

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
DACA87-99-R-0009
OE RESPONSE AT FORT MCCLELLAN, ALABAMA

32. Question: Does the offeror need to demonstrate in the field test all detection technologies that are presented in the Orals as part of their “tool box”? It is likely that one or more of the technologies an offeror may possess may not be viable for the test plot, but could be incorporated into other locations on Ft. McClellan.

Answer: No, the offeror is not required to demonstrate all the detection technologies included in his “tool box” only the one(s) proposed for use on the initial actual Task Order. This is an opportunity for the offeror to prove-out any technology(ies) proposed in the oral presentation that may be applicable to the initial actual Task Order.

33. Question: Currently, UXO field personnel are determining whether to have union representation. Will the selected contractor be able to re-negotiate union wages after award, if the personnel vote to include the offeror and its contract within a union agreement?

Answer: If a union agreement is finalized and wages renegotiated, contract wage rates in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement will not be effective unless the Government exercises the option years. Since this is a firm-fixed price contract, the Contracting Officer has the discretion whether a re-negotiation of labor rates is warranted.

34. Question: How will the Orals portion of the proposal be scored? Will points be deducted from an initial 400, or will points be awarded based on the response?

Answer: On the Oral portion, points will be awarded based on the response given by the offeror.

35. Question: Has a future land use for the three sites proposed been determined? If not, what land use or maximum depth for UXO clearance should the offeror assume for purposes of this proposal?

Answer: In paragraph 3.5 (Task 5) of the initial actual Task Order the contractor is given an assumed clearance depth of 4.0 feet for the area of concern.

36. Question: In the event that surface debris is determined to be present on the test site, how will USACE ensure that the debris remains in the same location and to the same extent for each subsequent offeror, since it is possible that surface materials may be disturbed during progress of the field demonstration? In other words, to what extent will the offeror be evaluated on the extent and accuracy of identifying surface debris?

Answer: The objective of the demonstration is not to identify or locate surface debris. As the site has been surface cleared prior to the field demonstration, any visible surface debris remaining is insignificant and not to be considered a target anomaly.

37. Question: The RFP states that the first of the oral presentations will occur approximately seven days after the close of the RFP. The closing date of the RFP is currently scheduled for May 17, 1999. Will the first oral presentation be held on May 24, 1999? This is during the UXO Forum. Will the oral presentations be scheduled for the same time period as the UXO Forum or a later period?

Answer: No, the RFP will be amended to state that the oral presentations will occur no earlier than 14 days after the closing date of May 17, 1999.

38. Question: Could you please define CLIN 0006? My interpretation is any cost other than material, subcontractor, travel, and labor.

Answer: Offerors should not propose a cost for CLIN 0006. This CLIN is included to remind offerors that any requirements of the data in Section J, such as the CDRL and DIDs should not be separately priced, but should be included in other line items. The RFP will be amended.

39. Question: I have a question on the subject section of the RFP downloaded. This DID is supposed to be the Geophysical Investigation Plan, but is actually a second copy of the OT-005-04, Explosives Siting Plan. Will a correction be made or should we pull the copy of Geophysical Investigation Plan from the Draft RFP?

Answer: The DID on the Ft. McClellan web page has been corrected. The RFP that was mailed to potential offerors contains the correct DID.

40. Question: Section B, page B-3 – Please define “Data per Section J – Not Separately Priced”. Does it refer to Section J Attachment D other than materials, subcontractor, and travel costs (i.e., internal costs)?

Answer: See the response to Question # 38.

41. Question: Section J, Exhibit 1, OT-FMC-025, page 1 of 5 – Subsection 10.3.1 Geographical Information System Manager is identified as Key Personnel, but is not listed as a required labor category in Section B. Should a contractor list it as an addition to the list or will the Huntsville Army be assigning the category a CLIN?

Answer: The CLINs 0007AP and 0008AP, currently listed as Reserved, will be changed to Geographical Information Systems Manager in an amendment to the RFP.

42. Question: Section B, CLIN 0007AN and 0007BD, as well as, 0008AN and 0008BD – The Project Manager category is duplicated by a Program Manager category. The RFP text discusses only the Project Manager role as the OT-FMC-025 only describes the Project Manager. Should the Program Manager be removed from the CLIN list?

Answer: Of these two labor categories, the RFP lists only the Project Manager as key personnel. However, the offeror may propose a Program Manager as part of their skill mix, as provided for in the CLINs. There are no current RFP criteria for defining Program Manager.

43. Question: Section J, Attachment D, page 4 – Subsection 3.3 does not discuss the land restoration the Huntsville Army requires of the contractor. What minimum land restoration does the Huntsville Army want within the Actual Task Order at Fort McClellan?

Answer: No restoration should be required under Task 3, para. 3.3, since site operations will continue through Task 5. Extensive site restoration should not be required based on the activities under the Initial Actual Task Order. The offeror should assume that the site will be restored to original grade (i.e. holes backfilled). However, if the offeror's proposed methodology results in extensive site damage, appropriate site restoration shall be assumed and included under Task 5, para. 3.5.

44. Question: What changes would impact the project once Fort McClellan is turned over in September 1999? What agency will then control the demolition activities on site? State or Federal?

Answer: Although Ft. McClellan is scheduled to close in September 1999, Federal control of property will not be turned over until safety hazards have been removed or appropriate controls are in place.

45. Question: Is it acceptable to submit a Section B schedule for the prime contractor and a separate Section B for each subcontractor?

Answer: No. Only the prime should submit a schedule B. These are not composite rates for prime and subcontractors. All subcontractor costs, including labor, should be included in the CLIN for subcontracts.

46. Question: Is a Small Business Plan required to be submitted with the Volume II Price Proposal or will it be requested at a later date (i.e., prior to award)?

Answer: Offerors should address Small Business/Small Disadvantaged Business/Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions commitment in the oral presentation. In accordance with FAR 52.219-9, if award is made to a large prime business, a Small Business Plan must be submitted and approved by the Government prior to award.

47. Question: Can you provide the Service Contract Act Wage Determination for Fort McClellan?

Answer: The Service Contract Act Wage Determination will be provided in the RFP Amendment #2.

48. Question: Should we assume that the Materials and Subcontracts Handling Fee (CLIN 0003) and the Travel Handling Fee (CLIN 0005) will be the same for Time and Materials and Firm Fixed Price tasks?

Answer: Yes. The handling fee should not be affected by the type of contract used. The term “handling fee” will be changed to “handling charge” in an RFP amendment.

49. Question: Does the Prime need to price out Team Member labor rates or will these be handled as subcontractor costs for all task orders?

Answer: See response to Question #45.

50. Section J, Attachment D, 3.5 (Task 5) – Is it the intention of this description to cost estimate the statistical sampling and analysis, removal, and disposal of anomalies and recovered scrap.

Answer: Yes, using the assumptions given in the task order. However, this task may require modification based on actual number of anomalies to be removed.