

Questions and Response

Question: In reference to RFQ number VA101-16-Q-0141, a substantial part (e.g., NEPA analysis) (see Task 4 on p.8 of 40) is close, or identical to some portion of the scope of services being requested by the VCO 22 in draft RFP/SOW number VA262-16-N-0693. If the option task listed under evaluated optional tasks and associated deliverables - “Option Task Order: This proposal may also include further work at West Los Angeles EUL project using the proposed final price” is exercised; we would like to know if requirements is complementary to the West Los Angeles Master Plan implementation services contract.

Response: RFQ VA101-16-Q-0141 is separate and distinct from the West LA master plan support contract. The main purpose of this RFQ is to support the Battle Creek EUL project. Further, the referenced Task 4 on p.8 of 40 is listed as an option requirement. All option requirements have to be preapproved by the CO and COTR. VA does not intend to duplicate work.

Question: There are several SDVOSB and VOSB firms with more than adequate EUL experience to successfully complete the work at Battle Creek at a fair and reasonable price. Under the BURR EUL program there were at least 6 SDVOSB awarded contracts for EULs similar in size, scope and complexity. Why did the government decide not to set-aside VA10116Q0141 for SDVOSB concerns?

Response: It is true the BURR had 6 SDVOSB and one WOSB. Further, Burr had at least 40 EUL projects of which 39 were set aside for SDVOSB and one was set aside for WOSB to meet the Social Economic Goals. That WOSB set aside EUL project was for Battle Creek.