 EVALUATION FACTOR – KEY PERSONNEL (OCT 2015)	L-17 - L-23	The Factors are listed in reverse order (Factor 3, then 2, then 1), please confirm that DOE desires Offerors to address each criterion in the order listed in Section L, L-9-L.11 which is Factor 3-Key Personnel, then 2-Organization and Staffing Approach, then 1-Past Performance versus presenting them in numerical order.	Text describing the factors have been reordered in Sections L and M consistent with the order of importance listed in Section M.6. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors has not changed.
55	L	L-11	DOE-L-2010 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE	L-19 - L-23	The Volume II Factors are unclear. For example, within Section L.11 and L.11(a)(2) Past Performance is defined as all three Factors (Factor 1, Factor 2, and Factor 3) in various places. Please confirm all Volume II Factors, 1-3, and the order in which they should be presented in the Volume II proposal response.	Text describing the factors have been reordered in Sections L and M consistent with the order of importance listed in Section M.6. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors has not changed.
56	M	M.6	DOE-M-2011 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS	M-7	Due to unclarity regarding Volume II Factors, please confirm the relative importance of evaluation factors (Section M, M.6). Please confirm the evaluation order using factor names (not numbers). For example, is Key Personnel or Past Performance the highest evaluated factor?	M.6(a) states "Factor 1, Past Performance is considered greater in importance than Factor 2, Organization and Staffing Approach. Factor 2, Organization and Staffing Approach is considered greater in importance than Factor 3, Key Personnel." Additionally, the evaluation factor numbers have been re-ordered to sync with M.6.
57	L	L.6(b)	PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME I	L-7	states that "Offerors shall include the information listed in the following paragraphs in Volume I, assembled in the order listed." However, Sections L.6 (b)(1-4) are a listing of pages that require the Offeror to fill in (including pricing, key personnel, etc.). Within which sections of Volume I should these forms/completed sections be provided?	Volume I proposals are to be assembled in the order that data elements are listed throughout L.6.
58	L	L.6 (b)(4)(i)	PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME I		Section L, L.6 (b)(4)(i) specifies for the completed Attachment L-8.B.2(a), Table B-1 be provided in Volume I. However, this is a pricing table and it is also requested in Volume III. Does DOE want us to provide pricing information in both Volume I and Volume III or only in Volume III?	Table B-1 shall be provided in Vols I and III.
59	L	L.12	PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME III	L-24	The instructions in L.12 for Volume III – Price Proposal only specify that the following shall be submitted in Volume III – completed Section L, Attachment L-8 Table B-1, Limitations or Subcontracting clause compliance statement, Financial Capability information (financial statements, annual report) and accounting system documentation. The instructions do not reference any requirements to submit a basis of estimate. We understand that a basis of estimate is typically NOT required for fixed price bids; however, we want to confirm. Please clearly state that there is no requirement for a basis of estimate.	A Basis of Estimate is not required.
60	L	B.11	Limitation of Government's Obligation	L-8-6	Attachment L-8, B.11 Limitations of Government's Obligation, provides two tables (n) Planned Funding Schedule and (o) Actual Funding Schedule. Is the Offeror to complete the (n) Planned Funding Schedule and submit it in Volume III or will the funding be populated by DOE upon award?	Funding will be populated by DOE upon award.
61	L	C.1.1	Task Order Implementation	L-8-16	Attachment L-8, states that the Transition Plan is due within 15 days of NTP but the Section L-8, Attachment J-4 states that the Transition Plan is due within 7 days of NTP. Which is correct?	L-8 C.1.1.5(a) bullet 2 has been revised to state, "Within seven (7) days after NTP". Amendment 1 will reflect this revision.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

62	H	H.20	Per Section H.20 DOE-H-2045 Contractor Community Commitment (Oct 2014) (Revised)	H-18	"the Contractor shall submit to DOE an annual plan for community commitment activities and report on program progress semi-annually." Is it the DOE's intent for Contractors to submit a Community Commitment Plan for this IDIQ contract? A Community Commitment Plan is not listed as a required deliverable in Section J – Attachment J-4. Please clarify.	The requirement for a Community Commitment Plan is on a Task Order basis. Section H.20 has been updated for clarity and the plan has been added to the ETEC Task Order deliverables list. Amendment 1 will reflect these changes.
63	L	C.1.1	Task Order Implementation	L-8-14	Can we use a leased construction trailer to be located on site during Transition for our leased Transition office space? This will facilitate Transition activities compared to an office space offsite.	Yes, a leased construction trailer may be proposed for use during transition.
64	L		Attachment L-3 Past Performance Reference Information Form	L-3-1	On Attachment L-3 box #4, "4. Name and UEI # of Entity Reference Contract Was Awarded To: (if the Entity was made up of member companies, provide the applicable member company's name and DUNS # as well)", should the item in yellow highlight be UEI # rather than DUNS #?	Yes, item #4 on Attachment L-3 has been revised to state, "(if the Entity was made up of member companies, provide the applicable member company's name and UEI # as well)."
65	H	H.11	Responsible Corporate Official and Corporate Board of Directors	H-9	If the offeror is a joint venture, are all member organizations required to complete Attachment L-1 entitled, Performance Guarantee Agreement, pursuant to DOE-H-2017 Responsible Corporate Official and Corporate Board of Directors (Oct 2014) (Revised)	Per H.10, a Performance Guarantee Agreement is required from all member organizations in the case of a joint venture, LLC, or other similar entity.
66	Section L	Attachment L-3	Past Performance Reference Information Form	L-3-1	Can bidders submit a PPRIF for a project which has had continuous operations, on a contiguous DOE property, performed for the same DOE customer under separate contract numbers?	Text on the L-3 form addresses the situations in which a PPRIF may be submitted that reflects multiple contract or task order numbers. "If the reference contract is for the operation and/or demolition of a commercial facility, the L-3 form may be utilized to reflect the contract or binding agreement with one single client for the referenced services performed. If the reference contract is an IDIQ, BPA, or BOA, the L-3 form may be utilized to include the entirety of performance under the subject contract vehicle along with a single point of contact responsible for administration of the IDIQ, BPA, or BOA.)"
67	Section L	L.6.(b)	DOE-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume I – Offer and Other Documents (NOV 2016)– Alternate II, Alternate III, Alternate IV, and Alternate VI (OCT 2015)	L-8	This section states in part, "...Offerors shall include the information listed in the following paragraphs in Volume I, assembled in the order listed..." Please confirm that task fill-ins containing pricing, such as ETEC Task Order B.2, is to be included in Volume I as well as Volume III.	Table B-1 shall be provided in Volumes I and III.
68	Section L	L.6 (m) 2	DOE-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume I – Offer and Other Documents (NOV 2016)– Alternate II, Alternate III, Alternate IV, and Alternate VI (OCT 2015); Instructions Regarding Non-Public Government Information/Source Selection Information	L-12	This section is numbered i, ii, and iv. Please provide the requirements for item iii, or confirm that no requirement exists.	L.6(m)(2) item (iv) should be (iii). Section L has been amended to reflect this revision.
69	Section L	L.11	L.11 DOE-L-2010 Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II – Past Performance (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	L-19	Please confirm the correct factor numbers for sections in Volume II. Page L-19 states Factor 1 is Past Performance, but Page L-20, first paragraph, identifies it as Factor 3 and Page L-20, Section L.11.a.2 identifies it as Factor 2.	Text describing the factors have been reordered in Sections L and M consistent with the order of importance listed in Section M.6. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors has not changed.
70	Section L	L.6 (h)	Facility Clearance	L-10	If an entity already has a Facility Clearance, does it need to submit "the date the Offeror's, JV/LLC member(s)', and Teaming Subcontractor's completed Standard Form 328 was submitted" and/or "the date of the Contracting Officer's affirmative FOCI determination"?	Yes: if an entity already has a Facility Clearance, it should have received a letter from the office that issued its FOCI determination notifying them of approval that includes this information. Such information may be provided in Volume I, if available.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

71	Section L	L.8 (d)	Teaming Subcontractors	L-17	Section L.8(h) states "If an Offeror's approach includes the use of Teaming Subcontractors, then the Offeror's proposal submission, including Volumes II and III, shall include "Teaming Subcontractors" as defined in DOE-L-2001, Proposal Preparation Instructions – General, Section (a)(2)." Please clarify what is meant by this.	This reference serves as a reminder that Teaming Subcontractors will be evaluated consistent with the terms of the solicitation.
72	Section L	L.11 (i)	List of DOE contracts	L-22 & L-23	Section L11(i) states both "The Offeror, to include all members of a teaming arrangement...shall provide a listing...of all DOE prime contracts...currently being performed and/or for contracts with a period of performance end date within the last five (5) years from the original solicitation" and "This list shall only include DOE prime contracts performed by the proposing entity and any affiliate companies for which an L-3 form is submitted ..." Please clarify if this list is to include all DOE prime contracts within the last five years or only those being submitted on form L-3?	All DOE prime contracts within the last five years should be listed, for any teaming member or subcontractor who qualifies to submit an L-3.
73	Section L	L.11 (a)	Contract Information	L- 20	Section L11 (a) states "the offeror shall only provide past performance information for contracts that are currently being performed or have a period of performance end date with the last five (5) years from the original solicitation issuance date." Given this is a project with an anticipated 10 year period of performance, would DOE consider expanding the prior years to within "10 years" to allow offerors to reflect projects that maybe more appropriately aligned in terms of scope an size with a contract that is reflective of POP of 10 years?	Past Performance information will not be expanded beyond contracts that are "currently being performed or have a period of performance end date with the last five (5) years from the original solicitation issuance date" as stated in L.11(i).
74	Section L	Attachment L-8	Task Order 1 EM – ETEC Site	L-8-1	Please provide historical staffing levels and corresponding salary ranges for incumbent employees for the existing ETEC project, as have been provided for other DOE EMCBC procurements of this nature. Since DOE has mandated hiring of incumbent personnel, this information will allow bidders to construct reasonable proposals.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
75	IDIQ RFP	H.33	Key Personnel		We request that the language regarding Contract fee reductions for Key Personnel be modified to align to the Nationwide DD&R language which states "Any key person change according to the definition for "Changes to Key Personnel" above shall be subject to reduction of fee as specified within individual Task Orders."	The fee reductions listed in Section H under Contract Fee Reductions for Changes to Key Personnel have been reduced to \$50,000 for the program manager, and \$25,000 for other key personnel.
76	Section L.9(c)		Key Personnel - Letter of Commitment		Since key personnel are only proposed for the ETEC task order, and we may have different key personnel for future task orders under this contract, we ask that the letter of commitment be modified as follows: change "I also hereby certify that I will be assigned full-time to the contract..." to "I also hereby certify that I will be assigned full-time to the task order..."	DOE-L-2005 Evaluation Factor - Key Personnel, paragraph (c), has been revised to state "I also hereby certify that I will be assigned full-time to the task order..." Amendment 1 will reflect this change.
77	Section L.9(a)		Key Personnel - Positions		Due to the unique requirements managing and implementing ES&H and Quality requirements on DOE projects, we request that offerors be allowed to submit two resumes to fulfill these functions - one for ES&H and one for QA.	Section M.2 has been revised to require only the Program Manager as Key Personnel. No additional key personnel may be submitted.
78	Section L.9(a)(2)		Key Personnel - availability		Since key personnel are only proposed for the ETEC task order, and we may have different key personnel for future task orders under this contract, we ask that this section be modified as follows: change "The Offeror shall confirm the availability of the key personnel as being full-time assigned to the contract..." to "The Offeror shall confirm the availability of the key personnel as being assigned full-time to the task order..."	DOE-L-2005 Evaluation Factor - Key Personnel, paragraph (a)(2), has been revised to state "The Offeror shall confirm the availability of the key personnel as being assigned full-time to the task order..." Amendment 1 will reflect this change.
79	Section L.5(a)(2)		Teaming Subcontractor		Since the award is not only for the first task order, but for the full IDIQ, we request that the definition of "Teaming Subcontractor" be modified to be "any subcontractor that will perform work on future task orders and that the prime Offeror considers necessary to enhance its team's ability to meet delivery requirements within the Master IDIQ Performance Work Statement."	The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

80	Section L.11		Past Performance		Since the award is not only for the first task order, but for the full IDIQ, we request that offerors be allowed to submit past performance that demonstrates the ability to deliver all aspects of the IDIQ performance work statement, and not just specifically the ETEC Task Order.	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
81	Attachment L-8	B.2, Table B-1	Task Order CLIN Structure		We understand that there is an incumbent contractor currently performing work at this site. To ensure a fair competition, since many of the incumbent personnel are supporting the program support services, we request that DOE provide information on current staffing, e.g., number of personnel, labor categories, and average salaries for the positions.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
82	Attachment L-8	B.2, Table B-1	Task Order CLIN Structure		We understand that DOE intends to negotiate CLINs 01002, 01003, 02002, and 02003 after award, and the dollars allocated in the table are not-to-exceed dollars. Offerors will have different indirect rate structures from the incumbent, so to facilitate a smoother negotiation after award, it would be beneficial for Offerors to know the current number of personnel, labor categories, and average salaries for the labor categories that are associated with each CLIN.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
83	Section L.10 and Section M.3		Organization and Staffing Approach		This section requires Offerors to identify their approach for ensuring an adequate workforce is available with the appropriate skills and qualifications. Since there is an incumbent at the site, to provide fair competition, it would be beneficial for offerors to know the makeup of the current workforce, e.g., number of personnel and the labor categories.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
84	Section M.4		Past Performance		This section requires past performance to be have a period of performance end date within the last five (5) years and that more recent past performance may be given greater consideration. Given the requirement to demonstrate relevance to the ETEC Task Order specifically, and due to the uniqueness of the ETEC site, we ask that the performance period be extended to at least seven (7) years, and that all projects, regardless of recency, be evaluated equally as long as they meet the period of performance.	Past Performance information will not be expanded beyond contracts that are "currently being performed or have a period of performance end date with the last five (5) years from the original solicitation issuance date" as stated in L.11(i).
85	Section L.11 and Section M.4		Teaming Subcontractor Past Performance		Since the award is not only for the first task order, but for the full IDIQ, we request that the "Teaming Subcontractor" past performance be allowed to be submitted for any teaming subcontractor that will perform work on future task orders and that the prime Offeror considers necessary to enhance its team's ability to meet delivery requirements within the IDIQ Performance Work Statement.	The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
86	Section H.5		Employee Compensation Pay and Benefits		Are any of the incumbent personnel on an existing DOE Pension and Benefit Plan? If so, we request information on the number of employees who are on this plan.	No, incumbent Contractor personnel are not on an existing DOE Pension and Benefit Plan.
87	Section H.6		Labor Relations		Does the current project have a collective bargaining agreement in place? If so, please provide a copy.	No, the current project(s) do not have a collective bargaining agreement in place.
88	Section L-8	Section J- Attachment J-3	Wage Determination		Please provide any applicable Service Contract Labor Standards and Construction Wage Rate Requirements applicable to the ETEC Task Order.	L-8 Task Order #1 ETEC, Attachment J-3 Wage Determination has been included in Amendment 1.
89	Attachment L-8	C.2	Self-Assessment Quarterly Report	L-8-18	We respectfully request that the dates for this report be modified to reflect the first report being due after the offeror has completed one full quarter of performance post-transition in order to have enough performance to assess.	Dates established for this report are consistent with government fiscal year quarters. Proposed content should reflect the period of performance up to that date regardless of quantity of substance.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

90	Attachment L-8	C.2.4.4	Quality Assurance	L-8-23	The RFP states that the contractor will need to develop and implement a training program related to site operations and activities. Is there site specific training that is provided by Boeing or another entity for overall site access?	Currently, site specific training is identified in the Annual Site Environmental Report (ASER), Section 4.3, Environmental Training. Additional Health and Safety (G. 12 of the Agreement), and site security (Exhibit B of the Agreement) training is identified in the Access Agreement, located in the Documents Library at the Acquisition Home Page.
91	Attachment L-8	C.2.4.8(14)	NQA-1	L-8-27	In the Records section there's a reference to ensuring quality records under NQA-1 are managed to meet the requirements of the approved standard. However, there's no reference in Section C.2.4.4 that this contract needs to comply with NQA-1. Please clarify if NQA-1 is required on this task order.	Yes, NQA-1 is required on this task order. As stated in L.8, C.2.4.8 (14). Additionally, Section J, Attachment J-2, Table J-2.1 listed DOE O 414.1D Chg. 2 (LtdChg) which references American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), NQA-1-2008 with the NQA-1a-2009 addenda, <i>Quality Assurance Requirements for Nuclear Facility</i> and ASME, NQA-1-2000, <i>Quality Assurance Requirements for Nuclear Facility Applications</i> .
92	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	Badges	L-8-28	This section references coordinating with Boeing for "site access badges" and also refers to DOE-issued security badges. Does this mean that all employees will require two separate badges?	Yes: employees will require both Boeing and DOE-issued badges.
93	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	Badges	L-8-28	What DOE office issues the "DOE-issued security badges"?	The Office of Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center (EMCBC) issues the DOE-issued security badges.
94	Section C	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security		As S&S is typically defined on a site by site basis, with sites typically having multiple contractors with divided responsibilities, we request that the details of S&S requirements be pushed down to a task order level. This applies to the entirety of C.2.5	In the Master Contract, Section C.2.5 requires the Contractor to plan and implement S&S programs in accordance with Department of Energy (DOE) directives, and site-specific S&S Security Plans and procedures. The requirements in Attachment L-8 provide additional information regarding compliance with site access, and conducting work in accordance with SSFL site security procedures.
95	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security	L-8-28	The RFP states that "this section provides additional requirements to Section C.2.5 of the Master IDIQ Contract." Please clarify if Security Programs for this task order are independent of Boeing's site security programs, or if the program will need to comply with Boeing's programs in addition to DOE requirements.	The security program will need to comply with Boeing programs and DOE requirements. Access is controlled through one gate with Boeing security presence and all contractor personnel adhere to local site security requirements and procedures per L.8, Section C.2.5.
96	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security	L-8-28	The RFP states that "this section provides additional requirements to Section C.2.5 of the Master IDIQ Contract." The Master IDIQ refers to Protective Force (ProForce) Operations (pg. C-11). Please clarify if ProForce is required on this task order as the task order references Boeing's security personnel being responsible for the entrance/exit gate.	ProForce is not required for the ETEC Task Order. The requirements in Attachment L-8 provide additional information regarding compliance with site access, and conducting work in accordance with SSFL site security procedures.
97	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	Safeguards and Security	L-8-28	The RFP states that "this section provides additional requirements to Section C.2.5 of the Master IDIQ Contract." The Master IDIQ refers to Physical Protection (pg. C-11). Since this is a shared site with Boeing, it appears that Boeing will be providing Physical Protection services that we would need to comply with. Please clarify if a Physical Protection Plan would be only under DOE requirements or would also need to comply with any Physical Protection requirements in place under Boeing.	In the Master Contract, Section C.2.5 requires the Contractor to plan and implement S&S programs in accordance with Department of Energy (DOE) directives, and site-specific S&S Security Plans and procedures. The requirements in Attachment L-8 provide additional information regarding compliance with site access, and conducting work in accordance with SSFL site security procedures.
98	Section C	C.2.8(1)	Telecommunications	C-14	In order to level the playing field for all offerors, please provide site procedures and policies regarding activities involving Communications Security, protected distribution systems, and TEMPEST/Transmission Security programs of Telecommunications Security.	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
99	Section C	C.2.7(2)	Telecommunications	C-14	Please clarify what is meant by "provide telecommunication capability". (a) Does this include providing phones, computers, and radios? And if so, is this considered Government Owned equipment per RFP Section H.42(a) states that DOE provides "Government Owned facilities, property, and other needed resources."	This requirement addresses IT capabilities that realize telephone, mobile phone, and video as part of a capability system to gather, record, send, and receive data securely. This shall include applications, procured services, infrastructure, information utilization, telecommunications, and IT management.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

100	Attachment L-8	C.2.9(2)	Cultural Resources	L-8-31	Who is the owner of the "cultural resources protection strategy" referenced in item 2?	The Cultural Resource Protection Strategy is not a deliverable. This strategy is referred to in L-8, Sections C.2.9 Cultural Resources and C.2.12. National Environmental Policy Act Support regarding the cultural resource support. Section C.2.9., number 9 – "the Contractor shall assist DOE in organizing and facilitating separate teleconferences and onsite meetings as needed" and Section C.2.12., number 6 – "the support may include assisting DOE in consulting with tribes concerning land use, treaty, or cultural issues."
101	Attachment L-8	general	RMHF Storage Tanks		Were the underground storage tanks associated with Building 4021 in the RMHF removed with the above ground structures or are they still present?	The "underground storage tanks" associated with Building 4021 as referenced in the question are listed as below-grade vaults with Building 4022, refer to L-8, Section J, Attachment J-7 and are still present.
102	H.26		Designation and Consent of Teaming Subcontracts		Given that we are only allowed to include teaming subcontractors related to the ETEC Task Order, we request that this clause be modified to be task order specific and not at the IDIQ level, or modify Sections L and M to allow inclusion of other teaming subcontractors anticipated for future task orders.	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
103	RFP	All Sections			This RFP is structured that technical/management and pricing are only required for the first task order. However, the development and implementation of many of the programs required in this first task order will be required for future task orders. Would DOE consider awarding all bidders a task that would allow them to build the programs and obtain DOE approval? This should accelerate the schedule for future task orders, as the programs would only need to be updated for specific task orders. This is a similar approach that was used on the DOE OREM CDDR IDIQ.	-Additional Task Orders will not be issued for the question's stated purpose at time of IDIQ contract award.
104	RFP	General			In order to conduct a fair evaluation for all bidders that receive an IDIQ award, we respectfully request that a task order is issued that provides funding for IDIQ awardees to develop Tier 1 program plans for DOE approval. This will eliminate those costs being flowed into individual task orders. This is a similar approach that was used on the DOE OREM CDDR IDIQ.	Additional Task Orders will not be issued for the question's stated purpose at time of IDIQ contract award.
105	Attachment L-8	Section M			In the pre-solicitation notice dated November 22, 2022, DOE indicated that DOE would evaluate the Offeror and members of a teaming arrangement in accordance with the work each entity is proposed to perform under the work scope described in the Master IDIQ PWS. However, the final RFP changed this language to be specific only to the ETEC task order. Considering that DOE anticipates that multiple awards will be made for the IDIQ while only one will be made for ETEC, we respectfully request that the team's ability to respond to the Master IDIQ PWS be evaluated - not only the ETEC PWS.	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
106	Attachment L-8	Section C.3.1.1.	General Environmental Monitoring	L-8-38	Multiple items in this section reference air monitoring requirements. In order to avoid duplicate scope and potential conflicting information, we request that all air monitoring activities be referenced only in Section C.3.2, Air Monitoring.	Section C.3.1.1 will not be modified at this time.
107	Attachment L-8		Key Personnel		Can you please provide minimum qualification requirements for the project manager? Degree or advanced degree required? Minimum years of relevant experience?	There are no minimum qualification requirements for the Program Manager position. The individuals proposed will be evaluated on the degree to which they are qualified and suitable for the proposed position in relation to the work for which they are proposed to perform and areas of responsibility.
108	Attachment L-8		Key Personnel		Can you please provide the minimum qualification requirements for the regulatory affairs position? Degree or advanced degree required? Minimum years of relevant experience?	Section M.2 has been revised to reflect that only a Program Manager is required as a Key Personnel on this contract. No other Key Personnel shall be proposed.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

109	Attachment L-8		Key Personnel		Can you please provide the minimum requirements for the ESH/Q position? Degree or advanced degree required? Minimum years of relevant experience?	Section M.2 has been revised to reflect that only a Program Manager is required as a Key Personnel on this contract. No other Key Personnel shall be proposed.
110	Attachment L-8	General	General		We respectfully request a site visit to ETEC to allow all offerors to better understand the site, the scope, and the interaction between site contractors/regulators.	A site tour will not be provided. Additional information has been added to the documents library to provide offerors with a more complete understanding of the work contained on Task Order 1.
111	General	General	General		Considering that a Draft RFP was not issued for industry review and offerors had no notice of the location/scope for the seed task for which there is an incumbent contractor, nor a listing of Key personnel prior to the Final RFP, we respectfully request a 2 week extension in order to provide DOE with proposals that address all RFP requirements and ensure a fair evaluation.	The proposal due date has been extended by two weeks. Proposals are due July 10, 2023.
112	Attachment L-8	Section B.2	Type of Task Order	L-8-5	Please clarify that the negotiations for CLINS 01002, 01003, 02002, and 02003 will be negotiated not only for contract type but also on price.	CLINS labeled "To Be Negotiated" will be negotiated for both cost and contract type.
113	Attachment L-3			L-3-2	We request that Item 14 "Approximate Average Annual Value the Company in planned to perform on Task Order" be removed from this task order as DOE is providing a plug number for many of the services on the ETEC task order.	Item 14 will not be removed at this time.
114	Attachment L-3			L-3-2	In order to evaluate team capabilities to provide services under the Master IDIQ PWS, please revise item #15 to Scope proposed to perform on Master IDIQ. This will allow DOE to be able to assess whether Teams can fully respond to future task orders and not only the seed task.	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
115	Attachment L-3			L-3-2	Item 15 requests that offerors provide the proposed PWS elements that a company is proposed to perform. Item 16 asks about the scope that company performed on the reference contract. If a reference contract only has a portion of the scope that the company is proposed to perform, will it be graded lower than if one contract demonstrates every PWS element?	DOE's evaluation of the relevancy of past performance information will consider how similar the information is with respect to scope, size, and complexity to the portion of the ETEC Task Order that the given entity is proposed to perform.
116	Attachment L-3			L-3-3	Per 29 CFR 1904 (OSHA Recordkeeping), injury logs and other required documentation are required by February for the previous calendar year (CY). Is it acceptable to provide that data vs. converting it to a government fiscal year (GFY)?	Yes.
117	Section L & Section M	L.5(d)(2)	Evaluation of proposals	L-4	This section references that proposals submitted in response to this solicitation will be evaluated for the purposes of awarding the ETEC Task Order as well as prospective IDIQ contracts. However, Section M does not reference the evaluation process for an IDIQ award. Please clarify how proposals will be evaluated for an IDIQ award.	Section M.7, Basis for Award, states in pertinent part: Award of the Master IDIQ: The Government intends to award multiple Master IDIQ contract(s) to Offerors with the most highly rated Technical and Management Proposals (Volume II) at a fair and reasonable price, allowing for efficient competition and award of future task orders. The evaluation factors for the Technical and Management Proposal will be adjectivally rated. The Price evaluation factor will not be rated, however the evaluated price will be evaluated for price reasonableness. The Government will not award a contract at an unreasonably high price. Award of ETEC Task Order: The Government intends to award one (1) ETEC Task Order to the Offeror with the most highly rated Technical and Management Proposal (Volume II) at a fair and reasonable price. (End of Solicitation)

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

118	Section H	H.26	Teaming Subcontractors	H-21	Considering that Teaming Subcontractors are identified at the IDIQ level and cannot be changed for future task orders, we request that all companies an Offeror views as a Teaming Subcontractor be allowed to provide Past Performance that correlates to the Master IDIQ PWS. Limiting Past Performance solely to the ETEC task order eliminates DOE's ability to evaluate all aspects of the Master IDIQ PWS, for example, Item C.2.3.1, Project Integration and Control and Earned Value Management and C.2.6 Nuclear Material Control and Accountability (NMC&A) which are not ETEC task order requirements.	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
119	Section M.6		Importance of Evaluation Factors	M-7	Considering that DOE is placing Past Performance as the Factor of greatest importance for evaluation, would DOE allow for a matrix of IDIQ PWS capabilities by company to demonstrate full coverage of the IDIQ PWS?	The first Task Order in support of ETEC is considered by DOE to be a representative sample of the type of work on future Task Orders. The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government's evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
120	Section M.2			M-3	This section outlines that DOE will evaluate the (a) confirmation of key personnel being assigned to the contract full time and permanent duty station located in the local ETEC area and (b) resumes. As the items above are covered in the resumes and letters of commitment (which are excluded from page count), please provide direction on what is required to be addressed in these five pages.	The reference to the five page limit in Section L.9 has been removed, as the Resumes and Letters of Commitment contain the entirety of the information required for the Key Personnel evaluation factor.
121	Attachment L-3			L-3-2	In order to evaluate prime offeror capabilities to successfully lead and manage lower tier specialty subcontractors, we request that item #15 language be changed to "is proposed to perform or manage"	No change has been made to attachment L-3.
122	H.10		Performance Guarantee	H-9	Is the Performance Guarantee applicable to subcontractors?	No.
123	G.5-G.6	(a)	Invoicing	G-2-G-3	Are invoices required to be notarized?	Invoices are not required to be notarized.
124	G.6	(d)(1)(k)	Cost-reimbursement task order invoicing	G-4	Is there a pre-existing Microsoft Excel template for providing the detailed invoice transaction data? Could the government please provide an example of what would constitute "sufficient data fields and detail" in the detailed transaction accounting format?	There is no standard template for invoicing. The Contractor shall comply with clauses G.5 - G.7 which provides instructions on billing and invoicing.
125	H.4	(a)	Hiring incumbent employees	H-2	H.4(a) discusses the preferential hiring of incumbent employees. Is there a listing of potential incumbent employees with titles and current pay scale that the government could make available to bidders to support price proposal preparation?	Additional historical data on incumbent contracts has been made available in the Documents Library.
126	H.33	(c)(1), (c)(2)	DOE-H-2070 Key Personnel	H-28	Subparagraph (c)(1), "Contract fee reductions for changes to Key Personnel," shows a reduction in fee of \$500,000 if the Program Manager is removed, replaced, or diverted within three years of being placed in that position. Additionally, subparagraph (c)(2) indicates that any time a key person other than the Program Manager is removed, replaced, or diverted within three years of being placed in that position, the earned fee will be reduced by \$250,000. For each task order, this amount seems to be somewhat punitive and considerably high for a small business who may possibly not earn that amount of fee on a given task order. Would DOE consider lowering these fees to \$50,000 for Program Manager and \$25,000 for other key personnel?	The fee reductions listed in Section H under Contract Fee Reductions for Changes to Key Personnel have been reduced to \$50,000 for the program manager, and \$25,000 for other key personnel.
127	L.5	(c)(2)	Date/time proposals due	L-2	Would the DOE consider extending the deadline for proposals by one month?	The proposal due date has been extended by two weeks. Proposals are due July 10, 2023.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

128	L.6	(b)(1) and (b)(4)	Section B.2 Table B-1	L-8	Section B of the ETEC Task Order, which includes Table B-1, is requested in paragraph (1). Paragraph (4) also requests this same Table B-1. Is it the government's wish that the same table be replicated in both places, or is there a difference between the two requirements?	Section L - L.6(b) has been revised Amendment 1 reflects these revisions.
129	L.8	N/A	Team introduction/executive summary in Volume II	L-16	Would the DOE consider allowing a brief allotment of approximately two pages for bidders to introduce their teams in an executive summary?	No additional page count will be added to those page limits listed in Section L.
130	Attachment L-8	C.2.5	ETEC Task Order safeguards and security	L-8-28	The third bullet indicates that all contractor personnel are required to have or obtain a DOE "L" level security clearance. i. What is the timing for obtaining a DOE "L" clearance? ii. Is there a possibility that while DOE is processing security clearances that escorts be provided to escort uncleared personnel? iii. Will DOE pay for the costs for escorts, if approved?	The security clearance process takes an average of three to four months to complete but can take up to a full year to complete depending on the employee's background. The DOE, upon award, will determine the need for escorts for uncleared personnel. The DOE will cover costs for escorts.
131	M.4	(d)	Capability of covering all PWS requirements	M-6	Subparagraph (d) states that in evaluating past performance, "The resulting rating may consider whether the Offeror's team as a whole (including Teaming Subcontractors) have demonstrated relevancy to all PWS requirements." Is this statement intended to mean that the more PWS areas a bidder's team is capable of covering, the higher the rating for this evaluation factor would be? If a bidder's team were only capable of covering a portion of the PWS requirements in the Master ID/IQ PWS, but addressed how it would meet capability gaps with subcontracting, would that bidder still be eligible for award of a base ID/IQ contract? If a bidder's team were only capable of covering a portion of the PWS requirements in the ETEC Task Order, would that bidder still be eligible for award of a base ID/IQ contract?	DOE-M-2012 states in pertinent part "The Government intends to award multiple Master IDIQ contract(s) to Offerors with the most highly rated Technical and Management Proposals (Volume II) at a fair and reasonable price, allowing for efficient competition and award of future task orders. The evaluation factors for the Technical and Management Proposal will be adjectivally rated." Therefore, the basis for deciding which Offerors are awarded an IDIQ contract will consider (in part) DOE's evaluation of their Volume II proposals as a whole, not just the Past Performance evaluation factor. The cited sentence from M.4(d) means that DOE's evaluation and resulting adjectival rating of an Offeror under the Past Performance evaluation factor may consider whether their Offeror team as a whole has past performance contracts that demonstrate relevancy to all ETEC Task Order PWS requirements. This evaluation will consider past performance information of Teaming Subcontractors included in the Offeror's proposal. If an Offeror's team has demonstrated relevancy to only a portion of ETEC Task Order PWS requirements, the Offeror's resulting adjectival rating may consider such.
132	M.4	(d)		M-6	Will the past performance be assessed based on individual scopes for task performance or based on the overall project performance?	Per DOE-M-2008 Evaluation Factor - Past Performance, paragraph (d) "Work to be performed. DOE will evaluate the Offeror and all members of a teaming arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1) and any Teaming Subcontractors, in accordance with the work each entity is proposed to perform to cover the work scope described in the ETEC PWS. Each reference contract will be evaluated for relevancy in terms of size, scope, and complexity. The resulting rating may consider whether the Offeror's team as a whole (including Teaming Subcontractors) have demonstrated relevancy to all PWS requirements."
133	Cover Letter	N/A	EMCBC-00416-23_SB Nationwide DDR Final RFP Cover Letter	1	In order to address all requirements of the RFP, including KP requirements that are not yet identified, please consider a 14 day extension to the due date.	The proposal due date has been extended by two weeks. Proposals are due July 10, 2023.
134	Cover Letter	N/A	EMCBC-00416-23_SB Nationwide DDR Final RFP Cover Letter	1	Will DOE organize a site walk so that bidders are given an opportunity to view the ETEC site and ask questions in order to adequately address the Task Order?	A site tour will not be provided. Additional information has been added to the documents library to provide offerors with a more complete understanding of the work contained on Task Order 1.
135	Attachment L-8	N/A	Task Order #1 ETEC	N/A	Considering the intent of the RFP is an IDIQ contract that includes more than the ETEC site, will DOE include additional example task orders other than ETEC? As the RFP is currently written, this does not allow for teams to demonstrate capabilities that may be applicable and required for performance of work at sites other than ETEC.	No additional example Task Orders will be provided.

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
Q&A Response 001

136	Section M	M.4	Evaluation Factors for Award, M.4 DOE-M2008 Evaluation Factor - Past Performance (OCT 2015)	M-5	The RFP currently lists the past performance evaluation period as five (5) years. Will DOE extend the past performance evaluation period so that bidders can demonstrate capabilities by highlighting experience that is relevant, beneficial for DOE, and still considerably recent?	Past Performance information will not be expanded beyond contracts that are "currently being performed or have a period of performance end date with the last five (5) years from the original solicitation issuance date" as stated in L.11(i).
137	Evaluation Factors for	M.2(a)	DOE-M-2003 Evaluation Factor	M-3	Due to the size a complexity of this contract, can the offeror propose an ESH Manager and QA Manager? Although the RFP lists this as one position, we would like to propose these functions being addressed as two positions with 2 different personnel. Can this position be proposed as two people and still meet the proposal evaluation criteria?	Section M.2 has been revised to reflect that only a Program Manager is required as a Key Personnel on this contract. No other Key Personnel should be proposed.
138	SF33	Section A, Block 9	proposal submission date	1	Will EMCBC consider an extension to the due date? With the requirement of references, past performance and other requirements, the offeror requests an extension of three (3) weeks to submit the response.	The proposal due date has been extended by two weeks. Proposals are due July 10, 2023.
139	C.1, B2	C.1, Table B-1	Performance Work Statement, Section B - Supplies or Services and Prices/Costs	C-4, L-8-5	Will relocation and COL costs for key personnel be an allowed cost in transition pricing? The cost of living in the LA area is substantially higher than in any other area of the country with the requirement for key personnel to be 100% dedicated.	Contract transition should be proposed as a Firm Fixed Price. Detailed cost proposals are not requested as a part of the Volume III submittal.
140	L	Attachment L-8, C.2 and C.2.5	Program Support Services (C.2),and Safeguards and Security (C.2.5)	L-8-28, L-8-29	Is there need for the contractor to provide additional ETEC task order safeguards and security (S&S) capabilities such as the following: 1) Alternate Derivative Classifiers (ADCs) to support or perform classification reviews, 2) Implementation of DOE OPSEC and computer/cyber security requirements, 3) S&S plans and procedures development, 4) S&S Management assessments, and 5) Resource support to DOE O 150.1B and PDD-40 implementation under Section C.2.8 for Emergency response and COOP/COG functions?	In the Master Contract, Section C.2.5 requires the Contractor to plan and implement S&S programs in accordance with Department of Energy (DOE) directives, and site-specific S&S Security Plans and procedures. The requirements in Attachment L-8 provide additional information regarding compliance with site access, and conducting work in accordance with SSFL site security procedures.
141	L	Attachment L-8, C.2 and C.2.5	Program Support Services (C.2),and Safeguards and Security (C.2.5)	L-8-28, L-8-29	Is the contractor's Facility Security Officer (FSO) responsibilities limited to the DD&R activities within the ETEC site boundary?	The Officially Designated Federal Security Authority (ODFSA) is responsible for approving S&S plans and procedures, and will determine the level of S&S required for work at ETEC.
142	L	Attachment L-8, C.2 and C.2.5	Program Support Services (C.2),and Safeguards and Security (C.2.5)	L-8-28, L-8-29	Is there a publicly available version of the ETEC safeguards and security plan that provides conditions for granting personnel access to the ETEC site and the level of S&S required for conducting work at the site?	For site access requirements refer to the Acquisition website Documents Library, Access Agreement. The Officially Designated Federal Security Authority (ODFSA) is responsible for approving S&S plans and procedures, and will determine the level of S&S required for work at ETEC.
143	L	Attachment L-8 SECTION J - ATTACHMENT J-7	Listing of Facilities for D&D scope	L-8-88 L-8-89 L-8-90	May we have access to the report(s) for each building or set of buildings that details the current radiological conditions for buildings/slabs listed in SECTION J - ATTACHMENT J-7?	Information may be found within the Final SSFL Area IV EIS - Volume 1 (Chapters 1 - 14). Chapter 3, Affected Environment, includes information including radiological conditions for building and/or slabs. The link to the public website is http://www.ssflareaiveis.com/final_documentation.aspx
144	L	L.11 DOE-L-2010 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	(h) Past Performance Questionnaire	L-22	If a past performance has no CPAR and a PPQ must be submitted, can a previously obtained PPQ be used and submitted with the proposal or should a new one be obtained and e-mailed directly to the Contracting Officer?	A new PPQ should be submitted for the subject procurement. L.11(h) states, "The Offeror shall request that clients return the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to DOE by electronic means to the address identified below no later than the date for receipt of proposals."
145	L	Sections L.9 and L.11	Past Performance and Key Personnel Factors	L-17, L-19 and L-20	Key Personnel is listed as Factor 3 but listed first. Past Performance is also listed as both Factor 1 and Factor 3. What is the correct order to place the Factors in?	Text describing the factors have been reordered in Sections L and M consistent with the order of importance listed in Section M.6. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors has not changed.
146	L	L.11 DOE-L-2010 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	(a) Contracts Information	L-20	For Past Performance we request a seven year time-frame vs. five years. *There have been few similar projects for small businesses with this size, scope and complexity in the last five years, either as direct small business set-asides for DOE and/or task orders issued by large business contract holders (i.e., more self-performance vs. subcontracting). There was also a substantial slow down (i.e., during 2020 and 2021) of work being able to be performed due to Covid.	Past Performance information will not be expanded beyond contracts that are "currently being performed or have a period of performance end date with the last five (5) years from the original solicitation issuance date" as stated in L.11(i).

SMALL BUSINESS NATIONWIDE DD&R– FINAL RFP
 SOLICITATION NO. 89303322REM000112
 Q&A Response 001

147	General	L.5 DOE-L-2001 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS – GENERAL	(e) Proposal volumes and page limitations, (f) Proposal specifications, (4) Print type	L-6	Would the Government consider the allowance of a smaller font size or an increase in the page limit (i.e., for Factor 2 from 15 to 20 pages) in order to suitably address all of the requirements?	No change will be made to the font size or page limit.
148	General		Due Date		Would the Government consider a two week extension to the due date?	The proposal due date has been extended by two weeks. Proposals are due July 10, 2023.
149	Section L	5(a)(2)	DOE-L-2001 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS – GENERAL (OCT 2015) ALTERNATE II (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	L-3	Given that this contract is an IDIQ with the intended use on a multitude of task orders of varying complexity and required experience at sites across the DOE complex, the definition of “Teaming Subcontractor” that limits subcontractors to just the ETEC Task Order appears to limit competition and does not provide the government with the full depth and breadth of small business teams capable to support the government on any anticipated future task orders. Would the government consider revising the definition of teaming subcontractor to include those subcontractors that are part of a small business’ team that bring niche or specialty capabilities to the team but may not perform work in the delivery of the ETEC task order?	The definition of Teaming Subcontractor in Section L has been revised. Offerors are free to include Teaming Subcontractors with experience for PWS requirements not otherwise included in the ETEC Task Order. DOE anticipates such information would be considered neutral in the Government’s evaluation if the entity has no record of relevant past performance information. Further, DOE-H-2058 does allow for new or replacement Teaming Subcontractors, subject to Contracting Officer approval.
150	Section L		11 DOE-L-2010 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	L-19	Would the government consider allowing submission of non-teaming subcontractors past performance given that this contract is an IDIQ with the intended use on a multitude of task orders of varying complexity and required experience at sites across the DOE complex. This would allow small business teams to demonstrate for evaluation the full depth and breadth of their teams to meet the ETEC and any anticipated future task orders.	Per L.8(d), "The Offeror shall not include the name(s) of any other specific subcontractor(s) (i.e., any non-Teaming Subcontractor(s)) within Volumes II and III."
151	Section L		11 DOE-L-2010 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, VOLUME II – PAST PERFORMANCE (OCT 2015) (REVISED)	L-20	The period of performance is limited to the past 5 years and also requires relevancy to the ETEC task order. COVID-19 has affected the award and performance of contracts for many businesses that do business with the federal government by delaying execution of work. Would the government consider revising the past performance to be within the past 7 years to account for the impacts from the pandemic?	Past Performance information will not be expanded beyond contracts that are "currently being performed or have a period of performance end date with the last five (5) years from the original solicitation issuance date" as stated in L.11(i).