

GROUP 2

1. C-1.4.2, Material Reference paragraph Services

The Government states, Material Services consist of several divisions and branches... It consists of a team of Government employees and contract personnel... throughout the depot. Lodge 2297 of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers represents a portion of Material Services workers.”

Since this procurement is under an A-76 review, it is assumed that only Government employees will be impacted if the contract is awarded to a commercial service provider. The mention of Lodge 2297 seems to indicate that part of the personnel impacted by this procurement are union personnel. Please clarify whether or not union personnel will be impacted. If union personnel will be impacted under this procurement, please identify the material services areas in which the union personnel work and the number of union personnel that will be impacted. In addition, please provide a copy of the collective bargaining agreement.

ANSWER: Personnel impacted will be employees of the Naval Aviation Depot, Cherry Point, North Carolina. These personnel are considered Government Employees, who may or may not have an affiliation with Lodge 2297, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. Pursuant to the policies set forth in Title VII, P.L. 95-454, and subject to the regulations issued by the Office of Personnel Management, and applicable Navy Directives, employees may choose to affiliate themselves with a bargaining unit that will represent their individual interests. Local 2297 is but one of several “bargaining units” which represent personnel within the depot.

2. Reference paragraph C-1.5.2.1

The Government states, “The SP shall provide a designated on-site manager... Alternates to the on-site manager are, in order, Supervisory Inventory Management Specialist, General Supply Specialist... Equipment Specialist (Electronics). The site manager may be one in the same as the site manager.”

The statement “alternates to the on-site manager are, **in order**, Supervisory Inventory Management Specialist, General Supply Specialist...” seems to indicate that the Government is requiring the SP to designate the alternative site managers in the order specified by the Government and the SP is not allowed the flexibility to establish a different hierarchy. Please clarify the Government’s intent.

ANSWER: See answer/correction to Question 8.

The statement “the site manager may be one in the same as the site manager” is ambiguous in nature. We realize that the site manager is the site manager. Is this a typographical error? Please clarify the intent of the Government’s statement.

ANSWER: The statement, “the site manager may be one in the same as the site manager” was a typographical error. It should read “ the project manager and the on-site manager may be one and the same person.” **Amendment 0001 incorporates the change.**

3. Reference paragraph C-3.2.1, GFF

The Government states, “The SP shall report any unsafe or non-operational condition... within 5 calendar days... The COR shall resolve... within 20 calendar days of the report...”

The timeframe allowed to resolve an unsafe or non-operational condition is excessively long especially in the case of an unsafe condition which is **immediately dangerous to life**. In this case, the SP should be required to report an unsafe condition that is immediately dangerous to life upon discovery and the COR should be required to respond and resolve the issue within one hour of receiving the report. Furthermore, unsafe and non-operational conditions that adversely impact or impede performance should be addressed immediately. Therefore, it is requested that the Government review this statement, address the liability issues that could result from such a long response and resolution time, and revise the statement accordingly.

ANSWER: Unsafe and non-operational conditions that pose an imminent threat to personal safety or life shall be addressed immediately and are adequately covered under various Occupational Safety and health Administration, Department of Defense, Department of Navy and local directives and instructions.

4. Reference paragraph C-5.2.1

The Government states, “Manage Material Services includes planning, controlling, and directing... to ensure the customers requirements are met... It includes close coordination and liaison between the SP and the COR.”

The close coordination and liaison between the SP and COR is acknowledged to be crucial to mission success, however this statement seems to restrict coordination and liaison to the COR only. Is the Government restricting the SP from coordinating and interacting directly with NADEP customers, vendors, etc, and requiring all coordination and liaison to go through the COR? Please clarify the Government’s intent.

ANSWER: The Government’s intent is directed toward situational issues that require DGR (Amendment 00001 changes “COR” to “DGR”) intervention. Routine interactions between the Service Provider and its customers, vendors, etc., are considered normal under the daily practice of providing the services requested.

5. Reference paragraph C-1.5.6.2, SP Quality Control

The Government states, “Section C-6 includes *Naval Aviation Depot Cherry Point Material Services/ Production Planning Quality Manual. December 13, 2001.*” The Government goes further to state in footnote 2 – “SPs may use this manual as the basis of a quality manual for their approach to performing the requirements of the PWS.”

Although the Government indicated that the manual was available in Section C-6 and the SP could use the manual for the basis of their quality manual, the manual was not made available in Section C-6 nor is it available for download from //padap.nadepcp.navy.mil/. It is requested that the Government provide the referenced quality manual as indicated in paragraph C-1.5.6.2 and the supporting footnote. If the Government will not provide the

referenced quality manual, please provide a valid rationale as to why it will not be furnished.

ANSWER: The manual is an ISO Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and is now included as a document in Section C-6. See provisions in section PWS C-6, for obtaining documents.

Amendment 00001 incorporates the change.

6. Reference H.12 Phase In and Phase Out

RFP section H.12a states the phase-in-period shall be 30 days. RFP section H.12b that the phase-out period shall be 60 days, which, in effect permits the successor SP a 60-day phase-in. Our experience clearly indicates that the initial transition to a private sector contractor resulting from an A-76 solicitation is the critical transition. Those that follow are typically smooth, efficient, and uneventful. Would the Government consider reversing these times to permit a 60-day phase-in and a 30-day phase-out?

ANSWER: The transition period to transition in a new service provider will be predicated largely upon HRO actions. The Government envisions that the transition will be implemented within 30 days.

7. Reference C-1.5.3.1 Organizational Chart

This reference makes further reference to Solicitation Section H and the “---requirements of the addition/substitution of essential personnel clause.” Section H does not contain an addition/substitution of essential personnel clause. Section H.12 makes reference to the “Project Manager and key personnel,” but only in terms of the Government providing limited office space during phase-in. Would the Government please provide the addition/substitution of essential personnel requirement? Would the Government please define “essential” personnel? Would the Government please choose between “Project Manager” and “Site Manager?” Would the Government please define “Key personnel?”

ANSWER: The Service Provider’s “project Manager” is the individual responsible for all requirements delineated within the PWS. The “on-site manager” shall act for the Service Provider and be responsible for the day-to-day performance of the work, serve as a point of contact for all customer relations and be responsible for resolving all quality, timeliness and accuracy issues. “Essential personnel” are defined as those individuals necessary to perform the services sought in the PWS. The Government desires that the private sector service provider identify a “Project Manager” and a Site Manager”, who may be one and the same person, to fulfill the requirements of the services sought in the PWS.

8. Reference C-1.5.2.1 Supervision

The second paragraph of this reference has two major problems.

1. Requiring the SP “Site Manager” to be at the NADEP for the first shift is not a problem. Permitting the COR to direct the SP “Site Manager” activities, to include where he/she will be on the NADEP is not acceptable. The “Site Manager” will be where he/she needs to be in order to properly manage this award. Should the COR or other government

representative desire to see or meet with the Site Manager or his designated representative, they are always available by phone.

2. The second paragraph of this reference specifies six prioritized “alternatives” to the Site Manager. This requirement is demeaning to professional industry SP who knows what they are doing and knows who should be representing the Site Manager in his/her absence. Would the Government please change this sentence to read, “the SP will designate in writing to the COR the key person(s) who will represent him/her in his/her absence.

ANSWER: The contents of the second paragraph have been revised to reflect the following:

The SP shall provide a designated on-site manager. The on-site manager shall act for the SP and shall be responsible for the day-to-day performance of the work, serve as a point of contact for all customer relations, and be responsible for resolving all quality, timeliness, and accuracy issues. The on-site manager shall be at the NADEP for the first shift. The SP shall also designate sufficient alternates to the on-site manager to serve in his or her capacity when the on-site manager is absent.

Amendment 0001 incorporates the change.

9. Reference C-1.5.2.5 Dress Code & Grooming Standards

This requirement is inappropriate. The SP personnel do not work for the Government. The dress code may include uniforms as a requirement at an allowable expense, but the dress code and grooming standards will be those of the professional SP. Would the Government please correct this oversight?

ANSWER: The Commanding Officer has issued an appropriate directive, applicable to all employees of the depot, including contract employees, that specifies clothing and personal attire which is deemed inappropriate for wear.

10. Reference C-1.5.5.2 Interactions with Support Contractors

The last sentence in this reference states, “In no case shall the SP direct contract personnel.” Does the Government actually mean to say, “In no case shall the SP for this Award direct other contractor personnel during interactions with other support contractors? This would be similar to the FAR, which prohibits the Government from directing the SP in the operation and management of a services contract.

ANSWER: The PWS intent is the same as the FAR. Since the PWS applies to a Government or contractor SP, the PWS does not use the phrasing “other contractor”.