Solicitation No. N62742-26-R-1801, Small Business Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract for Environmental Remedial Action for Sites in Hawaii, Guam, and Other Areas within the Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Pacific Area of Responsibility
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #	Reference/ Section	Question	Government Response
27		The US Navy emphasizes cost reimbursable work for NAVFAC in the AOR even though environmental remediation expertise is largely independent of contract type. This requirement provides an unfair advantage to the current incumbent who has held the NAVFAC PAC SB RAC contract for the past 10 years. NAVFAC has used firm-fixed price (FFP) SB EMACs for several decades (and many Federal ERS contracts use FFP cost structures) to execute CERCLA-type cleanups. We understand it is important for a contractor to have cost accounting systems to support a CR contract, but this requirement shouldn't be primary to the execution of work for NAVFAC or in the AOR. Our cost reimburable systems are described in the Price Volume and provide assurance that we, as the Prime contractor, have the existing systems in place to manage CR IDIQs. We request the requirement for Prime contractors to show CR experience be deleted as this is an unfair advantage to the incumbent who is the only contractor that has CR experience as the Prime throughout the AOR with the US Navy.	The list of Minimum Required Experience in Section M5(3)b.(3)a. remains unchanged.
28		The US Navy emphasizes work for NAVFAC even though environmental remediation expertise is provided for different agencies CONUS and OCONUS. This requirement provides an unfair advantage to the current incumbent who has held the NAVFAC PAC RAC contract for the last 10 years working in AOR. Will the US Navy change this requirement to emphasize experience for any Government agency as long as the work is recent and relevant to the work scope per Section C of the RFP?	Please see revised Section M5(3)b.(3)c. via Amendment 0003.
29		The US Navy emphasizes work in the AOR even though environmental remediation expertise is provided in different locations CONUS and OCONUS. This requirement provides an unfair advantage to the current incumbent who has held the NAVFAC PAC RAC contract for the last 10 years working in the AOR. Will the US Navy change this requirement to emphasize experience in any US locations as long as the work is recent and relevant to the work scope per Section C of the RFP?	Locations to be evaluated more favorably remain unchanged in Section M5(3)b.(3)c.
30		Form J.9 indicates that Offeror is to describe capability and capacity to deliver products similar to the type and complexity of the tasks. The current form asks for work performed by the current team, however there is no requirement in the form to provide information on the number and types of total resources (capacity) that were delivered to the project. a) How will the US Navy evaluate capacity based on the criteria in the J.9 Form? b) Will the US Navy revise the form to clarify the evaluation criteria?	Please see revised Section M and Attachment J.9 via Amendment 0003.
31		The US Navy emphasizes cost reimbursable work for NAVFAC in the AOR even though environmental remediation expertise is largely independent of contract type. Will the US Navy add a section to the proposal for offeror's to discus their historical depth and breadth of cost reimbursable experience as a means of demonstrating cost reimburseable work?	Additional sections will not be added to the Solicitation.

Solicitation No. N62742-26-R-1801, Small Business Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract for Environmental Remedial Action for Sites in Hawaii, Guam, and Other Areas within the Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Pacific Area of Responsibility
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #	Reference/ Section	Question	Government Response
32		When viewed collectively, a number of the solicitation requirements appear to be structured in a manner that disproportionately benefits the incumbent contractor. As a result, it is difficult to justify the substantial cost associated with preparing a high-quality IDIQ proposal when the likelihood of meaningful competition appears limited. If NAVFAC intends to foster a competitive procurement environment, the evaluation criteria should provide a fair opportunity for qualified firms to compete, rather than emphasizing requirements that align primarily with the incumbent's existing contract performance and experience.	Please see revised Section M via Amendment 0003.
33		We are concerned that the J.8 and J.9 forms present an unfair advantage to the incumbent as their projects on the current program will meet all relevant criteria and their "Key Personnel Assigned for Duration of Project/Contract" will show near perfect lacing between Key Personnel and projects. We suggest that the "Key Personnel Assigned for Duration of Project/Contract" box be removed from the forms.	Please see revised Attachments J.8 and J.9 via Amendment 0003.
34		The current MARAC N62473-18-R-2418 contract provides for similar services within the NAVFAC Southwest AOR, which defines relevant experience more broadly, encouraging multiple contractor interest and competition. These were defined as 1) Relevant experience in the array of specialized technical experience work elements identified; 2) Relevant experience with complex and innovative remediation technologies; 3) Relevant experience that demonstrates successful optimization efforts that reduced cost or time; 4) A wide array or relevant experience across the geographic Area of Responsibility for the solicitation; 5) Relevant experience working with the US Navy and/or other Federal Government entities. a) Will the US Navy adopt the same/similar aspects for this solicitation? b) MARAC also did not emphasize cost reimbursable experience only. Of the five required projects, the RFP noted that submitting more than one CR project was considered more favorably. Will the US Navy adopt the same/similar aspects for this solicitation?	Please see revised Section M via Amendment 0003.
35		The MARAC N62473-18-R-2418 contract is for similar services within the NAVFAC Southwest AOR, which defines higher-rated features with a broader view that encouraged multiple contractor interest and competition. This included: 1) Experience with Department of Defense contracts involving California regulatory agencies may be evaluated more favorably; 2) JV entities with shared relevant experience may be considered more favorable than newly formed JV entities; 3) Submission of more than one (1) cost-type project with the similar size/scope/complexity may be evaluated more favorably. Will the US Navy adopt the same/similar aspects for this solicitation?	Please see revised Section M via Amendment 0003.
36		Per the RFP, a relavant project must be a "remedial action" project. However, this is not clearly defined in the RFP. If a project includes elements of the Section C Scope of Work, is it considered a "remedial action" project? Please clarify.	Please see revised Section M5(3)a.(1)B. via Amendment 0003.
37		Is a project that focuses on investigation considered a "remedial action" project and is therefore relevant although no removal or remedial systems are in place? Will the US Navy add characterization coupled with additional removal or remdial actions to Section C Scope of Work for relevancy?	Please see revised Section M5(3)a.(1)B. via Amendment 0003.

Solicitation No. N62742-26-R-1801, Small Business Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract for Environmental Remedial Action for Sites in Hawaii, Guam, and Other Areas within the Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Pacific Area of Responsibility
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #	Reference/ Section	Question	Government Response
38		Is a project that focuses on investigation, studies, and/or characterization considered a remediation project and would therefore be considered relevant?	Please refer to Section M5(3)a.(1)A. and Section C, 1.2. An investigaton is not a remediation project. Per Section C, 1.2.1 the scope of work includes services that may include the following tasks: Performing pilot and treatability studies, site characterizations, groundwater characterization studies. Note, however, that the Government cannot respond to questions regarding the relevance of a general category of projects wtih generally applicable answers as each project must be considered individually depending upon its particular facts.
39		Many PFAS projects are at investigation/characterization/sampling stages in preparation for installation of treatment systems. Although no removal or treatment systems are currently in place, please verify such projects are indeed considered relevant.	Please refer to Section M5(3)a.(1)A. and Section C, 1.2. Any of the tasks listed in Section C, 1.2.1 involving PFAS would likely be considered relevant. Note, however, that the Government cannot respond to questions regarding the relevance of a general category of projects wtih generally applicable answers as each project must be considered individually depending upon its particular facts.
40		Is a project that has a large civil component but also includes removal of multiple CERCLA and/or RCRA hazardous waste streams (asbestos, lead-based paint, household hazarouds waste) considered a "removal action" project and would therefore be considered relevant?	Please refer to Section M5(3)a.(1)A. and Section C, 1.2. If a mixed project (including both relevant and non-relevant work) includes performing a removal action that is substantial it would likely be considered relevant (Section C, 1.2.1). Per Section C, 1.2.2, contaminants identified and regulated under RCRA and CERCLA are considered relevant. Note, however, that the Government cannot respond to questions regarding the relevance of a general category of projects wtih generally applicable answers as each project must be considered individually depending upon its particular facts.
41		Are projects on forms J.8 and J.9 collectively evaluated to show that the Prime contractor meets the minimum required experience? The RFP is unclear.	Please see revised Section M5(3)b.(3) via Amendment 0003.
42		Do we need to show that all projects collectively on J.8 meet the minimum contractor requirements and separately show on J.9 that all the J.9 projects meet the minimum required contractor experience? The RFP is unclear. Please provide clarity.	Please see revised Section M5(3)b.(3) via Amendment 0003.
43		Will NAVFAC remove instructions at the top of form J8 in order for us to adequately address all the RFP requirements and the complexity of this project in the two page limit provided?	The instructional paragraph on Attachment J.8 will not be removed.
44		Will NAVFAC remove instructions at the top of form J10 in order for us to adequately address all the RFP requirements in each resume in the two page limit provided?	The instructional paragraph on Attachment J.10 will not be removed.

Solicitation No. N62742-26-R-1801, Small Business Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract for Environmental Remedial Action for Sites in Hawaii, Guam, and Other Areas within the Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Pacific Area of Responsibility
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question #	Reference/ Section	Question	Government Response
45		Regarding J.1_J.1A_J2_J.7_J.7A_AMEND00002.xls file - the formulas are incorrect on Rows 11-54 of each of the Att. J.7 Cost Model years. It is locked into Cell C11 which is incorrect. Please supply an updated version of the file.	Please see revised Attachment J.7 via Amendment 0003.