

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. PR-CI-07-10997/0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 03/21/08	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. PR-CI-07-10997
5. PROJECT NO. <i>(If applicable)</i>		6. ISSUED BY CODE	
7. ADMINISTERED BY <i>(If other than item 6)</i> CODE		Not Applicable.	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR <i>(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)</i> To All Offerors/Bidders.		(✓)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. PR-CI-07-10997
CODE		(✓)	9B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 11)</i> 03/06/08
FACILITY CODE			10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
			10B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 13)</i>

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
 (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(✓)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: <i>(Specify authority)</i> THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES <i>(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)</i> SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER <i>(Specify type of modification and authority)</i>

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

The purpose of this amendment is to answer the technical questions received in reference to RFP (PR-CI-07-10997) On-Site Analytical and Technical Support at the Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Center in Ada, OK. See attached questions and answers, and revised Attachment #3, Technical Evaluation Criteria, Attachment #4, Technical Proposal Instructions, Attachment #5, Cost Proposal Instructions, and Attachment #6, Definition of Labor Classifications.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER <i>(Type or print)</i>		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER <i>(Type or print)</i>	
		SCOTT A. FOGLE	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ <i>(Signature of person authorized to sign)</i>		_____ <i>(Signature of Contracting Officer)</i>	

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

30-105

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 52.243

A. The following clarifications and/or corrections are hereby made as a result of technical questions received in response to RFP - PR-CI-07-10997:

1. Question: There seems to be a disconnect between the Technical Evaluation Criteria, specifically criterion 2.0 Demonstrated Qualifications of Key Personnel, sub-criteria 2.1 Program Manager, and the Demonstrated Qualifications of Key Personnel in the Technical Proposal Instructions, and Professional Level 4 (PL-4) area in the Definition of Labor Classifications. Technical qualification's is addressed in the Technical Proposal Instructions and Definitions of Labor Classifications, but not the Technical Evaluation Criteria for the Program Manger qualifications. Please explain. Answer: The technical qualifications will be evaluated for the Program Manager (sub-criteria 2.1), and has been corrected by revision to the Technical Evaluation Criteria, solicitation Attachment #3. The Definition of Labor Classifications, solicitation Attachment #6, has also been revised to clarify the technical qualifications of the Program Manager. Additionally, the Technical Evaluation Criteria, Attachment #3, and Definition of Labor Classifications, Attachment #6 have been changed to clarify experience and educations requirements of the PL-3's.
2. Question: Page 4-2 of 5 of the Technical Proposal Instructions state that "samples of scientific publications or corporate publications in support of responses to technical evaluation criteria are encouraged and don't count against this page limit." Can these supporting publications be delivered electronically in Adobe PDF or other suitable format on CD? Can we assume they should be organized according to the technical evaluation criteria to allow EPA an easy cross-reference? And, can EPA please suggest a time limit to these materials, e.g., 10 years or less? Answer: Yes, these documents can be delivered electronically in Adobe PDF or MS Word/PDF on CD-Rom. Additionally, a reference list of the scientific publications or corporate publications may be supplied in hard copy. This reference list shall include the authors, date of publication, name of journal or publication, volume (if any), and page numbers. Yes, the publications shall be organized according to the technical evaluation criteria to allow for easy cross reference. Time limit for these materials is 10 years or less. The Technical Proposal Instructions, Solicitation Attachment #4 is hereby amended to reflect this change.
3. Question: Under Section 1.1 (Demonstrated experience in fulfilling the technical requirements of contracts of similar technical scope to that specified in the solicitation) in Attachment 3, Technical Evaluation Criteria, examples of seven contract scopes are provided under the Performance Work Statement (Attachment 1 of the Solicitation). Should the response under Section 1.1 of the proposal be formatted to only address these seven areas or be formatted to address the various categories (A through H) under the Performance Work Statement? Answer: For sub-criteria 1.1 Demonstrated Experience of the Technical Evaluation Criteria the seven areas listed encompasses the day to day work that will be required under this requirement as identified in the PWS. Therefore, a response for this sub-criteria shall only address the seven areas identified under sub-

criteria 1.1. The Technical Evaluation Criteria, solicitation Attachment #3, is hereby amended to correct the language in sub-criteria 1.1.

4. Question: Table 1 - Level of Effort Distribution on page 5-5 of 7 of the Cost Proposal Instructions list 3,760 hours in the base quantity for the Sr. Scientist Specialist labor category, which is a key personnel category. Is it the EPA's intent that the offeror provide more than one resume for this position to fulfill the proposed level of effort? Answer: The decision of whether or not to propose one or more persons is the business decision of the offeror.
5. Question: Also on Table 1 - Level of Effort Distribution, the "Total of All P-Level Hours)" line for the Option Quantity states 46,060 hours. When the P-levels totals are added together, the total comes to 47,000 excluding the T-3 Glassware Technician and Clerical Support. Please confirm the correct P-level hours. Answer: 47,000 hours is the correct total for each of the quantity options years in Table 1- Level of Effort Distribution of the Cost Proposal Instructions. Please correct that figure in your copy of the RFP for each of the Quantity Option Periods (Five Total).
6. Question: In responding to Demonstrated Corporate Experience evaluation criteria (1.1), should the responses be organized in accordance to the seven areas (1)-(7) outlined on page 3-2 or according to the major sections A through H of the performance work statement? Answer: See question #3 above for an answer to this question
7. Question: Will the seven areas of section 1.1 be weighted equally? For example will the expertise in analysis of environmental samples be weighted equally with GIS? Answer: The seven areas in sub-criteria 1.1 Demonstrated Corporate Experience of the Technical Evaluation Criteria will be weighted equally, as all seven areas make up the 75 points for this sub-criteria.
8. Question: It appears that in technical evaluation criteria 1.1 parts (3) and (5) appear synonymous. Can the government clarify the difference between these two elements of the SOW? Answer: For sub-criteria 1.1, number (3) shall read as follows: "expertise in providing technical review assistance on the applicability and credibility of conceptual models and computer models applied at hazardous waste sites"; number (5) is unchanged. Additionally, sub-criteria 1.1, number (4) has been revised to insert "[this analysis can include" after "analysis of metals" and to change "and" to "or" after "(Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry)". The Technical Evaluation Criteria, solicitation attachment #3 has been amended to make this change.
9. Question: Will the eight areas (A-H) of the performance work statement be weighted equally? Will analytical support for example be weighted equally with environmental management system policy? Answer: Not all of the eight areas (A-H) of the PWS are being evaluated per the Technical Evaluation Criteria. The (7) seven areas in the Demonstrated Corporate Experience Criteria are all taken from areas with the eight areas (A-H) of the PWS, but (A-H) are not being evaluated separately.

10. Question: We cannot find a reference in the RFP to Attachment #7, Quality Surveillance Plan. Is this a document we need to respond to or address in our proposal, or is it just included for informational purposes? Answer: The Quality Surveillance will be used during performance of the contract to ensure quality. There is no requirement to address this attachment in an offerors proposal.
11. Question: Will the U.S. EPA be sending out the Past Performance Questionnaires to possible references or do the offerors need to include them along with the client authorization letter? Answer: The Government (EPA) will send out the Past Performance Questionnaires.
12. Question: RFP clause H.5 “LIMITATION OF FUTURE CONTRACTING HEADQUARTERS SUPPORT) (EPAAR 1552.209-74) (OCT 2005) ALTERNATE V (DEC 2005)” states that "The contractor, during the life of this contract, will be ineligible to enter into contracts or agreements of any types with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services". Does this disqualify contractors that provide remediation and waste management services from competing on this procurement? Answer: No, this does not disqualify a contractor from competing on this procurement, see Clause H.5, Limitation of Future Contracting (Headquarters Support) (EPAAR 1552.209-740 (OCT 2005) Alternate V (DEC 2005), and Clause L.20, Disclosure Requirements for Organizational Conflicts of Interest (Local LC-09-03) (DEC 2001) Deviation for further information.
13. Question: There appears to be a typo in the last sentence of clause L.20(c). Reading around the error, clause L.20(c) seems to specify that “firms that provide consulting and/or technical services...” to “...firms of organizations that provide remediation and waste management services may present significant actual or potential COI concerns”. Is this meant to exclude firms that provide remediation and waste management services directly or only include firms that provide consulting services to remediation and waste management firms? Please clarify. Answer: Paragraph (c) of Clause L.20 entitled; “Disclosure Requirements for Organizational Conflicts of Interest (Local LC-09-03) (DEC 2001) Deviation” is hereby changed as follows: “(c) The Agency has determined that firms directly engaged in or having significant business or financial relationships of any type with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services may have a significant actual or potential organizational conflict of interest in relation to the requirements of this solicitation. In addition, the Agency has determined that firms that provide consulting and/or technical services of any type with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services may present significant actual or potential COI concerns”. As stated in the last sentence of paragraph (b), “The EPA Contracting Officer will determine an offeror’s eligibility for award based on the information provided in the disclosure statement”.
14. Question: There appear to be either extra or missing words in RFP clause L.20(d) in the sentence that reads “Accordingly, the fact that a firm has worked, is working, or plans to work for any type with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services, will not necessarily disqualify the firm from consideration for

award on the basis of significant or potential COI.” Please clarify. Answer: Paragraph (d) of the Clause L.20 entitled; “Disclosure Requirements for Organizational Conflicts of Interest (Local LC-09-03) (DEC 2001) Deviation” is hereby changed as follows: “ (d) The purpose of requiring the information covered by Paragraph (b) above is to provide the Agency with an opportunity to assess its vulnerabilities relative to organizational COI with respect to individual offerors prior to award. The Agency recognizes that there exists a need for firms to gain the requisite experience necessary to fulfill the requirements of the proposed contract and that such experience is often gained through provision of consulting or related technical services to any type with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services. Accordingly, the fact that a firm has worked, is working, or plans to work with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services, will not necessarily disqualify the firm from consideration for award on the basis of significant or potential COI. There is no precise formula for determining whether a firm's business or financial relationships or its past, present, or future effort performing any type with firms or organizations that provide remediation and waste management services would result in a determination by the contracting officer that award to a particular offeror would not be in the best interest of the Government due to organizational COI concerns. Each offeror will be evaluated individually on the basis of the information disclosed pursuant to the requirements of this provision and upon the adequacy of the offeror's plan for avoiding, neutralizing, or mitigating such conflicts. In summary, the Agency is seeking a technically qualified firm which can demonstrate that its activities and relationships will not impact its ability to provide unbiased work products to the Agency under the proposed contract”.

15. Question: Clauses H.5 and L.20 detail EPA's concerns about organizational conflict of interest as it relates to firms that provide remediation and waste management services. You've indicated that COI requirements can be met by firms whose business includes substantial remediation and waste management support to private sector and government clients with an acceptable COI plan. Other options include the creation of a subsidiary business entity to insulate the contract support team at GWERD from a company's mainstream business. Is the agency comfortable that the COI issues can be handled with a COI plan? Or should remediation/waste management firms consider a separate business entity for the GWERD support team? Answer: The offeror's response to the disclosure statement requirements, along with their COI plan will be evaluated in accordance with the identified provisions of the solicitation.
16. Question: The subtotals summing all P-level hours appear to be in error for the five optional quantity periods (see page 5 of 6; Attachment 5). Rather than 46,060, the correct number appears to be 47,000. All other totals appear correct. Are we correct in our assessment? Answer: See question #5 same question and answer.

B. As a result of the above changes, answers and corrections, the following attachments have been replaced in the solicitation:

- Technical Evaluation Criteria, Solicitation Attachment #3
- Technical Proposal Instructions, Solicitation Attachment #4
- Cost Proposal Instructions, Solicitation Attachment #5
- Definition of Labor Classifications, Solicitation Attachment #6

NOTE: The due date for proposals is unchanged; 4:00PM Local Time 04/08/2008 as identified in block 9 of Standard Form 33 for Solcitation No. PR-CI-07-10997

C. Solicitation Attachments Revised and Replaced per RFP (PR-CI-07-10997)

1. The attachment entitled "TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA" Solicitation Attachment #3, has been modified. The text is as follows:

TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
GWERD On-Site Analytical and Technical Support Contract

1.0 DEMONSTRATED CORPORATE EXPERIENCE (150)

Demonstrated corporate experience in fulfilling similar requirements to those in the Performance Work Statement relative to the following subcriteria:

1.1 Demonstrated experience in fulfilling the technical requirements contracts of similar technical scope to that specified in the solicitation. Similar contract scopes should include: (1) scientific and computer modeling, visualization, data processing, and information management in the areas of geology, hydrology, hydrogeology, bioremediation, contaminant fate and transport, ecosystem restoration and ecology using existing computer codes and developing or modifying numerical codes; (2) expertise in GIS services; (3) expertise in providing technical review assistance on the applicability and credibility of conceptual models and computer models applied a hazardous waste sites; (4) expertise in the area of analysis of organic compounds in environmental samples [This analysis can include analysis by liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS), gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS), gas chromatography (GC), and high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). Techniques can include but are not limited to headspace analyzers, purge-and-trap, automated liquid sample injectors, large volume injectors, thermal desorption, and automated solid phase extractors]; and the analysis of metals [this analysis can include ICP-AES (Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometry), ICP-MS (Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry) or coupled ion chromatography-ICP-MS for speciation]. (5) expertise in the area or document review and analyzing plans and studies of specific remediation and restoration activities; (6) expertise in the area of technical information transfer (ie: technical bulletins and brochures, guidance documents, issue papers, and work shops for areas as stated in the PWS); and (7) expertise in field support. Support can include operation of drilling equipment, soil and ground water sample collection, and the operation of surveying equipment. **(75)**

1.2 Demonstrated experience in managing on-site contracts of similar size and type (type example: CFFF contracts with multiple WA's and subcontractors) to that specified in this solicitation. **(75)**

2.0 **DEMONSTRATED QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL** (300)

Demonstrated qualifications (experience, expertise, education), and availability of key personnel listed below to perform the requirements identified.

2.1 Program Manager (P-4) (100)

- Technical and management experience/expertise with diverse analytical services, support teams, and research support teams.
- Technical and management experience/expertise in research and understanding of subsurface processes and systems and ecosystem restoration.
- Technical and management experience/expertise with methods development and validation for research projects.
- Experience/expertise in the analytical chemistry (soil, organic or inorganic chemistry), soil science, or subsurface remediation field.
- Experience/expertise and adequacy of the proposed Program Manager's ability to manage contracts of similar size and scope (multi-task, level of effort) as specified in this solicitation.

2.2 Sr. Mass Spectroscopist (P-3) (50)

- Experience/expertise in leading analytical support teams.
- Experience/expertise in conducting analysis techniques in environmental studies including GC/MS, GC, HPLC experience in organic analytical methodologies that include the use of GC, GC/MS, and LC/MS.
- Experience/expertise in conducting method development and validation.
- Experience/expertise using computer based analytical instrument data systems.
- Experience/expertise trouble shooting and conducting minimal repair of GC/MS instrumentation.

2.3 Sr. GC Chemist (P-3) (50)

- Experience/expertise in leading analytical support teams.
- Experience/expertise in conducting analysis techniques in environmental studies using GC.
- Experience/expertise in using computer based analytical data systems.
- Experience/expertise in method development and validation.
- Experience/expertise in trouble shooting and conducting minimal repair of GC instrumentation.

2.4 Sr. Analytical Metals Spectroscopist (P-3) (50)

- Experience/expertise and availability in conducting metals analysis of environmental samples (aqueous and non-aqueous) using ICP-AES (inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectrometry), ICP-MS (inductively coupled plasma/mass spectrometry) and

coupled ion-chromatography-ICP-MS for speciation.

- Experience/expertise using computer based analytical instrument data systems.
- Experience/expertise in trouble shooting and conducting minimal repair of instrumentation.

2.5 Senior Science Specialist (P-3)

(50)

- Experience/expertise in scientific computer modeling related to subsurface environmental research and support activities.
- Experience/expertise with a wide variety of environmental modeling software applications.
- Experience/expertise in hydrology, geology, soil science, engineering, or environmental science with research qualifications in subsurface fate and transport processes and ecosystem restoration/rehabilitation issues.

3.0 QUALITY OF PROPOSED PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PLAN

(175)

3.1 Adequacy to plan to recruit, hire, and retain qualified personnel other than key personnel to perform contract requirements, ensure that personnel have the skills to perform contract activities and maintain the requisite level of technical professional skills for their labor categories. Staffing and skill areas shall include analysis of organics, metals, and inorganics utilizing instrumentation as stated in the PWS and staff to perform modeling, GIS, and document review. Adequacy of the Program Management Plan to identify, seek out, and acquire the expert personnel and specialized skills that may be necessary, on a case-by-case basis. **(75)**

3.2 Appropriateness of the overall organizational structure that clearly delineates the personnel responsibilities, lines of authority on contract and work assignment levels and proposed staff levels. **(25)**

3.3 Adequacy of the communication mechanisms proposed to ensure effective coordination and timely management of activities to be conducted under the contract, including a discussion of how communications will be instituted and maintained to ensure effective interaction between the offeror and any subcontractors and between the offeror and the EPA Project Officer (PO) and Work Assignment Managers (WAM). **(25)**

3.4 Adequacy of the system proposed to track and monitor costs and performance so as to ensure performance within the established budgetary constraints and scheduled deadlines. **(25)**

3.5 Demonstrated plan to manage research support activities utilizing existing staff and subcontractors and to provide reports of data and data quality on schedule **(25)**

4.0 APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROPOSED QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (100)

This criterion is established to evaluate the adequacy of the offeror's plan to effectively manage the quality assurance aspects of the contract with the evaluation centered on completeness and relevance of the offeror's quality management plan. See provision in Section L of the RFP entitled "Instructions for the Preparation of a Quality Management Plan (QMP)" (LC-46-22) and the Section E Clause entitled "Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirement (Government Specification)" (FAR 52.246.11).

5.0 PAST PERFORMANCE (250)

Demonstrated performance on all or at least five (5) contracts and/or subcontracts performed during the past three years, including all active contracts and subcontracts, in the areas outlined in the Attachment entitled "Past Performance Questionnaire," such as quality of products or services; timeliness of performance; cost control; business relations; and compliance with subcontracting goals. The Contracts and Subcontracts listed may include those entered into with Federal, State and local governments, and commercial businesses, which are similar in scope, magnitude, relevance, and complexity to the requirement which is described in the RFP..

6.0 PARTICIPATION OF SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES (25)

Demonstrated commitment to the use of Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) concerns, as demonstrated by the specificity with which offerors identify SDB concerns to be used in the performance of work under the contract, as well as the complexity and variety of the work the SDB concerns are to perform.

TOTAL POTENTIAL POINTS (1000)

2. The attachment entitled "TECHNICAL PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS" Solicitation Attachment #4, has been modified. The text is as follows:

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

- These technical proposal instructions supplement those set forth in paragraph (a)(1) of the provision in Section L entitled "Instructions for Proposals (LC-15-21)". Technical evaluations of the proposals will be based on the Technical Evaluation Criteria in Attachment #3.
- The offeror's technical proposal must be prepared as a separate part of the total proposal package, and shall be specific and sufficiently detailed to allow a complete evaluation of your method for satisfying the requirements set forth in this RFP. All cost and pricing details shall be omitted from the technical proposal.
- The technical proposal shall comprehensively address each of the criteria described in

Attachment #3, “Technical Evaluation Criteria,” and shall be prepared in exactly the same order, using the same numbering system for all criteria and subcriteria. The offeror shall include within the written proposal section for each individual criterion/subcriterion all material that is to be evaluated there under.

- Technical proposals shall be limited to a total of 150 typed pages including supporting appendices and diagrams. Paper size shall be 8 1/2 X 11. Pages shall not be smaller than a font size of 10. Any information on pages that exceed the page limit will not be evaluated. Samples of scientific publications or corporate publications in support of responses to technical evaluation criteria are encouraged, and do not apply against this page limitation, nor do resumes. The scientific publications shall be delivered electronically in Adobe PDF or MS Word/PDF on CD-Rom. Additionally, a reference list of the scientific publications or corporate publications may be supplied in hard copy. This reference list shall include the authors, date of publication, name of journal or publication, volume (if any), and page numbers. The publications shall be organized according to the technical evaluation criteria to allow for easy cross reference. Time limit for these materials is 10 years or less. The following items are also excluded from the page limitation; letter of transmittals, cover page, table of contents, dividers, Subcontracting Plan, and Quality Management Plan. Fold-out pages count as one page.

The following instructions apply to the “Technical Evaluation Criteria” as set forth in Attachment #3:

I. DEMONSTRATED CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

This criterion is established to evaluate the prime contractor’s (and any proposed subcontractor’s) corporate experience. In describing corporate technical experience for subcriterion 1.1, include a description of the technical scope of the contract, the contract value, contract type, the sponsor, the dates of performance, the role the offeror assumed in the overall performance, and any other information that would serve to establish the offeror’s technical ability to fulfill the requirements of this RFP. In describing past corporate management for subcriterion 1.2, include a description of the technical scope of the contract, the contract value, contract type, the sponsor, the dates of performance, the role the offeror assumed in the overall performance, and any other information that would serve to establish the offeror’s management experience to fulfill the requirements of this RFP.

II. DEMONSTRATED QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL

This criterion is established to evaluate the technical and management qualifications (experience, expertise, education) and availability of the proposed Program Manager under subcriteria 2.1, and, under subcriteria 2.2-2.5, the technical qualifications (experience, expertise, education) and availability of the proposed PL 3 personnel, relative to the requirements outlined in each sub-criteria [Reference to the (7) seven specified areas in the PWS were removed from this area of the Technical Proposal Instructions]. The Key Personnel must demonstrate experience related to the requirements of the PWS, including the following areas: (1) scientific and computer

modeling, visualization, data processing, and information management in the areas of geology, hydrology, hydrogeology, bioremediation, contaminant fate and transport, ecosystem restoration and ecology using existing computer codes and developing or modifying numerical codes; (2) expertise in GIS services; (3) expertise in reviewing technical documents associated with remediation and corrective actions; (4) expertise in the area of analysis of organic compounds in environmental samples [This analysis can include analysis by liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS), gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS), gas chromatography (GC), and high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). Techniques can include but are not limited to headspace analyzers, purge-and-trap, automated liquid sample injectors, large volume injectors, thermal desorption, and automated solid phase extractors]; and the analysis of metals using ICP-AES (inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectrometry), ICP-MS (inductively coupled plasma/mass spectrometry) and coupled ion chromatography-ICP-MS for speciation; (5) expertise in the area of document review and analyzing plans and studies of specific remediation and restoration activities; (6) expertise in the area of technical information transfer (i.e., technical bulletins and brochures, guidance documents, issue papers, and work shops for areas as stated in the PWS); and (7) expertise in field support. Support can include operation of drilling equipment, soil and ground water sample collection, and the operation of surveying equipment. All proposed personnel must meet the qualifications set forth in the RFP attachment, "Definition of Labor Classifications". All claims of qualifications must be supported by specific descriptions of the education and experience. At a minimum, an offeror shall provide the individual's resume and present the following items in simple, systematic table format or listing:

- A. Name, professional level, job title, and proposed role under the contract.
- B. Degree(s) held and corresponding field of study.
- C. Specific project experience related to the PWS area(s) of responsibility.
- D. Years of experience in each area related to the PWS.
- E. State relevance of the experience to the PWS

III. QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

This criterion is established to evaluate the quality of the offeror's plan to effectively manage the contract with the evaluation centered on the specific aspects covered by each of the subcriterion.

For subcriterion 3.1, offerors shall describe the adequacy of the offeror's plan to effectively recruit, hire, and retain qualified personnel other than key personnel and describe the offeror's plan to effectively maintain the requisite level of technical professional skills for each labor categories as outlined in the PWS.

For subcriterion 3.2, offerors shall describe how their overall organizational structure delineates the responsibilities, lines of authority, on contract and work assignment levels, and proposed staff levels to accomplish the work requirements set forth in the RFP.

For subcriterion 3.3, offerors shall describe communications mechanisms to ensure effective coordination and timely management of activities to be conducted under the contract. The offeror shall describe the strategy for managing work assignments with quick turn around time, rapid response deadlines, and providing smooth, efficient, coordination between the contractor and subcontractor, or the work assignment managers or project office.

For subcriterion 3.4, offerors shall describe the adequacy of the proposed system to track and monitor costs, hours, and performance under the contract. If subcontractors are to be utilized, the system to track and monitor subcontractor costs, hours, and performance should also be included. The offeror shall also address its understanding of the problems associated with performance under a contract of this type (multiple, ongoing analytical and method development type projects, with changing priorities).

For subcriterion 3.5, offerors shall describe the plan to manage research support activities utilizing existing staff and subcontractors and to provide reports of data and data quality on schedule.

IV. APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROPOSED QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

This criterion is established to evaluate the adequacy of the offeror's plan to effectively manage the quality assurance aspects of the contract with the evaluation centered on completeness and relevance of the offeror's quality management plan. See provision in Section L entitled "Instructions for the Preparation of Quality Management Plan (QMP)" (LC-46-22) and the Section E clause entitled "Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirements (Government Specification)" (FAR 52.246.-11).

V. PAST PERFORMANCE

This criterion is established to evaluate information which the Government will elicit from entities regarding their contractual experience with the offeror. List all or at least five contracts or subcontracts completed during the last three years and all contracts and subcontracts (similar to the subject requirement) currently in progress. See the Section L Clause "PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION" for more proposal instructions regarding the evaluation criterion. References may be contacted by the Government and used in the evaluation of the offeror's past performance. References contacted and used to evaluate past performance are not limited to those identified by the offeror.

VI. SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

Offeror is to identify and discuss any small disadvantaged business (SDB) concerns the offeror plans to use for the contract and targets expressed as percentages only. ALL SDB CONCERNS SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED AND EVALUATED UNDER THIS CRITERION SHALL BE LISTED IN ANY RESULTING CONTRACT. (See Section I, FAR 52.219-25, Section H clause EPAAR 1552.219-73, Section L, EPAAR 1552.219-72, and Section M provision EPAAR

1552.219-74. Offerors shall provide (a) proposed targets expressed only as percentages of total proposed contract amount in each applicable North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Industry Subsectors as determined by the Department of Commerce, (b) a total target (expressed only as percentages) for SDB participation by the prime contractor, including joint venture partners and team members, and (c) a total target (expressed only as percentages) for SDB participation by subcontractor. NOTE: THE OFFEROR'S RESPONSE TO THIS CRITERIA MUST ALSO BE INCLUDED IN THE OFFEROR'S COST PROPOSAL. IN THE COST PROPOSAL, OFFEROR'S SHALL PROVIDE THEIR PROPOSED TARGETS EXPRESSED IN BOTH DOLLARS AND PERCENTAGES OF THE TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACT AMOUNT FOR (a), (b), AND (c).

3. The attachment entitled "COST PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS", Solicitation Attachment #5, has been modified. The text is as follows:

COST PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

The following paragraphs supplement the instructions set forth in the provision entitled "Instructions for the Preparation of Technical and Cost or Pricing Proposals". These instructions apply to both the prime contractor as well as subcontractors. It is the prime contractor's responsibility to ensure that all instructions are disseminated to subcontractors.

In the cost proposal, the offeror must certify that all proposed personnel (including proposed subcontractor personnel) meet the qualifications specified in the RFP. In the cost proposal, offerors shall demonstrate that the labor rates for the individuals identified in the technical proposal are included in the labor rate calculations in the cost proposal. Those individuals included in the technical proposal must be included in the cost proposal in a magnitude consistent with the significance of their role in the technical proposal. For example, an individual included in the technical proposal with significant expertise and credentials, who is being included to respond to technical criteria and earn a favorable technical review, should also proportionately be included in the cost proposal at a level of effort reflecting the potential anticipated usage of that individual, so that a crosswalk of expertise and cost is evident. The individual should not, logically, be included in the cost proposal for a very minimal level of effort (i.e., 5 hours) when the proposed individual has been a significant part of the technical expertise evaluation. If individuals in the technical proposal are included in an average labor cost center/pool, offerors shall demonstrate how those individuals are included in the respective cost center/pool for which they are proposed.

Proposals shall be numbered "1 of 9, 2 of 9, etc." on the front cover of the proposal.

(a) Offerors shall submit a total of 11 summary pages in their chosen format, each showing the total cost and fee proposed for each block of hours below. The offeror's summary sheets shall be supplemented as necessary to provide thoroughness and clarity in the data presented.

1. Base Period, Base Level of Effort (LOE)
2. Base Period, Optional LOE
3. Option Period 1, Base LOE
4. Option Period 1, Optional LOE
5. Option Period 2, Base LOE

- 6. Option Period 2, Optional LOE
- 7. Option Period 3, Base LOE
- 8. Option Period 3, Optional LOE
- 9. Option Period 4, Base LOE
- 10. Option Period 4, Optional LOE
- 11. Aggregate, All Periods, All LOE

(b) The cost breakdown supporting the above documents for the prime contractor and all subcontractors, shall be prepared in the following format:

	Base LOE				Optional LOE				TOTAL		
	Base	Opt 1	Opt2	Opt3	Opt 4	Base	Opt1	Opt2		Opt3	Opt4
Total Direct Labor											
Fringe Benefits											
Overhead											
Travel											
ODC											
Consultants											
Subcontract											
X											
Y											
Z											
Total Subcontract											
Subtotal											
G&A											
Total Cost											
Base Fee											
Total Cost Plus Fee											

(c) All pages in the cost proposal should be numbered. An index with appropriate page references should be included. A complete narrative explanation regarding the basis of each cost element should also be included.

(d) The direct labor hours to be used to develop the cost proposal are detailed in Subparagraph (i) below. It is noted that no estimate has been included for company management or other support. If it is your disclosed practice to include company management, or other support as a direct cost, then your proposal must include an estimate of the hours and associated costs that you believe will be necessary to support the specified level of effort. A narrative explanation of the basis of this estimate must also be included. If company management, or other support is recovered through an indirect cost pool, no direct cost estimate is required. Your proposal must clearly indicate whether your disclosed practice is to recover company management, and other support effort as a direct or indirect cost.

(e) The direct labor hours in Subparagraph (i) are the estimated workable hours required by the Government. These hours do not include release time such as holiday, vacation, and sick leave. The portion of release time allocable to the proposed direct labor hours shall be computed and shown separately from the direct labor rate. If these costs are normally included in a fringe benefit or other indirect cost rate, separate identification is not required. However, if release time or other labor-related costs are factored into your direct labor rates, these costs must be separately identified in your proposal. Your proposal should clearly indicate your disclosed practice regarding recovery of release time or paid absence.

(f) For each contract period, the offeror shall propose the amount specified in Subparagraph (i) for Other Direct Cost (ODC). The specified amount may be allocated between the prime contractor and subcontractors if applicable. The estimated distribution of the specified ODC appears under the level of effort chart. If you anticipate additional ODCs

other than those listed in the distribution, your cost proposal must identify such cost as separate line items. Narrative explanation regarding the basis of the additional ODCs must also be included.

(g) When subcontract effort is included in the cost proposal, the prime contractor shall submit charts for each period (base level of effort and optional level of effort as separate charts) and for the aggregate (all periods, all hours) which clearly indicate the exact allocation of the specified level of effort among the prime contractor and the proposed subcontractors. Specified labor categories as well as job titles within the labor categories should be identified. THIS CHART SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN BOTH THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL AND THE COST PROPOSAL. HOWEVER, ONLY IN THE COST PROPOSAL SHOULD THE CHART ALSO REFLECT THE ALLOCATION OF THE SPECIFIED ODC.

(h) Offerors shall prepare proposals utilizing the labor categories, level of effort and ODC specified in the chart below. The level of effort is estimated to approximate the mix that will be required and is used primarily to provide a sound basis on which to compare competing cost proposals. The actual mix of hours incurred in performance of any resulting contract may vary greatly due to unknown factors that make the use of a level-of-effort contract necessary. Documents shall be submitted showing this data, one for each column in the chart below.

The cost must be broken down by discipline only if there are different labor rates for disciplines within a professional level. The disciplines identified under the professional categories are provided to reflect the professional titles commonly associated with the work to be performed under this contract. Those submitting proposals are encouraged to submit a professional staff which demonstrate the appropriate technical expertise and competence involved in these disciplines. The official titles of the proposed staff need not correlate with this list, which is provided merely to demonstrate the levels of expertise being sought. If the cost is not broken down by discipline, the proposal shall include a statement that rates are the same for all disciplines within a professional level.

The amounts shown for ODC do not include any indirect cost or fee. If it is your disclosed practice to apply an indirect rate to any of the categories of cost listed below, that indirect cost would be over and above the specified amounts. Your proposal should identify the applicable indirect cost as a separate line item.

The prime contractor and all subcontractors must include a statement that it is their normal accounting practice to charge the cost items specified below as direct costs. If any of the items are normally indirect costs, the proposal shall indicate the items and the allocated ODC amount shall be reduce accordingly.

If the prime contractor or any subcontractor has any normal ODC items that are not included in the list shown below, the basis for the ODC shall be explained in the proposal and the appropriate amount shall be added to the specified ODC.

(i) The format on the following page is provided as a guideline in preparing the charts.

Note:

If it is your practice to propose uncompensated overtime, please indicate this information in your cost proposal.

If the indirect cost rates included in your proposal and/or your subcontractors' proposals are lower than the current, approved forward-pricing rates or current, approved provisional billing rates, it shall be assumed that these are ceiling rates and they shall be incorporated into any resultant contract as such if the award is made upon initial proposals. If there is any objection to this, an explanation to the approach taken must be included in the narrative section in your proposal.

If a proposed subcontractor does not have any approved accounting system (one that is considered adequate for use on Government cost-type contracts), consent for a cost type (CPFF, etc.) subcontract will not be granted. Under this situation, a fixed-rate type subcontract would be more appropriate, and for proposal purposes, the ODCs should remain with the prime contractor. During performance the ODCs must be managed by the prime

contractor but may be allocated to the subcontractor on an as-needed basis. Please keep this in mind when negotiating the contract type with your subcontractors.

NOTE: PLEASE REFER TO ATTACHMENT #6 ENTITLED "DEFINITIONS OF LABOR CLASSIFICATIONS."

Table 1- Level of Effort Distribution												
Labor Category	P/T Lvl	Base Hours	Base Qty Opt Hours	Opt I Hours	Opt I Qty Opt Hours	Opt II Hours	Opt II Qty Opt Hours	Opt III Hours	Opt III Qty Opt Hours	Opt IV Hours	Opt IV Qty Opt Hours	Total Hours
Program Manager	P4	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
TOTAL P-4		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
Sr Scientist Specialist	P3	3760		3760		3760		3760		3760		18800
Senior GC Chemist	P3	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
Sr Mass Spectroscopist (GC/LC/MS)	P3	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
Sr Mass Spectroscopist	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Sr. Analytical Metals Spectroscopist	P3	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
HPLC/MS Chemist	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Mass Spec Chemist	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Environmental Specialist	P3		7520		7520		7520		7520		7520	37600
Sr. Computer Programmer	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Sr. Inorganics Chemist	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Sr. GIS Specialist	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Isotope Ration Mass Spectroscopist	P3		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
TOTAL P-3		9400	20680	9400	20680	9400	20680	9400	20680	9400	20680	150400
Operations Manager	P2	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
GC Chemist	P2	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	18800
GC/MS Chemist	P2	1880	5640	1880	5640	1880	5640	1880	5640	1880	5640	37600
GC/MS Headspace Chemist	P2	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	1880	18800
Inorganics Chemist	P2		3760		3760		3760		3760		3760	18800

Extractions Chemist	P2		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Driller	P2		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Database Specialist	P2		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
TOTAL P-2		7520	18800	7520	18800	7520	18800	7520	18800	7520	18800	131600
Extractions Chemist	P1	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400
Jr. Inorganics Chemist	P1		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Sample Tracker	P1		1880		1880		1880		1880		1880	9400
Physical Scientist	P1	1880	3760	1880	3760	1880	3760	1880	3760	1880	3760	28200
TOTAL P-1		3760	7520	3760	7520	3760	7520	3760	7520	3760	7520	56400
TOTAL ALL P-LEVEL HOURS		22560	47000	22560	47000	22560	47000	22560	47000	22560	47000	347800
Glassware Technician	T3		940		940		940		940		940	4700
Clerical	T3	1880		1880		1880		1880		1880		9400

Table 2 - Other Direct Costs											
Cost	Base	Opt Qty - Base	Opt I	Opt Qty - Opt I	Opt II	Opt Qty - Opt II	Opt III	Opt Qty - Opt III	Opt IV	Opt Qty - Opt IV	Total
Supplies	\$200,000	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$175,000	\$200,000	\$175,000	\$1,875,000
Travel	\$10,000	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$30,000	\$35,000	\$30,000	\$35,000	\$30,000	\$35,000	\$265,000
Medical Monitoring	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$75,000
Relocation	\$40,000	\$25,000	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$210,000
Fixed Price* Subcontracts	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$250,000
Total	\$310,000	\$230,000	\$310,000	\$205,000	\$310,000	\$230,000	\$310,000	\$230,000	\$310,000	\$230,000	\$2,675,000

*** The services associated with the ODC for Fixed Priced Subcontracts shall be proposed as indicated in Table 2, Other Direct Costs, but should not be captured in the direct labor hours of Table 1, Level of Effort Distribution. (Note: Only Fixed Price subcontracts that shall be proposed as ODC's are those necessary for annual maintenance/service agreements for the laboratory equipment. Other Fixed Price subcontracts, eg., for lab analysis services shall not be proposed as ODC's.)**

(j) "In the cost proposal, offerors shall provide (a) proposed targets expressed as both percentages and dollars of the total proposed contract amount in each of the applicable North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Industry Subsectors as determined by the Department of Commerce, (b) a total target (expressed as both percentages

and dollars) for SDB participation by the prime contractor, including joint venture partners and team members, and (c) a total target (expressed as both percentages and dollars) for SDB participation by subcontractors."

4. The attachment entitled "DEFINITION OF LABOR CLASSIFICATIONS" Solicitation Attachment #6, has been modified. The text is as follows:

DEFINITION OF LABOR CLASSIFICATIONS

The following definitions of the labor classifications are provided to aid in the preparation of the technical and cost portions of the offeror's proposal.

Professional Level 4 (PL-4) - Plans, conducts, and supervises projects of major significance, necessitating advanced knowledge and the ability to originate and apply new and unique methods and procedures. Supplies technical advice and counsel to other professionals. Generally operates with wide latitude for unreviewed action.

Typical Title:	Program Manager
Normal Qualifications:	Ph.D. Degree or equivalent (Note: Equivalent means the Program Manager must have a M.S. Degree plus 4 years of experience or graduate level study in the proposed field of expertise for a Ph.D).
Experience:	10 years or more

Professional Level 3 (PL-3) - Under general supervision of program manager, these professional level personnel (listed below) shall plan, conduct, and supervise assignments normally involving smaller or less important projects. Estimates and schedules work to meet completion dates. Directs assistance, reviews progress, and evaluates results, makes changes in project implementation or design where necessary. Operates with some latitude for unreviewed action or decision.

Typical Title:	Senior Scientist Specialist, Senior Analytical Metals Spectroscopist, Senior Mass Spectroscopist, Senior GC Chemist, HPLC/MS Chemist, Mass Spectroscopist Chemist, Environmental Specialist, Senior Computer Programmer, Senior Inorganics Chemist, Senior GIS Specialist, Isotope Ratio Mass Spectroscopist
Normal Qualifications:	Masters Degree or equivalent
Experience:	6-12 years (Note: A minimum of 10 years shall be demonstrated for the Sr. Mass Spectroscopist, Sr. GC Chemist, Sr. Analytical Metals Specialist and Sr. Science Specialist)

Professional Level 2 (PL-2)- Under supervision of a senior or project leader, carries out assignments associated with specific projects. Translates technical guidance received from supervisor into usable data applicable to the particular assignment; coordinates the activities of juniors or technicians. Work assignments are varied and require some originality and ingenuity.

Typical Title:	GC Chemist, GC/MS Chemist, GC/MS/Headspace Chemist, Inorganics Chemist, Extractions Chemist, Driller, Database Specialist, Operations Manager
Normal Qualifications:	B.S. Degree or equivalent
Experience:	3-8 years

Professional Level 1 (PL-1) -- Lowest of entering classification. Works under close supervision of senior project leader. Gathers and correlates basic data and performs routine analyses. Works on less complicated assignments where little evaluation is required.

Typical Title:	Extractions Chemist, Physical Scientist, Jr. Inorganics Chemist, Sample Tracker
Normal Qualifications:	B.S. Degree or equivalent
Experience:	0-3 years

Experience/Qualification Substitutes for PL-3, PL-2 and PL-1 personnel

Any combination of additional years of experience in the proposed field of expertise plus full time college level study in the particular field totaling four years will be acceptable for a B.S. Degree.

A B.S. Degree plus any combination of additional years of experience and graduate level study in the proposed field of expertise totaling four years will be an acceptable substitute for a Masters Degree.

A B.S. Degree plus any combination of additional years of experience and graduate level study in the proposed field of expertise totaling four years for a Master Degree plus four years of either additional experience or graduate level study in the proposed field of expertise will be an acceptable substitute for a PhD. Degree.

The following is a list of key personnel, with supplemental experience requirements to the labor classifications above: has been removed from the Definition of Labor Categories Attachment #6.