

Coastal Plains EIS
Questions and Answers
RFQ 140L63-18-Q-E001
3/19/2018

1. Will the BLM CARA comment analysis system be used for public comment analysis?

Response: The Contractor may use the Comment Analysis and Response Application (CARA) software in ePlanning or another BLM-compatible software system approved by BLM. BLM is expecting a large number of comments so is willing to consider another system if it is likely able to support this process better. Other tools, methods, and software shall be used to the extent that they are compatible with use of the ePlanning website. The Contractor is responsible for competence in the use of the software and insuring that schedules and deliverables are met. The Contractor shall provide clerical support in data entry, maintenance, editing, and posting of the EIS on the Project website during key milestones. The Contractor shall also provide data entry for comments received on the preliminary DEIS.

2. How many action alternatives should we assume will be analyzed in the EIS?

RESPONSE: NEPA requires a reasonable range of alternatives be analyzed, so BLM anticipates at least two action alternatives to meet this requirement.

3. Will a court reporter be needed for public meetings (scoping, Draft EIS hearings, and Section 810 analysis)?

RESPONSE: A court reporter would be necessary if it is determined it is necessary to hold Section 810 hearings.

4. Will an interpreter be needed for public meetings (scoping, Draft EIS hearings, and Section 810 analysis)?

RESPONSE: An interpreter may be needed. The Contractor should consider the locations that may require an interpreter and include it their proposal.

5. For the Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario task, does the BLM have any potential data?

RESPONSE: Yes. BLM staff, to include the Oil and Gas team, will work closely with the contractor in development of the RFD. This will include providing available data to the contractor and assumptions for the RFD. BLM staff would help determine the general

location where a central processing facility could be located, as well as a general range of future development of infrastructure based on technology and previous experiences with the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. We would also provide expertise for the different phases exploration, development and long-term production.

6. RFP did not include Exhibit 1 (past performance template). Is it acceptable to create our own template based on the requested information in Section 3.2(c) Past Performance?

RESPONSE: It is acceptable to create your own.

7. Will air modeling be required?

RESPONSE: Not as part of this requirement.

8. Will the BLM please consider a solicitation extension of one additional week for questions and an additional 3 weeks of proposal prep?

RESPONSE: A one-week extension is granted. An additional 3 weeks of proposal prep will not be granted.

9. Will the BLM please consider a time and materials with an estimated level of effort contract?

RESPONSE: At this time we are not looking at changing the contract format.

10. Is it possible to get a few extra days to put the proposal together? This is a complex proposal and the text submission requirements will take some time to assemble.

RESPONSE: A one-week extension is being discussed with the BLM team. We will notify vendors as soon as a decision is made on this.

11. Are all biological and cultural resources surveys already completed? If not, those are presumably not part of this RFP?

RESPONSE: The Contractor should assume they will need to compile new and historical information, and extract information from existing technical reports, however, will not need to conduct new surveys as part of this RFP.

12. In Section 3.2(d) of the RFQ (Page 3 of 6), it states that vendors must propose on all contract line items to be considered responsive. Is there a specific bid form that offerors should use for its price proposal? Please clarify on the contract line items.

RESPONSE: An attachment is being sent for our proposed breakdown. Each task will be a separate line item.

13. In Section 4.2(b) of the RFQ (Page 4 of 6), it states that the Government shall evaluate quotes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Please confirm if this is a typo or advise which tasks are considered base and optional.

RESPONSE: Each task will be a separate line item. Line item (Task) 1, 2, and 3 will be the initially funded line items with 4, 5, 6, and 7 initially being option line items.

14. In Section 7 of the PWS (Page 10 of 23), it states that the tentative completion date for the EIS is March 2019, which would entail an approximate 12-month period of performance; however, in Appendix A of the PWS (Page 19 of 23), it shows the timeline for the final task completed in Months 15 and 16. Please clarify the period of performance.

RESPONSE: The completion of the EIS would be 12 months from the date of the Notice of Intent (currently estimated to be published in March 2018), in accordance with Secretarial Order 3355. It is expected the final task (drafting Record of Decision) will occur after that 12-month period. Appendix A has been revised for clarity, however, the tentative schedule was provided as an example but the Contractor should develop a schedule that complies with the requirements of the Performance Work Statement as part of their proposal.

15. The SOW states the contractor to assist with the preparation of BA as needed (p.3); however, there is no BA task in the SOW. Please confirm who is preparing the BA and clarify contractor role related to the BA.

RESPONSE: The BLM will prepare the BA.

16. Is the Project Initiation meeting described on page 4 of the SOW different than kickoff meeting in Anchorage described under Task 1?

RESPONSE: No, they are the same. Language has been revised on page 4 for clarity.

17. Is the contractor responsible for paying for public meeting facilities under Tasks 2 and 4?

RESPONSE: YES

18. Preliminary schedule in Appendix A (Month 4-6) of SOW states “Dedicated Interdisciplinary BLM/USFWS Team prepare draft alternatives and preliminary analysis of impacts?” This sounds like contractor doesn’t draft alternatives or analysis, and that we wait for BLM/USFWS to provide? Please clarify contractor’s role on these tasks.

RESPONSE: No, the Contractor will be responsible for drafting the alternatives with support and input of the BLM and Cooperating Agencies (See Task 3). Appendix A has been revised for clarity.

19. Preliminary Schedule in Appendix A (Month 4-6) of SOW states analysis of stipulations and Best Management Practices (BMPs). Will BLM compile these or will contractor be responsible for developing stipulations and BMPs?

RESPONSE: The Contractor will be responsible working with the interdisciplinary team. Development of lease stipulations will be part of the alternatives development and BMPs will be developed as a result of identifying mitigation resulting from the environmental consequences analysis.

20. Has a Visual Resource Inventory been completed for the project area?

RESPONSE: NO

21. Please confirm no hard copy Administrative Record will be required.

RESPONSE: No hard copy of the Administrative Record will be required.

22. Please confirm if contractor responsible for preparing the Section 810 analysis and facilitating Section 810 hearing.

RESPONSE: The BLM will be responsible for preparing the Section 810 analysis and the Contractor will be responsible for facilitating Section 810 hearings, if required.