

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
1	I want confirm if this a new requirement or is there a contractor presently performing the same or similar work (incumbent contract)? If that's the case, can you provide me the contract number and name of the vendor?	This is a new requirement.
2	Will any PPE (steel toed shoes, safety glasses, etc.) be required for the site visit?	PPE is required for the site visit.
3	Where is the listed Attachment 2: Key Personnel and Qualifications?	Attachment 2 will be included with the final Request for Proposal and will be uploaded on SAM.gov.
4	Can we get a list of the attendees from the site visit/industry day?	The Air Force will provide the names of those who signed in on the attendance sheet when responses to Industry questions are posted on SAM.gov.
5	Can we get the slides presented during the site visit/industry day?	The Air Force will provide the PowerPoint slides when responses to Industry questions are posted on SAM.gov.
6	Can you provide an agenda for the one-on-one meeting?	No agenda provided by the Air Force for one-on-one meetings. The meeting is to allow Industry to ask questions to the Air Force and the mission partner. Verbal questions and responses are non-binding, until provided in writing with a response from the Air Force.
7	Can we present our capabilities during this meeting? (one-on-one)	Yes. Capabilities during one-on-ones can be presented during meeting.
8	Will the Contractor be required to stockpile overburden soil for reuse as backfill? a.Has the Air Force identified sufficient space to accommodate the soil piles needed to support the proposed schedule? The maximum soil volume for a five-point composite sample to demonstrate the soil meets FoSS ROD cleanup levels is 500 cubic yards. Each 500 cubic yard stockpile will require an area of 10,000 square feet. The OMCC excavation will generate 500 cubic yards of soil for every 50 linear feet of excavated creek bed. b.Is there a maximum time duration that the Air Force will hold the Contractor responsible for maintaining individual soil stockpiles?	The SOW will state the contractor shall propose how the overburden soil will be handled (i.e., where it will be stockpiled and used as backfill or taken off site for disposal). The SOW will also state the overburden cannot be taken to the CU. a. The Air Force's assumption is that the soil will be stockpiled adjacent to the creek as was done when Trench 1 was excavated (see Figure 1). Soil from Trench 1 was not used as backfill. The soil was held on site until it could be characterized. Then it was placed in the CU. However, the Trench 1 remediation shows that soil can be stockpiled next to the excavation. b. The maximum time the contractor would be required to stockpile the soil would be 40 months. This assumption is based on the 4-year period of performance minus an 8-month period to prepare and approve work plans and designs.
9	What daily volume of waste soil will the OMCC Contractor reliably be able to dispose of at the Consolidation Unit (CU)? a.What is the opening date for waste acceptance at the CU? b.What is the closing date for waste acceptance at the CU? c.How many 10-cubic yard trucks will the CU reliably process through the facility in an hour?	The CU should be able to accept 600 cy per day. Assuming 100 working days during the field season, this would allow 60,000 cy to be placed in the CU during a single season. a. The nominal opening date of the CU is April 1 each year. b. The nominal closing date of the CU is October 31 each year. c. The CU should be able to process six trucks per hour.
10	Will the Contractor be allowed to use an EPA approved landfill other than the McClellan Consolidation Unit for waste or surplus soil disposal?	Yes. All contaminated soil that meets the CU waste acceptance criteria (WAC) goes to the CU. Soil that does not meet the WAC will need to be taken off-site.
11	Are there examples of Radium 226 sites at McClellan that have achieved Unrestricted Release from the California Department of Public Health after using soil excavated from the site as backfill? If there are, what suitability qualification process was used to approve its use?	Yes, Sites CS 022 and CS 024 used this approach. Backfill was qualified using a 5-point composite every 500 cy checked against the site COCs. Additional information is provided within the Administrative Record website. Final Confirmed Site (CS) 022 Final Status Survey Report (FSSR), former McClellan AFB, AR # 470493 Final Confirmed Site (CS) 022 Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR), former McClellan AFB, AR #s 475634.1, 475634.2, 475634.3 Final Confirmed Site (CS) 024 Disposal Pit Final Status Survey Report (FSSR), former McClellan AFB, AR # 452701 Final Confirmed Site (CS) 024 Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR), former McClellan AFB, AR #s 466625 and 466625.1
12	Are there examples of Radium 226 sites at McClellan that have achieved final FSSRs for a Survey Unit that is adjacent to another Survey Unit still contaminated with Radium 226? a.Will a section of the OMCC will be considered completed to a point where it may be backfilled and restored while the downstream surface of it may not meet FSS goals.	Yes, sections of the OMCC, CS 069, and PRL 020 have received unrestricted radiological release while adjacent parts site were still contaminated. a. Two sections of the OMCC east of Building 690 have been backfilled, paved, and released for unrestricted use when the downstream surface did not meet ROD cleanup goals.
13	If radiological contaminants other than Radium 226 delay OMCC excavation, will the Contractor be responsible for costs directly caused by the delays?	This effort is considered non-severable. Should delays occur, the contractor shall inform the AF to include any proposed increase in costs. AF will determine if the costs are allowable.

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
14	The SOW identifies the Radium 226 as being in a 15 foot wide grey layer of soil between 12 and 14 feet bgs. a.Will the Contractor be responsible for removing any radiological contamination wider than the 15’ creek bottom? b.Will the Contractor be responsible for removing any radiological contamination discovered in the excavation sidewalls above that layer? c.Is there a limit to the width of the contaminated layer the Contractor is responsible to excavate?	The depth, width, and thickness estimates provided in the SOW are a good faith best estimate based on all information currently available about the site. The Air Force does not represent that those estimates constitute a definitive limit on the extent of contamination. The objective of the project is to remove all radium greater than 2.0 pCi/g associated with the OMCC. a. Yes, the contractor is expected to remove radium contamination associated with this site, even if it exceeds the estimated 15 foot width. b. Yes, the contractor is expected to remove radium contamination associated with this site, even if it extends higher into the overburden and/or sidewalls than currently estimated. c. The Air Force has not identified a limit to the width of the contaminated layer. If the conceptual model for the site proves to be fundamentally wrong, the Air Force would have to confer with the regulatory agencies to determine what adjustments would need to be made to the remedy. The Air Force would expect the contractor to provide already collected data, logs, photos etc. to support that effort. <u>The Air Force does not expect the contractor to bare the cost of expanding the remedy if the conceptual model turns out to be wrong.</u> Differing site conditions language/clauses will be included in the RFP. A modification will be determined if the identified differing site condition is outside the existing scope of work.
15	Will the Air Force establish a baseline of the structural condition of Building 690 prior to the remedial action? a.Who will monitor the structural status of the building during the remedial excavation? b.How does the Air Force define damage to the building?	The Air Force will establish and document the pre-remediation condition of Building 690 prior to the start of any work inside, beneath, or adjacent to the building. a. The contractor will be expected to monitor structural status of the building. The Air Force will also monitor it independently. b. The Air Force does not intend to define the term "damage" as it relates to Building 690. That term will be removed from the contractual documents. The performance objective will be to restore the building to its pre-remediation appearance, form, structure, and function. FAR 52.237-2 (Apr 1984) Protection of Government Buildings, Equipment and Vegetation will be included with the final RFP.
16	Will the Contractor be responsible for costs or delays directly attributable to encountering previously unidentified utilities in the area of excavation?	This effort is considered non-severable. Should delays occur, the contractor shall inform the AF to include any proposed increased in costs. AF will determine if the costs are allowable.
17	Will the Contractor be allowed to discuss or negotiate issues concerning the OMCC remedial action directly with the regulatory agencies? a.What role will the Contractor play in regulatory discussions?	The contractor will be expected to engage directly with the regulatory agencies frequently and proactively; however, the Air Force will be required to be fully involved with the interactions with the regulators. The contractors are not to perform any functions with the regulators that are inherently governmental. a. The contractor will be expected to discuss the project with the regulators as necessary to meet the project objectives. This will include but not be limited to participating in the monthly BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meetings with the regulators, holding planning meetings with the regulators, and holding comment resolution meetings with the regulators. The expectation is that the contractor will actively and constructively engage with the regulators on a regular basis with Air Force involvement.
18	Does the Air Force have information concerning the condition and use of the property prior to the construction of Building 690?	The Air Force does not have any written documentation on the previous use of this area. The Air Force has a large collection of aerial photographs covering this area over the life of the base, which can be made available to the contractor for review in person.
19	Will the Government consider interviewing for a potential sole source under the 8(a) set-aside?	Currently, this effort is being procured as a competitive 8(a) acquisition
20	Where do the drains in the hangars (B690) drain?	Those drains have been blocked off. They do not drain to any serviceable utility.
21	Will there be a need for a structural engineering study?	Yes, the engineering study will need to be performed by the contractor as part of this project. The study will be included in the revised SOW.
22	Will Sungro stay on the premises?	It is still to be determined whether SunGro will remain on premises. The Air Force's working assumption is that SunGro will be present and the contractor will need to coordinate site work to achieve the remediation objectives while minimizing impacts to SunGro's operations.
23	For the FFP model, what if there was a work unit price vs. linear foot price vs. other pricing options?	Contract Type: Hybrid, as Contract Line Items (CLINs) are Firm Fixed Price and Cost Reimbursable. FFP CLINs will define the unit of measure for the respective CLIN.
24	What is the history of Building 690?	Building 690 was constructed in 1995 after Old Magpie Creek Channel was filled in. The function of B690 did not have an impact on the contamination for this acquisition.
25	How do we price the risk to the contractor?	The AF does not dictate how contractors are to price risk in their proposal.

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
26	Where does the Air Force see the risk of this project?	The Air Force identifies the most likely risks for this project as follows: 1. The extent of the contamination might be greater than estimated. The highest probability risk here is that the contamination will extend deeper than currently estimated. It is less likely the contamination has greater horizontal extent, is present at shallower depths both in the overburden and in the sidewalls, or is present at the surface beneath the pavement. The greater depth is a possibility consistent with the conceptual model. Greater width at the depth of the contaminated layer would only be consistent with the conceptual model if the Air Force has misidentified the location and/or width of the former creek channel. Contamination in the overburden or the shallower portions of the sidewalls is inconsistent with the conceptual model. Contamination at the surface would only exist if flooding had caused radium contaminated sediment to be raised from the creek bed to the surrounding area and the subsequent construction and paving activities had left that contamination in place. The Air Force considers this a low likelihood. 2. Pre-excavation sampling identifies areas as uncontaminated but subsequent excavation of contaminated areas shows contamination actually extends into the area thought to be uncontaminated.
27	How quickly can the CU take radiological waste?	See response to 9
28	Is this a radiological excavation project or a soil management project?	This is a radiological remediation project. Soil management will be necessary as part of the project, but the objective of the project is meet the only cleanup goal identified for this site in the ROD: removal of all soil contaminated with radium-226 above a radiation level of 2.0 pCi/g.
29	Can we take overburden and stockpile somewhere else?	Yes. The revised SOW will allow overburden and stockpile to be taken somewhere else.
30	Can we do rapid testing?	The AF is unable to answer, as It is unclear what is being asked. Site release will be based on soil samples analyzed for radium-226 in a NELAP certified off-site lab using gamma spectroscopy with a 21-day in-growth. In process decisions may be based on any combination of data the contractor finds useful, including but not limited to visual inspection, scanning data, on-site lab data, data with no in-growth or in-growth shorter than 21 days.
31	Looking at the as-builts, how were the buildings reinforced?	The as-built drawings have some structural details on concrete reinforcement and wall details. Sheet S-2 details wall reinforcements. Sheet S-6 and S-7 details foundation reinforcements. S-10 has framing plans and details.
32	Can there be an additional site visit when the RFP is released?	The AF will review the recommendation. The Final RFP will provide information regarding additional site visits, due to the limited amount of individuals allowed. AFCEC can support another site visit, however there is a possibility it may need to be held on a Saturday to minimize impact to the tenants.
33	Can we get the sampling background studies?	The background was established in the Revised Reference Area Final Status Survey Report which is available from the Air Force Administrative Record (https://ar.afcec-cloud.af.mil/), AR # 5777.
34	Pre-excavation sampling-should this be a phase that is completed pre-design?	Yes, pre-excavation sampling should be done before the excavation is designed.
35	What is the final turn-around time for final reports/data packages?	Documents fall into one of three categories: Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) primary documents, FFA secondary documents, radioactive materials (RAM) permit amendment requests. Primary document are plans and reports (e.g., Remedial Action Work Plans, Sampling and Analysis Plans, Quality Assurance Project Plan addendums, Final Status Survey Reports, and Remedial Action Completion Reports). Secondary documents are reports or data packages that form the basis for or become part of primary documents (e.g., pre-excavation survey data reports, reports on sampling of backfill, reports on sampling of the site to show it is ready for backfill, pre-final inspection data packages). The RAM permit request will be a request to the Air Force Radioisotope Committee (RIC) to remove the OMCC from the McClellan AFB multi-sites permit. Primary documents are prepared as draft, draft final, and final. The nominal review cycle for primary documents is 60-60-30-30. The review period for drafts is 60 days. The regulators may grant themselves an additional 30 days. AFCEC then has 60 days to prepare the draft final. The review period for the draft final is 30 days. AFCEC then has 30 days to prepare the final. Any party may request an extension at any stage. Secondary documents are prepared as draft and final. The nominal review cycle for secondary documents is 60-60. The review period for drafts is 60 days. The regulators may grant themselves an additional 30 days. AFCEC then has 60 days to prepare the final. Any party may request additional extensions. The permit amendment request is intended to be a single submission, but the RIC might request changes or clarifications. The RIC requests AFCEC allow 90 days from initial submission through approval.
36	Does the government have a compaction standard?	Yes, the compaction standard is 97%.
37	What are the warranty requirements? (what happens if there is structural damage to B690 found years later?)	The Air Force intends to include FAR Clause 52.246-21 "Warranty of Construction" in the RFP.
38	Can we re-use components like fencing, landscaping, etc.?	Yes, as long as the components are kept in similar shape beofre the project began (i.e., good condition)
39	What are the hours at the CU?	7:00 am to 3:00 pm PST, Monday - Friday excluding Federal Holidays

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
40	How do we balance disruptions with risk and working with tenants?	It is essential to meet the cleanup goals to provide protection to human, health, and the environment. The contractor should take actions to mitigate risks such as the potential for contamination to have greater extent than estimated. Mitigation actions could be things such as sampling, trenching, boring, or geotechnical techniques. The contractor will need to use professional judgement to determine what mitigation measures are likely to be effective and cost effective. If SunGro is still present when the field work is performed, the contractor will need to work with the Air Force and MBP to preserve SunGro's ability to operate while still meeting the cleanup goals within the period of performance.
41	Can we get a list of the McClellan Business Park landscaping contractors to help us build our proposal?	MBP uses the following landscaping contractors: The Growing Company Linda Cardenas linda.cardenas@thegrowingcompany.com BrightView Landscape Services (www.brightview.com) 4215 Duluth Ave Rocklin, CA, 95765 Ashley Clark Ashley.clark@brightview.com Fairlight Beard fairlight.beard@brightview.com Cell: (916) 618-2785 Domingo Rivera Cell: (916) 240-0244
42	Will the government accept options for B690 or other buildings?	The AF will identify if options will be included in the Final RFP Schedule
43	Can the RFP allow contractors to submit multiple proposal/pricing options?	Multiple proposals/pricing options are not allowed. Proposal shall comply with the Request for Proposal information.
44	What are the locations of the backfill?	See Figure 2 that shows the locations of the backfill material.
45	What is the capacity of the CU?	The current remaining capacity of the CU is 53,000 cy. However, it is possible to expand the CU's capacity if necessary, so offerors should assume there will be adequate capacity in the CU to accept all waste excavated from the OMCC.
46	Are there any fees associated with using the CU?	There are no fees associated with using the CU.
47	What is the government looking for in an 8(a) set-aside?	Competition for the work required along with a sound technical approach at a Fair and Reasonable price
48	Whose standards must we comply with? Federal/State/municipality?	For environmental cleanup, the contractor must comply with the standards specified in the Follow-on Strategic Sites, ROD, both the cleanup standards, and the ARARs. For building and utility standards, the contractor must comply with Sacramento County standards. For health and safety, the contractor must comply with OSHA, CalOSHA, 10 CFR 20, and Title 17 California Code of Regulations plus specific requirements of the McClellan multi-sites RAM permit.
49	Would the government accept past performance from when a contractor was a key subcontractor?	Section L of the Final RFP will provide instructions regarding past performance as a Prime, Teaming Partner or Subcontractor

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
50	Can we get access to the report with the sampling reports??	<p>There are multiple reports with sampling data from parts of OMCC:</p> <p>Radiological Non-Time-Critical Removal Action for 17 of the 19 Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) 3 Sites (AR#7830); Part 2 of that report covers OMCC and has its onAR number(AR#7830.1)</p> <p>Radiological Non-Time Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) for Eight Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) 3 Sites Northwest Taxiway, Potential Release Location (PRL) 032, PRL 056 and 057, Taxiway 7612, Confirmed Site (CS) 067, Old Magpie Creek Channel (OMCC), PRL 068, and CS 037 (AR # 301088)</p> <p>Final Old Magpie Creek Channel Survey Unit 01 Addendum to the Radiological Non-Time Critical Removal Action Report for 17 of the 19 Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) 3 Sites (AR # 470448)</p> <p>Appendix A9 Final Survey Report OMCC Suth Survey Unit 01 (AR#461828)</p> <p>Follow-on Strategic sites remedial Action Status Report Old Magpie Creek Channel (AR#540129)</p> <p>Follow-on Strategic Sites Final Status Survey Reports (FSSR) Old Magpie Creek Channel (OMCC) near the Building 690 Annex (AR #538391)</p>
51	Is there asbestos testing results available?	Yes, all buildings at McClellan AFB have been inspected for asbestos. No asbestos is present in the buildings that will be impacted by this project. The 10 volumes of asbestos survey reports can be made available upon request.
52	Will a structural engineering study be required as part of the SOW to ensure the structural integrity of building 690?	Yes, the engineering study will need to be performed by the contractor as part of this project. The study will be included in the revised SOW.
53	When were trenches 1, 2, and 3 excavated and sampled?	Trenches 1, 2, and 3 were dug and sampled in 2015. The results for these trenches are reported in the Follow-on Strategic Sites Remedial Action Status Report Old Magpie Creek Channel, URS, 2016 (AR # 540129).
54	Have there been any studies or investigation to determine if the Radium 226 contamination is migrating?	There have been no studies specifically aimed at determining whether the radium is migrating. The conceptual model is that the radium in OMCC was released into Magpie Creek from the sewage treatment plant on the east side of the base and migrated downstream to be deposited in various reaches of the creek, including the OMCC. Since the OMCC was filled in this mechanism is no longer in play. The Air Force assumes all radium contamination at McClellan AFB originates from various activities involving radioluminescent paint containing radium. Evidence from another site at McClellan AFB has shown that such paint is mobile in water but can bound by various types of soil. Given all the preceding information, the Air Force believes there is little potential for horizontal migration of the radium but some potential for vertical migration.
55	Please provide as built drawings for the metal Sun Gro structures as well as building 708.	The Air Force does not have as built drawings for Building 708 or the open shelters in the Sun Gro lot.
56	Please provide list and drawings of all utilities that run parallel to Kilzer Ave between building 690 and the Sun Gro property.	The Air Force will include the utility drawings when the final RFP is issued. The Air Force will also provide any other information it has about utilities throughout the project area. However, as with all underground work the Contractor performing the work will be responsible for conducting utilities location checks before starting to dig.
57	Please provide a link to the Record of Decision (ROD) addressing the Radium -226 cleanup criteria.	The pertinent ROD is the Follow-on Strategic Sites ROD, which is available from the Air Force Administrative Record (https://ar.afcec-cloud.af.mil/), AR # 420534
58	Assuming the sections of Magpie Creek that have been remediated had numerous samples collected, can you provide us with the data on these samples?	The documents containing those sample results are currently available in the Administrative Record.
59	We understand that remediation activities are limited to April - October. Will we be able to perform other field work such as site restoration, paving, etc. outside of those months?	Yes
60	Will the equipment in building 708 be removed?	The equipment in Building 708 will not be removed prior to this project. That equipment will need to be removed by the contractor, but does not need to be restored. Air Force and McClellan park will conduct the inspection jointly.
61	Can the Air Force provide as-built or design drawings showing the footing depths for building 690, including the large support pillars?	The footing depths are shown in the Building 690 as-builts.
62	Are there any excavation logs and/or photos from Trench 1-3 available?	Yes, the photos are available in the Administrative Record annotated in the SOW within the final status survey report of the sites already remediated.
63	Is there any current or historical ground water data available?	<p>Yes. Groundwater in this area is approximately 100 ft bgs, and groundwater flow is generally toward the southwest. More detailed information is available from the McClellan AFB Quarterly Groundwater Reports.</p> <p>This information is located on the Adminstrative Record website. It is unclear why this information will need to be reviewed. This project does not involve groundwater remediation and there are no foreseeable circumstances under which the excavation would extend to the water table which is about 110 feet below ground surface in this location.</p>
64	Will building 690 be totally vacated during the excavation activities?	Yes
65	Can excavated soils be stockpiled adjacent to the excavations including in building 690 prior to backfilling?	Yes
66	We can accept a fixed price contract for a fixed scope/fixed quantity of soil to be excavated and disposed of. How would the AF contract/procure for additional material (if any) that were not originally included in the scope of the contract?	Contract Line Items (CLINs) which are Firm Fixed Price will identify known fixed quantities with additional quantities (options), if required. The AF will need to determine if additional work not originally included) is in within scope of the requirement. A modification will be issued to negotiate additional work into the requirement.

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
67	Will the Air Force obtain a waiver/exemption from CDPH before issuing the OMCC solicitation for potential contamination that is present directly underneath the support pillars in B690?	No.
68	MARSSIM-like surveys were mentioned for part of the OMCC project. Please provide a more detailed description and an example of MARSSIM-like surveys that are expected to be used the MDCC project, including locations and area sizes where these type surveys will be acceptable to CDPH or other stakeholders for final status?	The final status surveys for excavated portions of the site will be standard MARSSIM surveys. Since MARSSIM was not designed to address subsurface contamination technically it cannot be applied directly to clearing potentially contaminated soil. At McClellan, the AFCEC has applied the MARSSIM process to subsurface contamination by treating layers of soil as "surfaces." In this case, the layer of soil from 12-15 feet bgs would be treated as the layer to be released. That layer would be treated as one or more Class 1 survey units (depending on the length and width of the presumed contaminated layer. The number of random samples would be determined using MARSSIM. Any biased samples would be determined based on known site history and conditions. The random samples would be collected on a triangular grid with a random start point. Obviously no surface scans could be performed of the layer in question. Soil samples could be scanned, soil cores could be scanned, or scanning could be eliminated entirely. The latter is the approach used on previous projects at McClellan.
69	Attachment 2 which list key positions is missing from the draft SOW. Does the Air Force intend to send out Attachment 2 to potential bidders?	Attachment 2 will be included with the final Request for Proposal and will be uploaded on SAM.gov.
70	What contract vehicle will this be?	The AF will use a stand-alone "C" type contract vehicle for this acquisition.
71	Who are the regulatory agencies for this work to be done?	USEPA, California Department of Public Health/Environmental Management Branch, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). DTSC and RWQCB usually defer to CDPH on purely radiological issues. However, both will want to be assured that the requirements of the ROD have been met, and RWQCB will need to be able to verify that groundwater and surface water are adequately protected by the remedy.
72	Do you anticipate that the contractor be required to have the state radiological license for this work?	Yes (or an NRC license with a reciprocity agreement from the state).
73	Do you feel like this project will go 8(a) or is there an opportunity for sole source?	Current efforts will be a competitive 8(a) requirement
74	Are there other licenses or labor categories that the Air Force is particular on?	Attachment 2 of the SOW will be included with the final RFP.
75	Has funding for this project been obtained?	Yes. This is a Bona Fide requirement for FY'23
76	Is there any concern on the government side working with an ANC and its subsidiaries?	The AF has no concerns working with an ANC and its subsidiaries.
77	Is there any concern if this work is all completed in house?	This effort has been identified the AF does not have in-house capabilities to perform the work
78	Will bonding be required?	Since there is a significant construction component, bonding is required and will be identified in the final RFP.
79	Has any groundwater assessment been completed at that site?	Yes. This site does not impact groundwater.
80	Is the government only concerned with potential radiological contamination within the base, nothing beyond?	This project is for remediation of contamination within the OMCC. The base no longer exists, so its boundary cannot be used to limit the Air Force's liability. However, this project is intended specifically to remediate the OMCC.
81	Is there still an opportunity for this to go LPTA?	The AF is determining if LPTA is best suited for this requirement
82	Is this coming out as a design/build project since it is mostly construction?	This requirement is not coming out as a design/build
83	Are there any other goals other than unrestricted use?	The cleanup goals are to remove soil with radium-226 greater than 2.0 pCi/g and to obtain unrestricted radiological release. The other goals are to restore all infrastructure (buildings, roads, pavement, fences, utilities, landscaping, etc.) to their pre-remediation condition.
84	Is a proposal that reduces any impact to the tenants more highly favorable?	No. Section M will clearly identify how proposals will be evaluated for award
85	Is the building (B690) new enough to worry if it has been mitigated for earthquakes?	The building was built in 1995. The seismic requirements are specified in the drawing package on Sheet S-1> B.
86	Is an approach that involves as much pre-survey work be favored-an approach that delineated the actual location and amount of radiation?	Section M will clearly identify how proposals will be evaluated for award. General Loads > 3. Seismic Loads > "PER AFM 58-3, CHAP. 13 BASED ON SEISMIC ZONE 3 : Z = 0.75, I = 1.0, K = 1.33 AND CS = 0.14."
87	What is the timing on the release of a finalized SOW?	The release of the final RFP/SOW is TBD.
88	Evaluation criteria-LPTA or performance-based trade-off? Which one are you leaning towards and how would you evaluate performance-based?	The Final RFP will identify how proposals will be evaluated in Section M
89	LPTA reviews have been done different ways, by looking to see if the lowest is the technically acceptable, or which ones are technically acceptable, and see which is the lowest price? Which way will the AF use?	The Final RFP Section L, Instruction to Offerors will provide information
90	RAD materials license (RML) for the state of California- would it be important to have this as part of the requirement?	Yes, or an NRC license with a reciprocity agreement from the state
91	Transportation and disposal-is the Air Force looking for the selected contractor to package and dispose of the low-level radiation?	Yes, the contractor will be responsible for transporting low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) to the CU. The contractor will also be responsible for off-site transportation and disposal of any LLRW that does not meet the CU waste acceptance criteria, which is expected to be a very small amount.
92	Should the CU be able to handle all of the low-level radiation?	The CU should be able to handle almost all of the low level radioactive waste. The CU acceptance criterion for radium-226 is 500 pCi/g. There have been occasional sample at McClellan that exceeded this level, usually due to the presence of a discreet source. The offerors should anticipate that a few drums of waste will need to be sent off site for disposal. The number cannot be known precisely in advance but the Air Force estimates approximately five 55-gal drums for the entire project.
93	What does the government envision in past performance for a contractor? How will past performance be evaluated? 3, 5, 10 years?	The Final RFP will detail past performance information and how it will be evaluated
94	Characterization-how will work unit 4, 5, and 6 be characterized in the scope? And how will this be stated in the CLINs?	AF does not believe the discussions of Work Units 4, 5, and 6 in the SOW need to be expanded or clarified.
95	Can we do the investigation prior to mobilization to remove the remediation?	Yes
96	Is the government anticipating that the work sequence will begin at work unit 1, then 2 and 3 to 6, or will the government take this work being done out of sequence?	The work can be done in any sequence.
97	Is there an intent have another job site walk during the proposal process?	The Final RFP will provide information regarding additional site visits, due to the limited amount of individuals allowed.

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
98	Is this still going out as competitive 8(a)?	Yes
99	Are you looking for additional information on how to structure the buy?	AF is conducting market research to determine the best structure
100	Is there a deadline for providing additional information?	No. Offerors will have the opportunity to submit additional questions once the Final RFP is issued.
101	Is there an expectation that some areas of the creek bed will not have to be excavated?	There is a possibility some areas of the creek bed will not need to be excavated. In the active Magpie Creek channel, which was remediated under previous projects, the pattern of contamination was uneven with some portions of the creek requiring no remediation at all even though sections both upstream and downstream did require remediation. Similarly, the portion of the OMCC already remediated had areas that did not require remediation next to areas that did require remediation. A set of borings taken in the SunGro lot during an earlier removal action found no evidence of contamination. However, the Air Force does not have sufficient information to estimate what proportion of the creek bed will not require remediation.
102	Do you think there will be a challenge to get the regulators to agree that some areas will not have to be excavated?	Yes, there will be a challenge getting the regulators to release sections of OMCC based on pre-excavation sampling. However, it should not be an insurmountable challenge. The regulators have agreed that large areas of McClellan AFB do not require remediation for radionuclides based on samples from borings. The entire McClellan AFB radiological RI and by extension the RODs rest on the conclusion that samples taken at depth using a statistical sampling approach can be used to determine whether an area requires remediation. The approach used during the RI was to treat multiple depth horizons as "surfaces" and apply MARSSIM to each layer. For instance, samples would be taken at the surface, 2 ft bgs, 4 ft bgs, 6 ft bgs, and 8 ft bgs. The number of samples was determined by applying MARSSIM. The sample locations were determined using a triangular grid with a random start point. The regulators accepted those results as being adequate to determine which areas did and did not require remediation. The challenges at OMCC will be to (1) show that samples have been taken from the potentially contaminated layer and (2) show that the samples are of sufficient density to address the discontinuous and sporadic deposition of contamination found in McClellan's creeks and OMCC specifically.
103	How confident are we at the location of the creek bed for sampling purposes?	The Air Force is confident of the horizontal location of the channel. The excavation of the channel east of Building 690, the exploratory trenches west of Building 690 and in the SunGro lot, and the historical aerial photographs are all consistent. The Air Force is confident of the approximate depth of the contaminated layer based on the excavation east of Building 690 and the exploratory trenches. However, there is uncertainty about the maximum depth of contamination for two reasons. First, the sediment layer does not lie at a uniform depth (see Photos 1-3). It meanders vertically in a band that varies in thickness from about one foot in most places to two or three feet in others. The entire layer where the sediment layer is found will need to be removed. Air Force planning documents have assumed the layer to have an average thickness of two feet. Second, excavation of one reach of the active Magpie Creek found contamination extending to a depth of about 10 feet deeper than originally estimated. There is no evidence the contamination extends to such depths at OMCC nor any logical reason to assume it will. However, there is a risk that the depth will be greater than anticipated in some section(s) of the OMCC.
104	The sediment layer is 6-12 inches?	The sediment layer is about 6-12 inches thick (see Photo 1), but its depth is not uniform (see Photos 1-3) based on interviews with personnel performing previous remediation in OMCC, photos, and sampling results. The layer seems to be about 6 inches thick but to vary in depth so that the layer in which this contaminated band is found varies from about 1-2 feet thick. Note in Photo 3, the sediment layer in the sidewall is several feet higher than the bottom of the excavation. This is due to the bottom of the creek being concave as with any streambed.
105	Has anybody put any thought to seismic or GPR to map the hardpan of the creek bed?	The Air Force has not considered using geotechnical techniques to find the hardpan because trenching has proved effective and provides definitive identification of the discolored layer where the contamination is present. The site is probably too deep to use GPR. It is not clear that seismic measurements would provide fine enough detail to be better than boring or trenching.
106	Is horizontal boring still the approach that you are thinking of for this work?	The Air Force is looking for industry to provide its ideas about how best to excavate the material under Building 690. Any approach that is safe, effective, and cost effective will be considered.
107	Is there a survey unit size that has been more successful than others?	No, the survey units have been site specific. In general, the Air Force has used the MARSSIM maximum survey unit size unless there was a reason not to.
108	MARSSIM is based on averaging results and area factors; are we supposed to limit to 2 picocuries/gram or the MARSSIM averaging?	For other projects at McClellan soil has been excavated until in-process soil samples are all lower than 2.0 pCi/g. Then the final status survey has been performed using 2.0 pCi/g (inclusive of background) as the DCGL. The sign test has been used to demonstrate the DCGL has been met. The DCGLemc approach has not been used.
109	Can you speak at all to the prior remediation of the prior area of the creek channel? Lab grow spec with 21 day in-growth (not sure what this answer is) the hole can be left open	The remediation of the portion of OMCC east of B690 has been completed. That part of the site was excavated to the depth of the visually identifiable layer of dark soil that the Air Force presumes marks the creek bottom. That layer was removed and a combination of direct gamma measurements and soil samples was used to determine that the cleanup level had probably been met. The cleanup level was not met in one measurement at the west end of the excavation. The Air Force decided it was potentially unsafe to excavate any closer to Building 690, so a slurry wall was put in place to mark that end of the site and serve as one surface for the final status survey. The final status survey was performed using 100% gamma scan of the layer that had been contaminated and random soil samples. The soil samples underwent 21-day in-growth before being counter at a NELAP certified laboratory using HASL 300 Ga-01-R. The soil samples were used to compare to the DCGL of 2.0 pCi/g (inclusive of background) using the sign test.
110	Tenants/occupancy-is it safe to assume the tenants will remain and how much real estate we can take up?	The Air Force assumption is that tenants will not remain in Building 690 but that Sun Gro will remain in their current lot. Part of the contractor's task is to determine how to stage and phase the work in order to allow Sun Gro to continue to operate. A gross assumption is that the project will make the portion of the lot north of the creek channel unavailable to Sun Gro.
111	Working with Sun-Gro will still require disruption on their lot, correct?	Yes
112	What sort of team composition are you looking for in this requirement?	Attachment 2 to the SOW will be included with the final RFP.
113	Is it safe to presume a best value award?	Section M will clearly identify how proposals will be evaluated for award
114	Can you please provide the documentation that was used to establish the background radiation levels at the site?	Yes, that document is the Revised Reference Area Final Status Survey Report (https://ar.afcecc-cloud.af.mil/), AR # 5777.
115	Is it possible to obtain a number of soil samples to perform our own background measurements prior to submitting a proposal to the RFP? We would obtain the samples and perform the measurements at our cost.	The AF does not support the collection of samples prior to preparation of the proposal due to impacts to McClellan Park's tenants.

	Q&A Received for McClellan Radiological Industry Day	
Number	Question	Answer
116	Are the concrete slabs in the buildings post-tensioned?	AFCEC does not have a definitive answer to this question. There is nothing in the Building 690 slab drawings or details relating to post-tensioning. It seems that if the slabs required post-tensioning there would have been a call-out or detail of the tensioning specifications.
117	Please provide specifications for excavation and backfill, asphalt, concrete, coatings, etc.	The Air Force does not have specifications for the excavation. The expectation is that the contractor will design the excavation so that it accomplishes the cleanup goals safely and efficiently and in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements. The details are up to the contractor. The building and paving specifications are in the as-built drawings. There is no information available concerning the coatings.
118	Please confirm under whose authority are we allowed to backfill.	Backfill will be performed on the Air Force's authority but only after the regulators have reviewed the post excavation site data and backfill sampling data and indicated they have no objection to backfilling.
119	Can the site support a follow up job walk with other members of the team that were not present at the Industry Day?	The Final RFP will provide information regarding additional site visits, due to the limited amount of individuals allowed.
120	Are there specific utilities under the building slabs?	Sheet C-7 of the drawing package shows the Utilities Plan. Table 1 on the page shows the locations and depths of the service line connections to the building utility interfaces to the external utilities as well as the reference drawings that detail the interior utilities of the building. There are no legacy underground utilities under the building. The legacy utilities are either to the West under the cobbles or to the East behind the building. One water service line under the southern end of the building shows red-line notes that this 6" Asbesots Concrete (AC) water line was removed and capped.
121	Please provide available areas for contractor staging and stockpiling of excavations.	The Air Force assumes the soil will be staged north of the excavation similar to what is shown in Figure 2. The Air Force tentatively assumes the areas shown in Figure 3 will be available for staging soil. The contractor staging area can be set up in any of the areas shown in Figure 4.
122	What is an acceptable level of ground settling (B690)?	The floor is designed not to settle. Any new floor slabs need to be doweled at the edges to prevent movement or settlement between the slabs. The contractor will be expected to follow existing compaction and construction specifications and best construction practices to minimize any issues of settling. There are slope break lines on the floor slab drawings where it shows how the floor slopes to the floor drains. The sloping needs to be maintained.
123	Are special transportation permits required for transporting Ra-226 contaminated soil from the construction site to the CU?	No special permit is required to haul soils from OMCC to CU unless driving on public roadways; if driving on public roadways, the driver must comply with all USDOT and California driving regulations.