

**Region 8 – Emergency and Rapid Response Services III (ERRS III)**

**PR-HQ-06-14601**

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

- Q1.** The RFP states that primary mobilization offices must be set-up within 30 days of award in Denver, CO and Salt Lake City, UT. It also specifies, “Mobilization points must be within Region VIII”.

- a.** What is the definition of a mobilization point?

*A mobilization point is a major center for response operations with transportation and other logistical resources necessary to meet response times within Region VIII. Mobilization points are primary locations for the mobilization of labor and equipment to sites within Region 8. Mobilization points must be prime contractor facilities and not Team Subcontractor facilities.*

- b.** Do all employees that mobilize to respond to an emergency or remediation action need to be based at a mobilization point and therefore do all employees responding to any clean-up action need to be based in Region VIII?

*Not all employees responding to a clean up need to be located in Region 8, nor do they need to be located at the mobilization point. However, response times to all parts of the region are calculated based on the travel times from the mobilization point. Upon notification, the contractor has 2 hours to mobilize and 12 hours to be on site for emergency responses within Region 8. Please refer to the Introduction of the Performance Work Statement (PWS), Response Times, Paragraph G.*

- c.** In section B.2 - D. Mobilization. The RFP states that the primary mobilization points for equipment and labor are to be from Denver, CO and Salt Lake City, Utah. So does this mean that these mobilization points must be the Prime Contractor’s facilities or can these be Team Subcontractor facilities?

*The mobilization points (office/equipment yards) must be the prime contractor’s facilities, not a Team Subcontractor’s facilities.*

- d.** Is this true even if the closest employees may for example be located in an adjoining state?

*Employees may be located in adjoining states; however, mobilization for emergency cleanups must meet stated response times. Failing to meet the response time for a cleanup will result in a default status for the particular task order.*

- e.** What employees would be considered “uniquely” specialized and therefore exempt from this requirement?

*Uniquely specialized employees are not mentioned in the RFP.*

- f. Do all subcontracted employees also need to be based in Region VIII?

*Not all subcontract employees need to be located in Region 8*

- Q2.** The RFP specifies time limits for responses and specifies a Response Manager and two clean-up technicians need to be on-site. Additionally other personnel as requested by the OSC will also be required to be on-site.

- a. Aside from the Response Manager, are there any other “key” personnel (as defined in the RFP) that must be at every response action? For example, understanding the needs of the Site Safety Officer overseeing this contract, the RFP states that this person must have a CIH. Because the RFP refers to this person as a Site Safety Officer this suggests that he/she would be required to be on-site in response to emergency or clean-up actions. It would of course be impossible for all “key” personnel to be at every on-scene response, especially because the RFP also specifies that the contractor must be able to respond to simultaneous clean-up actions.

*Please refer to Paragraph G, Response Times, of the PWS. Other “Key Personnel” may be requested, depending on site conditions and requirements of the OSC. It is not mandatory, nor required, for all “Key Personnel” to be present at every response action.*

- b. Do personnel with similar qualifications such as the Site Safety Officer; need to respond to every emergency or clean-up action?

*See RFP Amendment a Site Safety Officer has been changed to a Health and Safety Officer.*

*Site conditions and the requirements of the OSC dictate the presence, or absence, of the Site Safety Officer for every emergency or cleanup.*

- c. Would an “on-scene” Site Safety Coordinator, for example (responding to any cleanup action as assigned by the “Site Safety Officer”) also needs to be a CIH?

*Please see RFP amendment for Health and Safety Qualifications as defined on page 1-30 of 39 of the PWS, Attachment 1. (Personnel assigned as Site Safety Officer is now a Health and Safety Technician)*

- d. Can personnel assigned by “key” personnel be on-scene, managed by the appropriate personnel from a different location; including personnel that may be assigned by the contract “Chemist” or “Transportation and Disposal Coordinator”?

*This decision is at the discretion of the Offeror’s management and organizational structure.*

- e. In section L.11 – III Key Personnel and M.4, III (B) it does not contain the instructions for the “B. On-Scene Personnel” section as requested and to be evaluated by Section M. Please clarify what information should be included to comply with this request. Information relative to Key Personnel is to be submitted with the Technical Proposal. Resumes shall be submitted as an addendum to the Technical Proposal.

*Please see RFP Amendment Section M - III Personnel for clarification.*

- Q3.** The pricing schedule in Attachment 3 specifies costs for a Health and Safety Tech, which is a position not identified in the PWS? Please clarify.

*The Health and Safety Technician position was omitted from the RFP. The PWS contained the description of the Health and Safety Technician, which is as follows:*

*Health and Safety Technician: Oversees site health safety plans, trained and certified as an EMT, with emphasis on immediate response to hazardous substance exposure.*

- Q4.** In Attachment 3 Pricing Schedules – The pricing schedule lists Equipment Operators, Health and Safety Techs and Subcontract Support, however in the personnel qualifications and training requirements (Attachment C-1 Exhibits B &D) it does not state any qualifications for those disciplines.

- a. Are there any minimum qualifications for these positions and what are the requirements?

*Please refer to Pg 1-32 of 39, Performance Work Statement (PWS) for Equipment Operator qualifications. Please refer to Q3 for Health and Safety Tech qualifications. Additionally, the following description shall apply for Subcontract Support (personnel) and will be incorporated in the RFP by this amendment:*

*Performs specific/general administrative duties relative to contract and site-specific procurements. Prepares contract/subcontract procurement packages for bidding purposes, reviews/evaluates proposed bids, prepares breakout documentation and recommends appropriate procurement awards to management structure.*

- b. The pricing schedule list a PAS. Is this the same as the Field Clerk as requested in Exhibit B Personnel Qualifications?

*A PAS is also considered a Field Clerk.*

- Q5.** Under Attachment J.1 (PWS), Exhibit B, Part E, the T&D Coordinator minimum qualifications require a BS degree in Chemistry or Chemical Engineering and 3 years of relevant experience. Minimum qualifications for other Key Personnel allow for substitution of additional years of relevant experience and/or professional certifications in lieu of degree requirements. In our experience, highly competent ERRS T&D Coordinators often have degrees in fields other than chemistry, or CHMM certification in lieu of a degree. Would EPA consider allowing degrees other than Chemistry or Chemical Engineering? In addition, would EPA consider allowing for substitution of additional years of relevant experience and/or professional certifications (e.g., CHMM) in lieu of the degree requirement for T&D Coordinators?

*See RFP Amendment, an “or equal” description was included in the RFP for the T & D Coordinator. The following qualification is permitted for this “Key Personnel.”*

*Certified Hazardous Materials Manager (CHMM) – Senior Level. Certificate and recertification documentation required, with 3 years experience in Hazardous Waste Field relating directly to the arranging of transportation and disposal of Hazardous Waste or similarly related activities with working knowledge of chemical characteristics and technical experience in oil, petroleum, and hazardous substance disposal regulations. Knowledge and experience in the use of Federal Regulations (DOT, TOSCA, RCRA, and Superfund), State and local regulations and their applications to various transportation methods and treatment technologies.*

- Q6.** Exhibit B of the PWS specifies that the Transportation and Disposal (T&D) Coordinator have a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in Chemistry or Chemical Engineering. The T&D Coordinator is a specialized position requiring expertise in hazardous waste disposal and transportation regulations. Will relevant experience and a science degree in lieu of the B.S. degree in Chemistry or Chemical Engineering satisfy EPA’s requirements for this position?

*Please refer to Q5 for clarification.*

- Q7.** On Page 1-30 of 39 (PWS): Site Safety Officer Qualifications. Does the EPA truly want to require a CIH as the credential for a SSO under this program? OSHA required contractors to have a Site Safety Officer on every project (more times than not the SSO position is filled by the Project / Response Manager). In essence, USEPA is stating that only CIH is allowed to fill the SSO function, and OSHA states that an SSO is required on every job. Requiring a CIH as SSO does not appear to be cost effective.

*For “Key Personnel” a Health and Safety Officer is mandated for the contract. This individual has total responsibility for ERRS site safety concerns for all Region 8 cleanups under the proposed contract. Depending on the Offerors internal management structure, personnel with appropriate qualifications may be assigned to individual sites, but report to the Health and Safety Officer. This is at the discretion of the Offeror; however, EPA requires that the Health and Safety Officer must have CIH qualifications.*

**Q8.** Page H-5 of 39 does not list a chemist as “key” personnel. Is this simply an oversight? See RFP Amendment. “Key Personnel” for the Performance Work Statement will be as follows:

1. Program Manager
2. Response Manager Level II
3. Health and Safety Officer
4. Chemist
5. Transportation and Disposal Coordinator

*A resume for each “Key Personnel” is required and shall be submitted as an addendum to the Technical Proposal, outside of the 85- page limitation.*

**Q9.** The RFP states on page H-7 and H-8 of 39 that the contractor and subcontractors shall not enter into an EPA contract or a subcontract, which supports EPA’s performance of Superfund Headquarters policy, work. It also states activities that relate to the conduct of response action activities are a conflict of interest (COI). Elsewhere in the RFP this COI specification notes conflicts associated specifically with the EPA START contract.

**a.** Aside from START, which other contracts would be included in this restriction?

*Contracts that provide services relating to technical assistance, site characterization/assessment and hazmat sample collection and analysis.*

**b.** Would this include, for example, technical assistance contracts related to Superfund clean up or technology evaluation? *Yes*

**c.** Is this COI restriction meant to be specific to contracts associated only with Region VIII? *No, please see RFP Clauses H.8 and H.9 for clarification*

**Q10.** The QA Program Plan, required for the proposal, is exempt from the page limit specified for the proposal.

**a.** Is the Written Task Order Scenario provided in Part IV also exempt from this page limit? The RFP states that the elements in the technical proposal are subject to an 85-page limitation. It also states that this includes all areas of Section I but does not include the pop quiz. The written scenario example in this section requires a Health and Safety Plan and a Quality Assurance Project Plan.

*The written task order scenario is not exempt from the 85-page limitation. However, the Quality Assurance Project Plan and the Health and Safety Plan shall be submitted as an addendum the Technical Proposal and not subject to the 85-page limitation.*

- b. Are the QA Project Plan and/or Health and Safety Plan (prepared for the written presentation) also exempt from this page limit?

*Please refer to Q10 a. for clarification*

- c. There is one written scenario provided in the RFP. Is the other written scenario going to be provided as part of the oral presentation and is this subject to the page limit specification?

*There will be only one written scenario required by the RFP. During oral presentations, two task order scenarios will be provided to Offerors for oral responses.*

- Q11.** In section L.11 IV Written Scenario: Can the government provide topographic maps for the scenario vicinity, as well as, directions and distances between structures (i.e., buildings, mine entrance, tailings pile, impoundment) creeks, tributary, portable well and wetlands?

*No further information relative to the written task order scenario will be provided*

- Q12.** On Pg L-6 of 29: Section I of L.11. The RFP defines an 85 page limit for Sections I through V of the technical proposal. This includes Resumes and the requested HASP for the written scenario. A HASP is a relatively lengthy document with a page range of 25-40 pages, and the resumes will easily exceed 6 pages each using EPA requested format ('empty' templates alone for resumes total 18 pages, and will quickly expand to 40-60 pages as data is input). Can EPA exclude resumes and the HASP from page count?

*Please refer to Q8 for clarification. Again, resumes shall be submitted as an addendum to the Technical Proposal.*

- Q13.** The RFP states that no numerical scoring scheme will be applied to evaluation factors. Further, it states each evaluation factor will be judged as acceptable or unacceptable and that an unacceptable rating in any of the evaluation factors will be determined as unacceptable and disqualifies the proposing contractor from contract award. This means that essentially each evaluation factor is judged equally. Why then are there percentage assignments to each of the evaluation factors in Section M?

*See RFP Amendment. The percentages for the technical factors have been removed.*

- a. In section M.4 and M.5 – M.4 references the technical volume as a GO/NO-GO then in M.5 the RFP states percentages for each technical factor. There seems to be a conflict between these two sections, please clarify.

*Please refer to Q13 for clarification.*

- b. On Page M-4 of 5: Section M-5. If the proposal must be graded as ‘acceptable’ on each sub-element, what is the intention of the defined % associated with each proposal section as defined?

*Please refer to Q13 for clarification.*

- Q14.** Section M Evaluation Criteria – As per this section the technical proposal will be evaluated on a Go/No-Go basis, however in the Scope of Work, Attachment C-1, Exhibit D it states the “Compliance with NIMS requirements at time of award will be given greater consideration.” This seems to be a conflict, please clarify.

*The statement under Exhibit D, “Compliance with NIMS requirements at time of award will be given greater consideration,” is deleted from the RFP. All ERRS staff proposed for response and disaster work shall comply with the above training requirements within the first three months after contract award, per Exhibit D, page 1-36 of 39.*

- Q15.** On Pg L-24 of 29: Section L-12 - Past Performance Information: This section requires contractor to provide past performance information, but it is not mentioned in Section L-11 as part of the proposal. Does this information get placed in the Cost Proposal? If so where?

*Under Section L.11, Pg L-6 of 29, Past Performance Information is requested, per Item I. Experience.*

- Q16.** Which SCA category corresponds to the RFP positions of “Cleanup Tech” and “Laborer”? In the SCA Wage determination, there is a “laborer” position.

- a. Does this correspond to the “Cleanup Tech” or “Laborer” in the Pricing Schedule?

*For proposal purposes, please use the SCA Wage determination for the ‘Laborer’ and ‘Cleanup Tech’ positions. The SCA wage rates represent the base for the projected rates. However, for Cleanup Tech positions, there may have additional ‘built-ups’ costs depending on the Offerors cost estimating formulas. All labor and equipment rates projected shall be full loaded.*

- b. Does the laborer position in the pricing schedule require 40 hour OSHA 1910-120 training, or does this position work outside the exclusion zone?

*Per descriptions in the PWS, Pg. 1-32 of 39, a laborer performs general duties outside of the ‘hot zone’ and is not required to have full safety training.*

- Q17.** Is the EPA OSC responsible for designating whether a Response Manager I or Response Manager II is required for the specified response action?

*The contractor selects appropriate personnel to mobilize for a cleanup. A simple cleanup would suggest a Response Manager Level I, while a complex cleanup implies a Response Manager Level II. The OSC cannot direct the contractor relative to personnel choices; however, a workplan projecting staffing levels will be required for review by the OSC.*

*In addition, cost effectiveness is an important criteria for contractor performance evaluations after contract award.*

- Q18.** On Pg. L-12 of 29: III. Personnel A. Key Personnel. Please clarify the number and format of resumes. The beginning of the section requests descriptions of one Program Manager, two Level II Response Managers, a single each Response Manager, Chemist, Health / Safety Officer, and T&D Coordinator for a total of seven.

- a.** If the contractor is proposing, multiple positions per category are we to provide a resume for each?

*Please refer to Q8. The contractor shall propose a resume for each “Key Personnel.” For Level II Response Manager, the number 2 should indicate the qualification level and not the number of personnel. A resume is not required for Response Manager Level I.*

- b.** In section L.11, III. Personnel: Is it correct to assume that ONLY the resumes of 1 Program Manager, 2 Level II Response Managers, 1 Level I Response Manager, 1 Chemist and 1 T&D Coordinator is required?

*Please refer to Q8, Q12 and Q18 for clarification.*

- c.** In the PWS, Attachment C-1, Exhibit A & C – The T&D Coordinator is listed as Key Personnel in Exhibit A but under “Other On-Scene Personnel” in Exhibit C. Please clarify that T&D Coordinator considered Key Personnel and a resume required.

*Please refer to Q8 for clarification. The T&D Coordinator is a Key Personnel and a resume is required.*

- d.** The resume format (Using RM Level II an example) requires contractors to provide ‘duty descriptions’ for eight EPA ‘Experience Factors’, and ‘descriptive examples’ for six EPA “Knowledge Factors” on a template that is not to be changed. History has repeatedly demonstrated that these resumes become very lengthy as multiple ‘duties’ and ‘examples’ are provided for each of the 14 EPA Factors. It is not uncommon for each resume of this type to exceed 10 pages because of the requested format requirements.

*Resumes shall be submitted in as an addendum to the Technical Proposal.*

- e. Will the EPA please exclude these from page count? Can the EPA define a maximum number of resumes requested by key staff category?

*Resumes are excluded from the 85-page limitation; however, the Offeror shall submit a resume for each individual per category defined as “Key Personnel”.*

- Q19.** Section J, Attachment 7 includes identical resume formats for the Health and Safety Officer and the T&D Coordinator, which appear to be appropriate for only the T&D Coordinator. Does EPA want to provide a different resume format for the Health and Safety Officer?

*See RFP Amendment for the Health and Safety Officer description and format.*

- Q20.** The RFP states that only proposed Key Personnel who are full time employees of the offeror (no subcontractor employees) may present the response to the scenarios and pop quiz.

- a. Does this requirement mean that Team Members are also exempt from being presenters?

*The RFP states only “Key Personnel” that are full time employees may be present at the oral presentation.*

- b. How many pop quiz questions will be asked?

*Ten pop quiz questions will be asked.*

- c. Are there time restrictions for answering the question(s)?

*See clause L.11, section IV, C (3) and (4) for clarification.*

- Q21.** On Pg. B-8 of 10: Clause B.2 Section III - Other Items – Please define or expand the list of what type of coveralls are considered chemical resistant

*EPA cannot direct you on what type of equipment to use, please refer these types of questions to your Health and Safety Office as stated in the PWS Exhibit B – Personnel Qualifications under Health and Safety Officer Qualifications #5 and Exhibit C.*

- a. Is it EPA intent to make all disposable PPE (tyvek, saranex etc) not billable?

*All disposable PPE is ‘non-billable.’*

- Q22.** Is previous experience using the Removal Cost Management System part of the evaluation criteria? What is the cost of the software?

*Previous experience is not required for the Removal Cost Management System. The software and training is available through the EPA Environmental Response Team, Cincinnati, Ohio, at no cost.*

- Q23.** Is the National Incident Management System (NIMS) a “new” requirement to perform the ERRS scope of services? That is, was it a requirement for the previous award to the incumbent under Solicitation #PR-HQ-01-12795?

*The NIMS is a new requirement and was not a requirement for the previous award to the incumbent under Solicitation #PR-HQ-01-12795.*

- Q24.** In Clause B.2, Section II, 4th paragraph it states that the fixed equipment rate applies only to Contractor-owned equipment, and that leased equipment will be billed at cost with applicable mark-up. In this case, does “leased” include “rented” equipment on a short-term basis? If so, this paragraph also states that fixed equipment rates are inclusive of fuel. Is it correct to assume that leased and rental rates are “dry” since they are being charged as an ODC?

*In the case of leased or rental equipment on a short-term basis, the CLIN item and fixed rates apply only to company owned equipment. Equipment that is leased or rented shall be billed at cost plus applicable make-up.*

- Q25.** Do daily equipment rates include the rental cost plus indirect cost and fee, or only rental cost plus indirect cost with no fee?

*Please refer to Q24 and Q27 for clarification.*

- Q26.** On Pg. L-5 of 29: Clause L.11 Section II – (d) Other Direct Costs. When the total of all contract years are added, the total ODC estimate is \$18,403,489. This number conflicts with the total ODC amount listed in Section (e) of \$17,441,475. Can EPA please clarify which ODC figure to use?

*See RFP Amendment. Please use the table on Pg. L-5 of 29: clause L.11 – Section II – (d)*

- Q27.** On Pg. B-1 of 10: Clause B.1 (b) states that equipment rates apply only to company owned equipment. Clause B.1 (d) states that equipment rates apply to contractor owned or rented/leased equipment. Clause H.25 states that if a contractor provides equipment through a third party subcontract or short term rental/lease, that reimbursement will at cost plus any applicable indirect costs not to exceed the rate in the contract.

*See RFP Amendment. Clause B.1 (d) has been replaced with the following:*

*The rate(s) set forth in the Pricing Schedule cover all expenses, including report preparation, salaries, overhead, general & administrative expenses and profit. The equipment rates shall apply to equipment that is company owned and shall be inclusive of all costs (operation and maintenance, fuel, repair costs, depreciation and other acquisition costs and indirect costs, as applicable).*

**Q28.** If the lowest rental rate obtained through competitive bids plus indirect costs exceeds the contract bid rate, will the contract rate supersede the actual cost as a cap?

*The fixed equipment rates in the contract are considered a “cap.”*

**Q29.** On Pg. B-6 of 10: Section III. Other Items. - Please clarify the list on page B-6, B-7, and B-8. Is it the EPA’s intent to classify these items as ‘non-billable’ for contractors? Or is the intent for the CO to grant permission to bill for these items as required by a Task Order?

*The items listed on page B-6, B-7 and B-8 are classified as “non-billable” for bidding purposes.*

**Q30.** Can you please clarify whether rental equipment that has a listed rate in the contract will be handled as an ODC or as a CLIN item in the contract?

*Rental equipment that has a listed rate in the contract will be handled as an ODC.*

**Q31.** L.11, Section I, first paragraph: EPA has set a limit of 85 single-sided pages for all requirements specified in L.11, Section I except for the QA Program Plan and the Oral Presentation. This includes:

- QA Project Plan for the Sample Task Order Scenario (typically more than 30 pages)
- Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan for the Sample Task Order Scenario (typically more than 30 pages)
- 7 Resumes (would require at least 22 pages if the required Attachment 7 forms were filled in and required no additional space than the blank forms)
- The Experience, Technical Management, Personnel, and Written Sample Task Order Scenario sections (which EPA uses 10 pages to list all the required information).
  - a. It would appear that EPA has not allowed a reasonably adequate number of pages to present all of the required information. Would EPA please consider removing the QAPP, HASP, and Resumes from the page limitation? If not, would EPA please consider increasing the page limitation to 200 single-sided pages?

*The QA Project Plan, the Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan shall be submitted in as addendums to the Technical Proposal and not counted in the 85-page limit; as well as the resumes. The 85-page limitation remains in effect for the Technical Proposal.*

- b. In L.11, Section I – Technical Proposal: Because of the length of the resume format (one set of resumes provided as Attachment 7 in its entirety and uncompleted is 16 pages), would the government consider removing these from the page count?

*Please refer to Q11, Q12 and Q18 for clarification.*

- c. In L.11, Section I – Technical Proposal Sample Task Order Written Response: Because of the length of a complete Work Plan, Health and Safety Plan and Quality Assurance Plan, (these plans are generally approximately 85 pages each); would the government consider removing these documents (Work Plan, HASP and QAPP) from the page count? If not, are we to assume that you are looking for just general overviews of each of the documents?

*Please refer to Q11 for clarification. The workplan is required in the response to the written task order scenario.*

- d. We assume that EPA desires offerors to include a Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Acronyms, etc. in our proposal. Would these pages be excluded from the 85 single-sided page limitation?

*An Offeror may submit a Table of Contents, List of Figures, List of Acronyms, etc. as part of the Technical Proposal that are excluded from the 85 page single-sided limitation.*

- e. Will EPA allow the use of 11'x17" foldout pages? If so, how many pages does each sheet count against the page limit?

*EPA will allow the use of 11"x17" foldout pages, however each foldout would be considered as 2 pages and counts towards the 85-page limitation.*

- f. Limiting graphics to 10-point fonts significantly reduces the amount of information that can be included in typical graphics. Would EPA please consider allowing the use of smaller fonts (e.g., the graphic standard Arial 8 point) as long as graphics are clearly readable?

*The use of 8-point fonts may be used for graphics and foldout, but not text materials. Please make sure that the font is readable.*

- g. In L.11, Section I – Technical Proposal: Is the 10-point minimum requirement inclusive of graphics (i.e., city names on maps, etc.) or is a reasonably legible font acceptable? If not, are 11x17" pages acceptable and would this count as a single page for only a graphic?

*Please refer to Q32 for clarification.*

- Q32.** Section M.4, Paragraph III mentions "Letters of Intent," yet there is no mention of Letters of Intent anywhere in Section L. Are Letters of Intent required? If so, are they required for key personnel only, or also for on-scene personnel? Are any required Letters of Intent excluded from the 85-page limit? Where should Letters of Intent be included in the proposal?

*Letters of Intent shall be required for personnel that are not presently a company employee. Letters of Intent would apply only to "Key Personnel" and can be submitted in with Resumes that are excluded from the 85-page limitation.*

- Q33.** In Clause L.11, Section I, Part I it specifies 5 projects completed during the last 5 years for work similar to the PWS. This "completed" requirement would disallow inclusion of ongoing ERRS contracts (~90% complete) as relevant experience (including the current Region 8 ERRS contracts). Would EPA consider changing this requirement to the same as included in the Past Performance section – contracts that either have been completed or are currently in process (perhaps for at least 6 months)?

*A five-year history of past performance experience will be required.*

- Q34.** On Page L-13 of 29: IV. B. Ground Rules - The RFP states oral presentations will commence up to two weeks after receipt of proposals, or as soon as possible, and that the CO will notify offerors of the scheduled date within 1 week of receipt of offers. Contractors must ensure their presentation teams are available for the oral presentations. Can EPA confirm that under the existing proposal due date this means the CO will call bidders no later than December 5, 2006 and oral presentations will begin no later than December 12, 2006?

- a.** What is the minimum amount of time between the time the CO calls and the contractor presents?

*The minimum amount of time between the time the CO calls and the contractor presents at oral presentations is one week.*

- b.** Will the schedule be effected by EPA staff taking 'end of year' leave if the proposal due date gets extended? *No*

- Q35.** On Pg. L-14 of 29: IV. Oral Presentation. C.1. This paragraph defines the that the Point of Contact / Program Manager who has full time operational responsibility of the contract performance shall be present to answer questions. Additionally it requires the Program Manager having full time operational responsibility for ERs of this type (scenario) be present to answer questions. Is the POC and Program Manager the same person? *Yes*

- a.** Will the Key personnel attending the meeting be the same key personnel whom the contractor submits resumes to?

*Question Not Clear*

- b. Can EPA confirm that the QA Project Plan is outside page count?

*The QA Project Plan is outside of the 85-page limitation and may be submitted as an addendum to the Technical Proposal.*

- Q36.** In section L.11 – IV.E. The RFP states that no electronic devices, reference materials, etc. may be used during oral presentations. Does that include use of these items during the preparation of the presentations?     Yes

- Q37.** Attachment 5 of the RFP specifies that the client authorization letter should be received no later than October 25, 2006. This date has long since passed, therefore what is the date for returning the client authorization letter?

*December 1, 2006*

- Q38.** Will there be an extension for turning in the proposal?     Yes, *The due date has been extended to December 5, 2006 by 3:00pm EST.*

- Q39.** Due to the proximity of the due date to a holiday, we would like to request a two-week extension of the due date.

*See Q38 for clarification.*

- Q40.** On the SF33 states that an original + 6 copies of the proposal should be submitted. Section L requires an original + 5 copies. How many copies should be submitted?

*See RFP Amendment. An original plus 4 copies of the Technical Proposal and an original plus 3 copies of the Cost Proposal will be required.*

- Q41.** Attachment 1 – I.F Trans-boundary Response and G. Response Times. Question: If a response in Canada occurs, will the 12-hour emergency response time for contractors still apply (i.e. is Canada considered within “the zone of coverage”)?

*Canada is not considered within the “zone of coverage” and there is not a 12-hour emergency response time specified for a Trans-boundary response. Should a future situation require a response into Canada for cleanup purposes, the requirements would follow the Urgent Requirements Clause that has been added to the RFP.*