

**Pojoaque Basin Regional Water System
Environmental Impact Statement Compliance Support Services
Bureau Of Reclamation Solicitation Number R12PS40020**

Questions & Answers

Q1. On Page 108, Evaluation Factor 4.4-Evaluation of Key Personnel Past Performance, suggests that references for key personnel are required, such as Please provide more detailed requirements, such as are references required in resumes?

Answer: *See clause L.16 WBR 1452.215-82 Technical Proposal Instructions for more detailed requirements. You were looking at Evaluation Factors, which do not spell out requirements.*

Q2. On Page 107, Evaluation Factor 3.1, Table of Federal, State, Local government or commercial projects, suggests that a table of our relevant projects is required. However, no other details are provided. Please clarify.

Answer: *See clause L.16 WBR 1452.215-82 Technical Proposal Instructions for more detailed requirements. You were looking at Evaluation Factors, which do not spell out requirements.*

Q3. Page 98 of the SOL details instructions for reps and certs. However, item d.5 is missing. Please clarify.

Answer: *A correction to items d.4, d.5 and d.7 were made. See latest solicitation for corrected language.*

Q4. There are requests for related project experience information in both Factors 3 and 4. Where does Reclamation expect to see offeror's detailed project descriptions?

Answer: *The language in factors 3 and 4 were modified to more accurately clarify what Reclamation is seeking for in proposals. Factor 3 involves Experience (what your firm has done), while Factor 4 involves Past Performance (how well your firm has performed). The information for Factor 4 should enable evaluators to contact your previous and present customers. See latest solicitation for modified language.*

Q5. We suggest that Reclamation consider lowering the percentages of total planned subcontracting dollars, to be more consistent with standard Reclamation goals.

Answer: *This was investigated, and it was determined that the percentages were made mandatory by the Department of the Interior. As such, the Bureau of Reclamation is not permitted to deviate from those goals. However, proposals that do not contain plans meeting or exceeding these goals will not be disqualified on this basis alone, but may receive a less favorable rating for Factor 6.*

Q6. Are team subcontractors, if a GSA schedule-holder, required to provide those GSA rates in the cost proposal?

Answer: *If the proposal includes a [Contractor Team Arrangement](#) document ([CTA document](#)), all contractor teams with a GSA schedule must separately sign its own copy of the Certification Form in Section J, Solicitation Attachment (F), and all copies must be included in the Contractor Team's proposal. If it's a Prime-Subcontractor relationship, the Prime must sign the same Certification Form, which reflects a certification that the subcontractor's proposal to the prime did not include hourly rates that exceed any of the Prime's hourly rates in its GSA schedule.*

Q7. How does Reclamation intend to address field activities to complete cultural resources activities?

Answer: *This question was not clear to Reclamation. The contractor who posed the question will be requested to clarify the purpose and intent of the question, and an answer will be provided in a subsequent RFQ modification.*

Q8. The GSA schedule limits contracts to \$5 million. How does Reclamation intend to address this issue should the final PWS require services exceeding that limit?

Answer: *GSA and FAR regulations do not prohibit a task order award over what is termed a "Maximum Ordering" amount. Regulations allow a GSA contractor to reject a task order exceeding such a ceiling; however, we do not anticipate encountering such a situation due to the significant level of competition involved, as well as the fact that the Government intends to enter into negotiations with offerors within the competitive range.*

Q9. On pages 100-101, the draft SOL evaluation criteria for Factor 1, Technical Capability, states "The extent to which the offeror demonstrates technical expertise in environmental compliance work comparable in size, magnitude, and complexity." It appears this criteria is redundant to corporate and personnel experience. Please provide more detail for the requirements of this proposal section.

Answer: *There is a difference between quality of capability as demonstrated by possession of skills and abilities, and depth of experience. Experience does not necessarily correlate perfectly with technical capabilities, although there typically is a strong relationship between the two. Technical capability is a factor in which the Government seeks to evaluate the contractor's possession of skills and abilities that would likely enable the contractor to meet the Government's requirement. Experience is a factor in which the Government seeks to evaluate the work previously performed, which would, in many cases, correlate with the level of technical capability. Although they might appear to be redundant, the two elements are complementary.*

Q10. On page 106, the evaluation criteria for Subfactor Lb appears to require a completed draft PPIP. Is Reclamation asking for a sample PPIP from previous Reclamation or other related projects?

Answer: *Reclamation is requesting the preparation of a draft Public Involvement Plan for this project. We are looking for innovative solutions which would effectively inform, engage, and get input from the diverse potentially affected publics for this project.*

Q11. On page 107, the evaluation criteria for factor 3 requires a "Table of Federal, State, Local government or commercial projects". This requirement is not cited in the Factor 3 narrative, page 103. Please clarify requirements for proposal section 3.

Answer: *The identified discrepancy is noted. As such, the title of this evaluation factor in Section M was corrected to ensure consistency between the Section L instruction and the Section M factor.*

Q12. Factor 4 criteria states " Evaluation of Reference Information From List of Projects and Questionnaire: This factor will be evaluated based on the detailed information provided by the references listed for Federal, State, local government or commercial projects similar in scope, complexity, and magnitude to the work required under this solicitation that meet (or exceed) the requirements of the Work Statement completed by the offeror within the last 5 years, as well as the Past Performance Questionnaire responses received by the Government. Specifically, it is the extent to which the past performance information suggests the ability of both the firm, team partners / members, and key personnel to successfully manage and accomplish projects in a timely manner, utilize resources, effectively manage subcontractors, and work with project owners, that will influence the rating provided for this evaluation factor."

We interpret this criterion to mean that Reclamation will refer to the corporate experience and references detailed in section 3 and combine with PPQ responses to develop a score for evaluation factor 4. Please confirm/clarify.

Answer: *Factors 3 and 4 will be separately evaluated and rated. Factor 3 is a focus on the work performed and its relevancy to the requirements in this Solicitation. Factor 4 is a focus on the quality of such relevant work performed in the past, and what it suggests to the Government the probability of successful performance for the requirements of this Solicitation.*

Q13. I checked my notes from the previous few days and I did not see a date or dead line for input to the RFI. Did BOR specific a date?

Answer: *There isn't a formal deadline for responding to the RFI (GSA RFQ #647898) in terms of comments/feedback/questions related to the draft Solicitation. However, once the final Solicitation is released, input/questions will be accepted up until 10 days prior to the scheduled proposal submission deadline date, which is anticipated to be 30 days from date of final RFP release.*

Q14. Can a firm be involved in both the EIS contract and the ASR wells feasibility study?

Answer: *At this point in time, the Government believes that all potential contractors for the ASR study would have the same amount of information as Reclamation and the EIS contractor do, including data obtained from exploratory drilling. As this would create an equal playing field for the ASR wells feasibility study, the Government does not expect a conflict of interest to arise for the incumbent EIS contractor in competing for the study.*

Q15. The *Key Contractor Personnel Minimum Qualifications* include a Principal Engineer who is a New Mexico-registered professional engineer with experience in the design of municipal drinking water systems. The Performance of Work Statement does not specifically identify work products requiring a professional engineer. What would be the role of the Principal Engineer for the EIS contractor versus the role of the Design-Build Engineers to be contracted separately?

Answer: *Reclamation believes a Principal Engineer is needed for the EIS to: (1) help us design the preferred alternative in a way that would avoid and minimize adverse impacts to the environment; and (2) describe the various alternatives under consideration and the impacts each would have on the affected environment. An Engineer may also be needed to help analyze and prepare the Water Resources Technical Report. All of these tasks would be completed before the Design-Build firm is under contract.*

Q16. In the meeting it was stated that the EIS contractor would also be responsible for preparing a preliminary jurisdictional delineation and a 404 permit application. Would this also include other tasks that may be associated with the permit application, such as 401 certification, 404(b)(1) compliance (alternatives analysis), and preparation of a compensatory mitigation plan?

Answer: *The EIS contractor will be required to prepare the preliminary jurisdictional delineation, a 404/401 joint permit application, the associated 404(b)(1) compliance (alternatives analysis), and a compensatory mitigation plan.*

Q17. It is specified that the contractor is required to hold a GSA Schedule for at least the anticipated duration of the project. Does this apply only to the prime consultant, or also the subconsultants?

Answer: *Since the Government does not have privity of contract with a prime's subcontractors, subcontractors are not required to have GSA schedule. However, if GSA contractors enter into a Contractor Team Agreement for this project, all members of the team will be required to hold a GSA schedule for the anticipated duration of the project.*

Q18. Will a bid bond (also called an "offer guarantee") be required for this project?

Answer: *Since this is a services contract which will not require performance or payment bonds (typically only for construction), a bid bond will not be required.*

Q19. It is specified that the contractor is required to hold a GSA Schedule for at least the anticipated duration of the project. Does this apply only to the prime consultant, or also the subconsultants?

Answer: *Since the Government does not have privity of contract with a prime's subcontractors, subcontractors are not required to have GSA schedule. However, if GSA contractors enter into a Contractor Team Agreement for this project, all members of the team will be required to hold a GSA schedule for the anticipated duration of the project.*

NOTE: **The following questions were received during the Pre-Proposal Conference on 6 March 2012. Be mindful that long-hand transcription was used to record the questions, so they may not be "verbatim" in most cases. If you recognize a question that you/your firm asked and it is not what you intended to ask, please email the Contracting Officer accordingly at kmunro@usbr.gov so that clarifications can be made.**

Q20. A question was received on where Climate Change will be described.

Answer: Reclamation's current position is that this will be part of the Water Resources report. It is discussed on pages 27-28 of the statement of work – there it will tell you where to insert this information in the EIS.

Q21. Will the Pueblo of Nambé have the opportunity to get some of the money and subcontract any facet of the contract?

Answer: *My understanding is that the Pueblo needs to work with BIA to obtain their share of the \$15 million included in the Aamodt Pueblo Settlement Fund for water-related infrastructure improvements. There will be small business and tribal member employment requirements, I'd imagine, in the construction contract for the RWS. That money is separate from the funding provided to plan, design and construct the RWS. Any pueblo can choose to hire a contractor to do an inventory of their current wastewater and drinking water systems. If you wanted to use a portion of the Pueblo Settlement Fund money to hire a contractor and provide that information to us, that would be helpful.*

Q22: It seemed to me that there wasn't complete agreement in all facets of the settlement. Do you believe there will be any delays? Are there any components of the settlement process that are still outstanding and may cause some type of delays?

Answer: *The EIS process should not be delayed by that. There is a parallel process in the District Court that is ongoing to finalize the water rights adjudication. The court has a process for dealing with any outstanding objections. But that is not going to hold up the process at work here. If you have concerns about the terms of the settlement, you can bring them to the court.*

Q23: Ground Water – other than the Feasibility Study, how much ground water modeling do you expect otherwise as part of the EIS preparation?

Answer: *My understanding is that the BIA, Reclamation, the URGWOM technical team, and the State, will be refining the already existing ground and surface water models for the basin and will also be incorporating the new 4,000 AF diversion into the URGWOM model. So we'll be doing that piece. The State Engineer will be doing modeling related to water rights administration. We'll be doing additional ground water modeling as part of the ASR Feasibility Study. This information will be made available to the EIS contractor. The EIS contractor would be responsible for doing any additional hydrological analysis that is necessary to describe the impacts the RWS will have on water resources.*

Q24: As for firms that are selected to work on the EIS Contract being prevented from bidding on the Design-Build Contract – does that apply to all partners/subcontractors?

Answer: *We're leaning towards disqualifying subcontractors and partners as well. We don't have an official answer yet. We'll get one and distribute it in writing.*

Q25: Would there be a conflict of interest with bidding for BIA opportunities or procurements for the Pueblos, such as the work related to the \$15 million? Is that a conflict with the EIS contract?

Answer: *Depends on what kind of work we're talking about. It would probably be complementary planning work for pueblo infrastructure systems. That is another good question and we'll forward it to legal counsel.*

Q26: In the awarding of the EIS Contract, will we have any Indian Preference?

Answer: That clause is not included in this solicitation. We anticipate it will be included in the construction contract.

Q27: The Phase 2 cultural resources will be included in this work?

Answer: *Yes. The piece that isn't in our Scope of Work right now is the third phase, to develop mitigation plans.*

Q28: The implementation of mitigation plans would be part of the Design-Build contract?

Answer: I'm anticipating the mitigation implementation would not be a part of the EIS support services contract. Depending on the type of mitigation it may, or may not, be part of the design-build contract.

Q29: Are obtaining the permits that will be required for this project, such as the Clean Water Act, part of this contract?

Answer: *Yes, including NPDES permits. Preparing permit applications would be part of the contract, but Reclamation would submit the applications to the regulatory agencies.*

Q30: Cultural Resources – wasn't there a Class 1 survey done recently?

Answer: *There was one done in 2002-2003 that would have to be updated. Another Class 1 survey needs to be done.*

Q31: In Task 6, in some places it seems like you are asking for a freestanding report, in other places, just draft chapters of EIS.

Answer: *Yes, that is correct. We are asking for separate technical reports for water resources and cultural resources, as well as a Wetland Delineation Report. The other resources will just be described in the appropriate sections of the EIS.*

Q32: *Separate technical reports for the Phase 1 literature search and for the Phase 2 field surveys for cultural resources?*

Answer: *Yes.*

Q33: *When are you expecting the Cultural Resources Field Survey Report?*

Answer: *We don't know exactly yet, sometime after the literature search.*

Q34: *Are you going to be looking for additional Program Management services/Construction Management services for the Construction Contract?*

Answer: *Currently we're planning to do those functions ourselves. If we do decide to go that route, contractors will be disqualified from bidding on the Project Management services if they worked on the EIS Contract.*

Q35: *In the PWS, it describes the assumed scope of the project as including 160 miles of pipeline, but doesn't include the miles of new and improved access roads.*

Answer: *The intent is to include all of the impacts in the EIS. What we do know is the potentially affected project area – see map with 36,000 acres shown. We calculated 36,000 acres of potential impact – including a ¼ mile buffer zone around each proposed facility location. We want you to do the Phase 1 literature search for that whole area. The area of potential affects includes areas that may need new or improved access roads. Once we get the results of the literature search that will help us figure out where we want to build new roads. We don't have information yet about the miles of new access roads needed, but we will have it figured out before the phase 2 field surveys.*

Q36: *Is there a way to put an assumption in there so we can all start on equal footing?*

Answer: *Base your proposal on the information available in the final Solicitation and terms and conditions contained therein. Make your assumptions clear in your cost proposals so we can understand what you have in mind for the prices proposed. It is to the government's advantage to have you all start from the same assumptions, and is necessary in order to ensure we can do an apples-to-apples comparison when it's time for the selection. If you see ambiguities, please ask questions as soon as possible. The Contracting Officer will accept questions/comments/feedback up until 10 days to the proposal submission deadline. This deadline will be indicated in the final Solicitation RFQ when it comes out sometime in late March 2012.*

Q37: *Have you considered other contract types or have you decided this is fixed price?*

Answer: *We've decided to do most line items as firm fixed price. We understand that this is a risk inherent with fixed price contracts, and we anticipate that bidders will, on a fair and reasonable basis, price in that risk appropriately. Items where there may be variability in quantities, where they are indicated as per meeting, we will allow fixed unit pricing to accommodate the unknowns in such situations.*

Q38: *Cultural – Phase 2, will that also include some level of effort to do evaluative testing?*

Answer: *Yes.*

Q39: I want to look at the timeline really quick with the ASR. The ASRs are part of the supply system. Is the NEPA clearance for the ASR wells part of this contract?

Answer: *No, we will separately complete the environment compliance for the exploratory drilling and the Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study will include full-size hybrid ASR wells.*

Q40: How involved has the Fish & Wildlife Service been so far and do they have any concerns?

Answer: *They have a representative on the Federal Implementation Team for this project. Her name is Cyndie Abeyta. She will be on the Hydrology and ASR Well Technical Teams and they will be providing input and feedback on those study plans and draft reports. The Fish & Wildlife Service has not expressed any concerns to date about this project.*

Q41: Could there be an inclusion of a list of all those items, related to hydrology, that you expect to make available at some point in the solicitation?

Answer: *Yes, a list of government furnished information that we expect to provide in the future can be added to the SOW.*

Q42: The solicitation notice states a close date of April 14, 2012. Will this change based on revised solicitation?

Answer: *The closing date will be 30 days from the date the final solicitation is issued. Note that the final Solicitation will be released under a different GSA RFQ number, due to limitations of the GSA e-buy system not allowing us to use an existing RFQ number for a final solicitation. Yet, Reclamation's own internal tracking number for the solicitation will remain the same at R12PS40020.*

Q43: Can you please provide a map or detailed instructions for each location to be visited on the Wednesday site visit?

Answer: *A handout with the itinerary and maps for the site visit is available today.*

Q44: I.9 (page 47 of solicitation) describes Offer Guarantee. This section is rather brief and we are not sure we understand the ramifications. Could you please provide additional details?

Answer (replaces verbal answer provided during conference): *The Contracting Officer determined after the Pre-proposal Conference that an offer guarantee (also known as a bid bond), is not going to be required for this procurement. The final solicitation will reflect this accordingly. Although such bonds can be used for non-construction requirements, it would be unusual without a compelling reason. Since this is a pure services contract, it did not make sense to require a bid bond.*

Q45: Section F.1 (page 30) describes the cost for liquidated damages. How does this relate to Section 1.9 (Offer Guarantee)? This seems to be another mechanism used for the same reasons. Wouldn't this be double penalization?

Answer: *There is no relationship between offer guarantees and liquidated damages. See answer to Q42 as it relates to offer guarantees. Liquidated damages are based on a daily rate and the rate is established based on the Government's estimated financial loss due to the failure of a contractor to accomplish required deliverables. It should be noted that the Contracting Officer has a firm responsibility to mitigate liquidated damages in cases where they occur, particularly when it involves Government-caused delays or other factors entirely out of the control or responsibility of the contractor. This is not a clause where the Government*

intends or desires to be “trigger-happy.”

Q46: I am not sure I fully understand the Performance Based Payment. This may not be practicable for such a large project and with such varying effort, particularly for small business concerns. If payment is allotted by CLIN, a substantial effort and time may be required to meet end deliverables. For example, the CLIN 10 and the CLINs for Resource Evaluations (#13-20). These take extensive labor effort and direct costs. Even if payment is on interim deliverables as identified in the PWS, there is substantial time where the company is not reimbursed for labor and cost outlays. This can be problematic for small businesses that rely on steady revenue streams to pay for services (i.e. labor). For example, according to Section F and PWS, no interim or final deliverables occur between November 2012 and June 2013 (about seven months); nothing between September 2013 and December 2014 (about 16 months). Could this system be better explained or better yet, derive a more equitable payment policy to cover such large contractor expenditures?

Answer: *Bidders have the opportunity to propose their own alternate performance-based payment schedule which would protect the interests of both the contractor and the Government. I'm interested in seeing what kinds of ideas you come up with for your own performance-based payment schedule. This is an issue that we can negotiate on if your proposal is included in the competitive range.*

Q47: Could you please provide more detail regarding the Award Fee? How is the fee determined? Is it part of the Offeror's Cost Bid or determined by Reclamation? Is it paid by CLIN?

Answer: *We intend to set up an Award Fee Pool (CLIN 0024), with payments to be made every 6 months and determined via procedures identified in the Performance Evaluation Plan. The amount in the fee pool will depend on how much proposals come in at, and this is another item that will likely be on the negotiation agenda with those whose proposals are included in the competitive range.*

Q48: Does Reclamation determine that?

Answer: *We'd likely negotiate this. It really depends. It is a separate line item in each proposal's bid schedule. How much would it take for you to exceed the schedule? We want to ensure the pool is sufficiently funded to effectively incentivize the contractor to perform to a higher level than the minimum requirements.*

Q49: It is difficult to put this (i.e., proposing an award fee) on the contractors. We would want to cut that award amount down to the lowest possible number in order to be to the advantage of the government. This might be better negotiated with the contractor after award.

Answer: *Yes, that might be a better approach. It is suggested that bidders do not propose an award fee amount (CLIN 0024), so that there isn't the sense of pressure to adversely compromise an amount for the sake of competition that may otherwise become disincentivized in the process. I will try to remember to put in a note on the final solicitation Section B schedule accordingly.*

Q50: Can you tell us how much money is allocated for the EIS process?

Answer: *No.*

Q51: When will a COR be selected by Reclamation?

Answer: *Marsha Carra will be the COR. Don't call her until after the contract is awarded though.*

Q52: There appears to be some discrepancy in delivery dates as listed in Section F of the Solicitation and the dates in the PWS. For example, CLIN 9 of the Solicitation states that the Preliminary Alternatives are due

December 14th. The PWS (page 8) states May 14. Other minor inconsistencies were noted. Will these be rectified in the final solicitation? Will the deliverables dates in the solicitation have preference?

Answer: *Thanks for pointing out the discrepancy. The right answer is that they are due December 14th. We'll make the dates consistent in our final solicitation.*

Q53: Section F, CLIN 1, 4th deliverable is a Monthly Action Items List. Please clarify if the list of work to be completed is for the next quarter (as stated in the CLIN) or is it for the next month?

Answer: *The list of work we want you to submit each month is work to be performed during the next quarter. It will be like a rolling plan.*

Q54: Am I correct that costs described in Volume I will solely be total line items for each CLIN, but that Reclamation expects Offerors to have documentation supporting the specific line item bid (L17 (c) (4) and M.1 (c)?

Answer: The language in this is just saying that the Contracting Officer has the right to ask for additional information. At this time, I don't expect spreadsheets, just the total price for each CLIN.

Q55: Does this conflict with needing to list our assumptions re: pricing?

Answer: *Assumptions will certainly help us understand the scope of your pricing and understand your positions accordingly. It would be to the Government's and each bidder's benefit if the bidder includes a set of assumptions being made as it relates to pricing for each line item.*

Q56: No specifics as to criteria for proposal format is presented in the draft solicitation. Will final include such criteria including page length limit, format criteria (font size, margins), use of 11x17 pages, use of attachments such as resumes, etc.?

Answer: *I think you are the experts, and know best how to tell us what you are good at and how you can meet our requirements. I won't give a page limit or mandate formats, but make sure that only what is germane to our requirement is put into the proposal and that you properly index and organize the information for ease of review and location. Also, avoid including fluff that makes your proposal so large and unwieldy that it becomes cumbersome to review. Otherwise, doing so will only serve to distract evaluators from understanding your firm's capabilities as it relates specifically to our requirements, and this will certainly not help your proposal ratings.*

Q57: Page 3 of the PWS states the Rio Tesuque modification still needs to be determined. Will the extent of this river modification be included in the final documents for accurate bidding?

Answer: *No. We don't have this information yet and we will be working with the Pueblo of Tesuque to get the answer to this, but don't expect it immediately. We will have it in plenty of time to put it into the preferred alternative.*

Q58: So we can make assumptions based on the preliminary report?

Answer: *Yes, and please provide your assumptions. I think you are the experts.*

Q59: Will the project components, particularly the extensive pipeline alignments and roads be surveyed and staked in the field so that accurate cultural, wetland, and biological surveys can be conducted?

Answer: *Pipeline alignment isn't fixed, but we are looking for some information that will help determine the*

final designs – we may end up moving from one side of the road to the other, for example, to avoid cultural resources. We know where it will start and where it will end, but that's about it. There are going to be a lot of factors that we'll come across as we start designing the final alignment.

Q60: We will have alignments and they will be GPS'd.

Answer: *Yes, that information will be provided to the contractor who is awarded the contract.*

Q61: If we have an alignment, would we be expected to do a cost estimate for the part 0- 100 feet on each side of the center line – or...?

Answer: *This is defined on that map that you were looking at earlier. We will enter into discussions on each of those resource areas before it is time to do Phase 2. For purposes of the proposal, assume 5,000 acres for field surveys as discussed on page 25 of the SOW.*

Q62: Section J has an attachment for Key Personnel Qualifications. This includes a climatologist. However, there is no CLIN that describes the analysis effort for Climate or Climate Change effects. Does Reclamation envision detailed climate change evaluations?

Answer: *That was answered earlier and is described in more detail on page 27-28 of the solicitation. We need to meet the requirements of NEPA and the other regulations described in the SOW.*

Q63: Section F, CLIN 20 Air Quality and the PWS description indicates the concern is the increased construction traffic and changes in traffic patterns as the issue regarding air emissions. To determine extent of emissions and possible impacts, traffic numbers and vehicle types will need to be predicted for specific areas. Such a deliverable is not included in the solicitation or PWS. Will Reclamation provide traffic evaluation or will this be part of Contractor Scope? If so, can it be included as a separate CLIN or at least described as a deliverable?

Answer: *We are not going to have a traffic impact assessment done. That usually doesn't take place until further along in the process. For these purposes, we are assuming that you've evaluated other types of construction projects and will do something similar. You will need to do enough of an assessment to provide an evaluation of impacts.*

Q64: I think in the PWS it describes air quality analysis, possibly requiring hot spot analysis. If we do that, we need to have traffic numbers. This seems to be a conflict.

Answer: *A hot spot analysis wouldn't take place at this phase. We will have a lot of traffic during the construction phase. Once that is completed, it will no longer be an issue. We are looking for the standard air quality analysis in that area - typical amount of vehicles, emissions, size of vehicles, number of dump trucks, etc. - typical construction information. The assumption is that there will be no detailed analyses for the EIS. Typically the analysis wouldn't involve air quality modeling.*

Q65: Please confirm that for purposes of preparing an offer the project dimensions are as assumed on page 3 of the PWS.

Answer: *The answer is yes, assume those dimensions are correct, and as further defined in phase 2 of the resource analysis (cultural and biological) on page 25.*

Q66: Does Reclamation have an idea of how many practicable alternatives will be carried forward for full analysis?

Answer: *We discussed earlier today how we've been authorized to build a RWS in substantial compliance with the HKM report, and we expect that to be the case, with minor modifications.*

Q67: ASR wells and Feasibility Study – do you expect that to enter into another alternative, where some wells are used and others are used for storage

Answer: *For this initial look, we'll be restricting this aspect of the project to the 3 well fields that we've already laid out. We'd do a contract modification if this is changed.*

Q68: Does Reclamation anticipate the need for semi-permanent field offices in locations other than Albuquerque?

Answer: *We don't anticipate a need to set up a field office in the Pojoaque Basin during the EIS process. We do anticipate setting up a field office in the Pojoaque basin during construction of the RWS; maybe in one of the construction trailers provided by the construction contractor. We don't anticipate a continuing presence after construction is complete.*

Q69: Will you provide the attendance list from today?

Answer: *Yes.*

Q70: Will assumptions be incorporated into the contract after the award?

Answer: *That would be a good suggestion.*

Q71: Disks (i.e., CD's containing GFI relevant to this procurement), for those of us who didn't get one?

Answer: *They are currently being made as we speak. (NOTE: If your firm did not attend the conference, you may request a CD from the Contracting Officer by sending a request via email to kmunro@usbr.gov.)*

Q72: Would you consider lowering the percentage of subcontracting to be more consistent with Reclamation goals?

Answer: *The numbers in the solicitation are mandatory goals from the Department of Interior. If you have trouble meeting such goals in your proposal, keep in mind that it isn't the most important evaluation factor as it relates to the other evaluation factors, but it will have some effect on your rating for Factor 6.*

Q73: How much time to get the short list and then how much time to prepare oral presentations?

Answer: *We'll have the short list by the end of May; oral presentations by mid-June. We would plan on giving at least two weeks' notice prior to oral presentations.*

Q74: Did you invite the BIA? Are they here? Is this something that may be indicative of problems or delays in the future?

Answer: *BIA is very involved and very busy, but we are working closely with them. We don't anticipate specifically any delays from BIA.*

Q75: Back to the contract. I forgot where but it describes the proposal needs to include draft PIP Public Involvement Plan and it also requests a submittal of draft work plans. How much detail would you expect to see in a draft workplan being as how phase 1 isn't done and there are a lot of unknowns. That kind of points to the inherent difficulty in pricing some of these line items. I'd assume that the contract would have to be

modified, but at this point, it is pretty ambiguous.

Answer: *The intent of submittal of both these plans is to demonstrate to the Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee that you can do those kinds of analyses. Put in lots of caveats, assumptions. Convince the evaluators that you know enough to do this work. After the contract award, the whole team will firm up the schedule. We need enough in your proposals to evaluate your expertise.*