

**Questions / WRPS Answers/Clarifications in Response to RFP 265103**

1. **Q.** Section 3 of the Statement of Work (SOW) cites RPP-RPT-54322 as a relevant example of the report to be prepared. The work documented in RPP-RPT-54322 included convening and facilitating the deliberations of a Decision Support Board, and including the outcome of that deliberation in the final report. Please confirm that the SOW for this procurement does not include interactions with the Decision Support Board; if this is not correct, please clarify what those interactions are anticipated to be.

**A.** The SOW cites report RPP-RPT-54322 only as a relevant example of the type of report to be prepared. The SOW does not include any activities related to convening and facilitating the deliberations of a Decision Support Board. There are no outcomes of any Decision Support Board to be included in this report.

2. **Q.** Section 3 of the SOW and Item #1 of the MSR requires that “A detailed proposal shall be submitted with the proposal demonstrating compliance with key milestone dates. Key milestone dates are shown in the TOC Master Submittal Register.” Please clarify which of the submittal dates in the MSR are considered “key milestone dates,” and which may be driven by the contractor's proposed schedule.

**A.** Submittal number 18 on the TOC Master Submittal Register (MSR) is considered the “key milestone date” for the SOW. Milestone dates for MSR submittal numbers 2 through 17 support the completion of key milestone number 18. As such, the dates for submittal numbers 2 through 17 must allow for the timely interaction with the contractor and the review and comment from WRPS, and the timely incorporation of comments into each of the report sections ahead of the submittal number 18 due date. The contractor is encouraged to propose alternate dates for submittals 2 through 17, if required to support the vendor’s proposal.

3. **Q.** Section 4.1.2 of the RFP requires vendor to submit a Quality Assurance Program. Can the vendor work under WRPS QA Program? We can work to WRPS engineering procedures associated with developing a study and produce it accordance therein.

**A.** The Quality Assurance Program requirement is removed from the SOW. See revised SOW.

4. **Q.** The SOW will require a lot of historical research and other technical information that only access to HLAN can provide. How does WRPS expect the vendor to gain access to this?

**A.** Remote access to the Hanford Local Area Network (HLAN) from offsite locations can be provided to the vendor using a SecurID token if required to support this SOW. Remote access would be provided by the Mission Support Contract (MSC) information resource management (IRM) services provider.

5. **Q.** Having worked for Hanford off and on for over 20 plus years and having had dealings with a lot of the sensitive topics, such as flammability, stress on the tanks, erosion and corrosion of the vessel and pumps, tank riser loading, mixing uncertainties (which is still going on), is there relief from the roughly 2 month schedule or are we supposed to provide our own schedule?

**A.** The Offeror is encouraged to respond with their proposed schedule.

6. **Q.** It is nice to see the key topics to be addressed by the report are spelled out, however, is there a level of detail for each of the SOW sections expected especially in light of the previous bullet?

**A.** The key topics to be addressed in the report are meant as a guide for the subject matter of the various sections. The actual content of the various sections will be determined during interactions with WRPS during the preparation of the study and report. There is no predetermined level of detail required for each of the SOW report sections.

7. **Q.** Section 5.1 of the RFP may require vendor to supply financial statements. Although this is feasible, why is it required for a time and materials contract?

**A.** WRPS must determine that the selected vendor has financial resources to perform the work.

8. **Q.** Section 5.3 of the RFP states “Funds are not presently available for this Subcontract”. When do you expect to know when they will be available? Are you going to award but not release the work until they are available? This could significantly affect the dates shown on the MSR, and are we to assume they would be adjusted accordingly?

**A.** The funding for performance of work from the award date through September 30, 2014 is available. The contract will contain an Option clause for work to continue through November 2014. At this time, funding for work to be performed after September 30, 2014 is not available. Availability of funding for the option period is expected at a later date.

9. **Q.** Will the vendor be required to have Hanford General Employee Training (HGET) and other training?

**A.** Subcontract personnel are not expected to take HGET, but key personnel may be required to receive some site specific orientation training prior to site visits. WRPS will assume the cost of these training sessions.

10. **Q.** Will the vendor be required to have a Hanford security badge and access to the site?

**A.** Key personnel should expect some visitations to the site. During those visits, a Visitor type security badge will be issued for a short term visit.

11. **Q.** Is the vendor required to perform this work at the WRPS site?

**A.** Refer to Section 10.0 of the SOW.

12. **Q.** The detailed study/report online, provided in section 3.0 of the SOW, is very helpful in defining the scope of the document. But to ensure we are providing the level-of-effort expected, do you have an approximate page count you expect for the final document?

**A.** The page count of the reporting document would be dependent on the results of the supporting study; however, the report should not exceed 350 pages.