

Question 2:

With respect to Tritium Operations, please explain how the SRNL interacts and supports this mission on a day-to-day basis.

Response:

The Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) maintains certain staff and capabilities that are critical to the functioning of Tritium Operations. On an annual basis, the necessary skills and capabilities are procured by Tritium Operations via Work Authorization Documents. SRNL's principle support is for Directed Stockpile Work (DSW), which includes a direct interface with the Weapons Design Laboratory (LANL and LLNL) scientists and engineers, to ensure producibility of new or modified gas transfer system designs. SRNL also prepares the specifications and designs for special tools, gages, fixtures and test equipment for production activities. SRNL staff performs the examination of gas transfer system components and prepares the related reports as part of the NNSA Stockpile Evaluation Program. Another important function of SRNL is to support the maintenance and modernization of the Tritium Facilities, through the diagnosis of material failures and the development of new production, instrumentation, and detection technologies. This support includes the development of improved techniques and materials for hydrogen isotope storage, which is beneficial for Tritium Operations and has the potential for commercial applications. Some of this development work is conducted in the Center for Hydrogen Research.

Questions 3 and 4:

What DOE office is the landlord for SRNL? Which organization within DOE-SR is responsible for SRNL?

Response:

The DOE Office of Environmental Management is responsible for SRNL. The Office of the Assistant Manager for Nuclear Material Stabilization Project is the DOE-SR organization at DOE-SR currently responsible for SRNL.

Question 5:

What is the source of SRNL LDRD funding? At what level?

Response:

The SRNL LDRD program is conducted in accordance with DOE Order 413.2B, Laboratory Directed Research and Development. For fiscal year 2007, the funding level has been established at 2% of the laboratory's total operating and capital equipment budgets, including non-DOE funded work. The system for accrual of these funds, to a reasonable extent, provides for equitable pro rata contributions by all sources of operating and capital equipment funding.

Question 6:

What are the FY06/07 budgets for SRNL?

Response:

The FY2006 SRNL funding profile was \$138.2M. It was broken out by funding source as shown in the table below. FY2007 funding is anticipated to be similarly proportioned with increases in both other federal and LDRD funding.

Site funded: Environmental Management	\$63.3M
Site funded: National Nuclear Security Administration	\$29.1M
Non-Site funded: Defense Programs	\$12.7M
Non-Site funded: Nonproliferation	\$12.5M
Other Federal Agencies	\$8.8M
Memorandum Purchase Order/Inter-Office Work Order	\$3.8M
WTP-Hanford	\$4.1M
Office of Science Technology	\$2.5M
Commercial	\$1.2M
Laboratory Directed Research and Development	\$0.2M

Question 7:

We recommend that DOE create an incentive structure that increases the fee for SRNL as the laboratory grows in a manner consistent with DOE's stated intent. This structure could be similar to the way NNSA provides incentive for growth of work for others in other operations contracts."

Response:

DOE is currently evaluating various options to incentivize the growth of SRNL consistent with DOE expectations.

Question 8:

Could you explain SRNL's relationship (if any) to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) with respect to DOE's charter to advance hydrogen technology as a future energy source?

Response:

There is no formal relationship between SRNL and NREL. However, one of SRNL's core competencies is in hydrogen storage and SRNL takes a collaborative approach to address DOE missions.

Question 9:

With respect to SRNL, are there limitations on increase in business volume? Describe the uncertainties of the funding. Is the Strategic Plan available to offerors?

Response:

Support to SRS missions will remain the priority for SRNL. Information on requirements for SRNL business can be found in the following DOE Directives (all are available on the SR Site Management and Operating Contract RFP Website Document Library):

- DOE Order 413.2A, Laboratory Directed Research and Development
- DOE Manual 481.1-1A, Reimbursable Work for Non-Federal Sponsors Process Manual
- DOE Order 481.1B, Work for Others (Non-Department of Energy)
- DOE Notice 481.1A, Reimbursable Work for Department of Homeland Security
- DOE Manual 483.1-1, DOE Cooperative Research and Development Agreements Manual
- DOE Order 483.1, DOE Cooperative Research and Development Agreements

SRNL funding is subject to the same uncertainties as the rest of the Federal government. The recently approved SRNL Strategic Plan has been posted to the Acquisition website.

Question 10:

Will the compliance matrix be excluded from the Volume II page count?

Response:

Yes. Section L will be modified to clarify the expectations.

Question 11:

Does the font Times New Roman size 12 requirement apply to such things as graphics, charts, and figures?

Response:

No. This is the requirement for text only. Section L will be modified to clarify the expectations.

Question 12:

Will an interested vendors list be distributed?

Response:

The listing of individuals and their affiliations who registered at the Presolicitation Conference and Tour has been posted to the SRS Acquisition website. Additionally, a list of companies participating in the one-on-one meetings has been posted.

Question 13:

With the exception of the HEU Blend Down activities and some international non-proliferation activities, it appears that most of the Nuclear Nonproliferation work within the M&O scope is Title II-type engineering support to the development of new facilities, most notably PDCF, MFFF, and the WSB. Is this perception correct?

Response:

The M&O support to the Nuclear Nonproliferation work supports both new facilities development activities and program mission support activities as indicated:

1. For the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF), the M&O scope does include mostly Title II and Title III Engineering Support with some regulatory and site interface support work.
2. The Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility (PDCF) M&O scope includes Title II and Title III Engineering Support, Design Authority, Design Responsibility for some facility components, Construction Management, Startup Testing, and Facility Operation. However, the PDCF Startup Testing and Facility Operation are expected to occur after the contract period.
3. The Waste Solidification Building (WSB) M&O scope includes Title II and Title III Engineering (rather than engineering support), Construction Management, Startup Testing, and Facility Operation.
4. The M&O direct support to the Fissile Materials Disposition Office (FMDO) in 2006 included 224 staff, with more than half of those positions filled by Engineers, Scientists, and other Professionals.

Question 14:

Section L, Attachment D, Item 13 on Past Performance Information Form requires "Regulatory Performance" information. Please clarify what specific regulatory performance data need to be provided.

Response:

DOE is evaluating deletion of Item 13 of the Past Performance Information Form, since specific details related to regulatory performance will be requested in Item 15.

Question 15: Why is DOE going forth with this acquisition plan (i.e., two separate contracts for SRS operation)?

Response:

DOE is implementing the acquisition strategy approved by Deputy Secretary Clay Sell on December 5, 2005 which calls for the division of the current M&O contract into separate contracts for the Liquid Waste Program and the Management and Operation of SRS.

The Department anticipates a long-term presence at the SRS for accomplishment of its national security mission and the research and development activities of the Savannah River National Laboratory. The environmental remediation work at the site is, however, of a limited duration and DOE anticipates an ultimate close to the clean-up function. In the Department's opinion these distinct objectives are best served by focused program and contractor management through distinct contractual vehicles that take advantage of specialized commercial capabilities that are most appropriate to the successful achievement of the mission objectives. This perception was shared by many of the interested commercial entities who provided comments to the Department.

The work of the Liquid Waste function can be logically segregated and is a relatively stand-alone function. The Liquid Waste System is the critical path to the close-out of the Environmental Management mission and separation of this work from the Site M&O contractor will facilitate competition, permit selection of a company with significant, specialized capability to manage and operate the system, and should permit more focused management and acceleration of work at reduced costs.