


Appendix A
Performance Work Statement



US Army Corps
of Engineers

**FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES
MILITARY MUNITIONS RESPONSE
PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT
FOR
SITE INSPECTIONS
AT MULTIPLE SITES
(CONUS AND OCONUS)**

**PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT
FOR
Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS)
Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)
Site Inspections (SI)
at Multiple Sites
(CONUS and OCONUS)
24 May 2005**

**Modification #1: 18 July 2005
This is a firm fixed price Task Order**

1.0 OBJECTIVE:

The objective of the MMRP SI is to determine whether the individual project sites within the FUDS program warrants further response action or no Department of Defense action indicated (NDAI).

2.0 BACKGROUND AND GENERAL STATEMENT OF WORK:

2.1 Regulatory Guidelines. The work required under this Scope of Work (SOW) falls under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program - Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS). Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) exist on property formerly owned or leased by the Department of Army. USACE is conducting environmental response activities at FUDS in accordance with Engineer Regulation (ER) 200-3-1 and the *DoD Management Guidance for the Defense Environmental Response Program (DERP)*. USACE is conducting these activities in accordance with CERCLA.

2.1.1 MEC is a safety hazard and may constitute an imminent and substantial endangerment to the local populace and site personnel. The work associated with this Site Investigation(s) shall be performed in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Section 104, and the National Contingency Plan (NCP), Sections 300.120(d) and 300.400(e), Executive Orders 12580 and 13016.

2.1.2 All activities involving work in areas potentially containing unexploded ordnance hazards shall be conducted in full compliance with Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Army,

US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), state, local and federal requirements regarding safety, personnel, equipment, and procedures. 29 CFR 1910.120 shall apply to all actions taken at this site.

2.1.3 The project sites are not suspected to contain Recovered Chemical Warfare Materiel (RCWM); however, if the contractor identifies or suspects CWM, the contractor shall immediately withdraw upwind from the work area and notify the USAESCH Chemical Warfare Design Center and the USAESCH Ordnance and Explosives (OE) Safety Office for assistance and guidance. The contractor shall secure the area and locate two Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Technicians at level II or above upwind of the suspect CWM to secure the site until relieved by the Technical Escort Unit (TEU) or Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) personnel.

3.0 Performance Work Statement:

The following performance work statement will apply to all tasks/projects in this PWS.

The contractor shall perform the activities necessary to meet the objective in paragraph 1.0 of this PWS for munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) and munitions constituents (MC). MEC intrusive activities shall **not** be performed during this SI. Work shall be in accordance with (IAW) with ER 200-3-1, the *DoD Management Guidance for the Defense Environmental Response Program (DERP)*, and Engineering Pamphlet (EP) 75-1-2.

The contractor shall collect the minimum amount of information necessary to (i) eliminate from further consideration those releases that pose no significant threat to public health or the environment; (ii) determine the potential need for a time critical removal action; (iii) collect or develop additional data, as appropriate, for Hazard Ranking System (HRS) scoring by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and (iv) collect data, as appropriate, to characterize the release for effective and rapid initiation of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS). The contractor shall also collect the appropriate data to complete the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSPP).

Methods to be used to achieve the specified objectives shall be determined by the Contractor.

Quality Control. The Contractor shall implement an accepted Quality Control (QC) Program. The Quality Control Program shall include QC procedures for all aspects and types of work. The Contractor shall ensure that QC documentation is maintained, and provided in the Final Reports. If any Government QA review identifies a process failure or a work product failure, the contractor will be issued a Corrective Action Request (CAR). The Contractor shall provide full documentation detailing the cause of the failure, why it was not detected in the Contractor's QC Program, and how the problem was corrected. Failure can be defined as workmanship or work products not complying with the WP or not meeting project needs defined during TPP or other accepted industry practices or defined as not complying with basic safety concepts and other industry safety practices.

Kick Off Meeting: The Contractor(s) shall plan to attend a kick off meeting, after award, in Huntsville, Alabama for 1 day.

Work Plan: The contractor shall prepare and submit a programmatic SI Work Plan (WP) which will also address any contractor-specific programmatic information supplemental to the Programmatic Sampling and Analysis Plan provided by the government. The WP shall be prepared following the general format described in data item description (DID) MR-001. Deviations from this format will be accepted if they are for the purpose of consolidating topics into a single chapter or sub-chapter or for removing duplications. For each site, a site-specific Work Plan and SAP annex shall be prepared.

Geographic Information System (GIS). The Contractor shall create a GIS in accordance with DID MR-005-07. The coordinate system for these tasks/projects shall be UTM Coordinates. All geo-referenced data shall be submitted in UTM Coordinates.

Munitions Constituents Sampling and Analysis: MC sampling and analysis shall be performed IAW Final Programmatic SAP and applicable Site-Specific SAP. Any exceptions to the Programmatic SAP must be clearly indicated in the Site-Specific SAP. Contractor shall

determine in consultation with their subcontractor laboratory appropriate analytical methodology to meet or exceed the data quality objectives provided in Table 1 of the Programmatic SAP. If these DQOs cannot be met with standard analytical methodology, provide recommendation for best value approach. Technical proposal shall provide laboratory's proposed reporting limits along with their method detection limits. It shall also describe laboratory's procedures for subsampling and sample preparation for explosives and any method variations to address analytes not addressed by routine methods, such as PETN and nitroglycerine. For aqueous samples, solid phase extraction rather than salting out extraction shall be used.

The contractor shall address MC sampling and analysis requirements and deliverables IAW with DID MR-005-10, with the following exceptions:

- The USACE validation process has been replaced. The contractor shall use a laboratory that meets the requirements of the HTRW Chemical Data Quality Management (CDQM) Policy for Environmental Laboratory Testing (USACE, 2004), to include NELAP accreditation and self declaration of compliance with the DoD Quality Systems Manual (DoD QSM) (latest version). All laboratory requirements of DID MR 005-10 not related to the validation process continue to apply.

- Section 1.4 of DID MR-005-10 shall be modified as follows:

Electronic Data Deliverable; G.

All laboratory data for samples analyzed by commercial laboratories shall be submitted in the Staged Electronic Data Deliverable (SEDD) format. Details on the SEDD format are provided in SEDD Version 5.0 (or most recent version) specification located at <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/clp/sedd.htm>. EDDs shall be provided to applicable Design Center and MM CX on a site-by-site basis IAW schedule provided in Contractor's proposal. SEDD Stage 2a is a mandatory submittal. SEDD Stage 2b should be provided if the laboratory is capable.

- Section 2.8 of DID MR-005-10 shall be modified as follows:

2.8 ELECTRONIC DATA DELIVERABLE

Chemical data shall also be provided electronically by the Contractor in the SEDD format and as part of the Geographic Information System. The SEDD formatted deliverable will require data parsing for use in the Automated Data Review (ADR)

software (most current version). Use of the ADR software will also require that the contractor develop a comprehensive library file for all of the methods to be analyzed under this PWS. The library file will accurately reflect all of the analytical quality requirements as documented in the Final Programmatic SAP (or site-specific SAP, if deviations from the Programmatic SAP are approved) and will be provided to the appropriate Design Center, MM CX, and the sub-contract lab for use in screening EDD submittals. All electronic data submitted by the contract laboratory is required to be error-free, and in complete agreement with the hardcopy data. Data files are to be delivered both by e-mail and on high density CD accompanying the hardcopy data reports. The disk must be submitted with a transmittal letter from the laboratory that certifies that the file is in agreement with hardcopy data reports and has been found to be free of errors using the latest version of the ADR evaluation software provided to the laboratory. The contract laboratory, at their cost, will correct any errors identified by USACE. The Contractor is responsible for the successful electronic transmission of field and laboratory data under this PWS. The Contractor's laboratory is responsible for archiving the electronic raw data and sufficient associated hardcopy data (e.g., sample login sheets and sample preparation log sheets) to completely reconstruct the analyses that were performed for a period of ten years after completion of this contract.

- The following software is available upon request to support this task as government furnished software: ADR, Environmental Data Management System (EDMS), SEDD parser, and Forms II Lite. Use of the SEDD parser and ADR software is mandatory, use of EDMS and Forms II Lite are optional.
- Information required for completion of main SI Report need not be duplicated in SI Report Appendix containing **CHEMICAL DATA FINAL REPORT**

Perchlorate Sampling and Analysis. Sites indicated on the table below as “Yes” will be included in a MMRP SI Request for Approval to Sample for Perchlorate to be submitted through HTRW CX. Perchlorate analysis must be provided by the Contractor's laboratory. Analysis must be performed by Liquid Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry or Ion Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry, preferably by SW6850 or SW6860. Either tandem or single mass spectrometry is acceptable. If the laboratory identified in the Contractor's initial proposal is unable to perform

perchlorate analysis by one of these methods, Contractor may propose a supplemental laboratory for perchlorate analysis. If a supplemental laboratory is proposed, it must meet all PWS requirements and all documentation for new laboratory that was required for initial proposal must be provided. Contractors should include costs for collection of additional sample volume, acquiring containers/coolers, etc., shipment of the containers to the Laboratory, and validation of analytical data..

SI Reports: The Contractor shall prepare a final report using DID MR-030 as a guideline for general document format. The report content outline is attached as Appendix A. Each report shall identify the specific members and title of the Contractor's staff and subcontractors that had significant and specific input into the reports' preparation or review. The contractor shall also include a cover letter signed by an authorized person (preferably the person who signed the Task Order) of the company certifying, on behalf of the company, that the requirements of this Task Order have been met.

Schedule: The Contractor shall submit a proposed programmatic project schedule in the proposal. Seven (7) days after Award the contractor shall submit and electronic copy (preferably by email) of the schedule. The schedule shall be adjusted and refined during the Technical Project Planning (TPP) process. The contractor shall update the schedule in accordance with DID MR-085, Project Status Report. A task/project specific schedule shall be submitted a minimum of 14 days after the completion of the TPP process. All schedules shall be in a format compatible with Primavera software.

Teleconferences: The Contractor shall participate in monthly MMRP teleconferences with HQ, MM CX, Technical PM, District PM, and other contractors to discuss project status and any issues that have arisen during the SI phase of work. The Contractor will be prepared to present issue resolution alternatives as part of these discussions.

In Progress Review Meetings: The Contractor shall attend Quarterly In-Progress Review (IPR) meetings on the MMRP SI with USACE representatives and other contractors at various CONUS locations. In addition, the Contractor will be expected to plan, coordinate, and host one

IPR meeting each year.

Reports/Minutes, Record of Meetings. The Contractor shall prepare and submit a report/minutes of all meetings attended in accordance with DID MR-045.

Telephone Conversations/Correspondence Records. The Contractor shall keep a record of each phone conversation and written correspondence concerning this Task Order in accordance with DID MR-055. A copy of this record shall be attached to the Project Status Report.

Project Status Reports. The Contractor shall prepare and submit project status reports in accordance with DID MR-085 and include any other items required in the PWS.

Specific Tasks/Projects:

The specific Tasks/Projects below are shown in the table below. Along with the project, the responsible Geographic FUDS USACE District is shown as well as the USACE design center that will provide technical management and execute the project. The 4 (four) design centers are the Huntsville Center MM Design Center (HNC), Omaha District MM Design Center (NWO), South Pacific Division Range Support Center (SPD), Baltimore District MM Design Center (NAB).

An additional list of project sites is attached as Appendix B. This list will be used for optional future SI Projects based on funding and priority from DoD.

Task #	District	FUDS ID	FUDS Name	MM DC	Perchlorate Sampling
1.1	SAW	I04NC107101	Corolla Naval Target	HNC	YES
1.2	SAS	I04GA004503	Camp Toccoa Mil Res	HNC	YES
1.3	SAJ	I04 FL 0405	Pinycastle Jeep Range	HNC	YES
1.4	POH	H09HI024901	Kane Puu	HNC	YES
1.5	LRL	G04KY0028	Camp Breckinridge	HNC	YES
1.6	SAM	I04AL06700	Fort McClellan	HNC	YES
1.7	POA	F10AK0291	Burma Road	HNC	YES
1.8	SAC	I04SC0040	Lake Murray Bombing & Gunnery Range	HNC	NO
1.9	SAW	I04NC080303	Charlotte Naval Ammo Depot	HNC	NO
1.10	SAS	I04GA106401	Arabia Mountain State Park	HNC	NO
1.11	SAJ	I04 FL 0856	Chaffee Road Bomb Target	HNC	NO

Task #	District	FUDS ID	FUDS Name	MM DC	Perchlorate Sampling
1.12	SAC	I04SC0023	Sand Hills Bombing & Gunnery Range	HNC	YES
1.13	POH	H09HI047601	Big Island Target – Mahukona Range	HNC	NO
1.14	LRL	G04KY016506	Kentucky Ordnance Works	HNC	NO
1.15	SAW	I04NC1085	Southern Shores	HNC	YES
1.16	SAC	I04SC0042	Lk Isaqueena Bom Rng	HNC	NO
1.17	SAJ			HNC	YES
2.1	NAB	C03MD0930	Assateague Island	NAB	NO
2.2	NAE	D01ME003200	Seal Island Gunnery Range	NAB	NO
2.3	NAN	C02NJ0004	Fort Hancock	NAB	YES
2.4	NAO	C03VA000901	NAAS Creeds	NAB	YES
2.5	NAB	CO3DE0526	Fort Delaware	NAB	NO
2.6	NAE	D01MA023204	Hingham NAD	NAB	YES
2.7	NAN	C02NJ0792	Millville Bomb & Gunnery Range	NAB	YES
2.8	NAO	C03VA020201	Plum Tree Island	NAB	YES
2.9	NAB	C03PA0048	Susquehanna Ordnance Sub-Depot	NAB	NO
2.10	NAO	C03VA0162	Virginia Ordnance Works	NAB	NO
2.11	NAB	C03DE0528	Governor Bacon Health Center	NAB	NO
2.12	NAO	C03VA0103	Ft. Monroe/Ft. Wool	NAB	NO
2.13	NAO	C03VA1012	Camp Wallace	NAB	YES
2.14	NAO	C03VA0194	Chopawamic Troop Trng	NAB	YES
2.15	NAO	C03VA0027	Ft. Lee	NAB	NO
3.1	LRL	G05OH0007	Lockbourne, AFB	NWO	YES
3.2	NWK	B07MO014601	Jefferson Barracks Target Range	NWO	YES
3.3	NWO	B08WY042601	Casper Ground Gunnery Range	NWO	NO
3.4	NWS	F10OR004102	Camp Abbott	NWO	YES
3.5	LRL	E05MI003402	Camp Claybanks AAA Firing Range	NWO	YES
3.6	NWK	B07KS002904	Olathe Naval Air Station	NWO	NO
3.7	NWO	B08WY042901	Casper Precision Bombing Range No. 3	NWO	NO
3.8	NWS	F10OR002903	Camp Adair	NWO	YES
3.9	LRL	G05IN0010	Camp Atterbury	NWO	NO
3.10	LRL	G05OH002706	Erie Army Depot	NWO	YES
3.11	LRL	G05IN001904	Kingsbury Ordnance Plant	NWO	NO
3.12	LRL	E05MI001303	Ft Custer Rec Area	NWO	YES
3.13	LRL	E05MI000501	Camp Lucas/Camp Brady Target Range	NWO	NO
3.14	LRL	E05IL009903	Green River Ordnance Plant	NWO	YES
3.15	LRL	E05IL010203	Sangamon Ordnance Plant	NWO	NO

Task #	District	FUDS ID	FUDS Name	MM DC	Perchlorate Sampling
4.1	SPA	K06NM042401	Fort Sumner	SPD	YES
4.2	SWF	K06TX1008	Matagorda Peninsula Bombing Range	SPD	YES
4.3	SPL	J09CA1110	Camp Matthews	SPD	YES
4.4	SWT	K06OK011001	Great Salt Plains Bombing Range	SPD	YES
4.5	SPL	J09AZ057601	Sahuarita AFR	SPD	YES
4.6	SWF	A06LA0008	Camp Livingston	SPD	YES
4.7	SPL	J09CA707802	Camp Lockett - Target Pit	SPD	YES
4.8	SWT	K06OK001301	Camp Gruber	SPD	YES
4.9	SPA	K06NM005206	Walker AFB	SPD	YES
4.10	SWF	K06TX0058	Matagorda Island AF Range	SPD	YES
4.11	SPL	J09CA711501	Naval Air Base - Ordnance Areas	SPD	YES
4.12	SPL	J09CA724201	Camp Vista Army - Green Oak Ranch Small Arms Range	SPD	NO
4.13	SWF	K06TX0144	Pyote AAF Bomb Range #1	SPD	NO
4.14	SWF	K06TX0293	Childress AAF Bombing Range #1	SPD	NO
4.15	SWF			SPD	NO
4.16					
4.17					
4.18					

Design Center-Specific Requirements:

Huntsville Design Center Projects: Southeast and Pacific IMA Regions (Tasks 1.X)

The contractor that is awarded the tasks/projects assigned to the Huntsville MM Design Center shall plan for an onboard review of draft programmatic work plan and the internal draft SI report at USAESCH in Huntsville, AL. This onboard review shall take place after the contractor has received comments on the draft WP and after receiving comments on the internal draft SI Report. The contract shall be expected to provide a CD of the draft version at the conclusion of the onboard review.

Baltimore MM Design Center Projects: Northeast IMA Region (Tasks 2.X)

The contractor that is awarded the tasks/projects assigned to the Baltimore MM Design Center shall plan for an onboard review of the draft SI report at the District office in Baltimore, MD.

This onboard review shall take place after the contractor has received comments on the internal draft version.

Omaha District Design Center Projects: Northwest IMA Region (Tasks 3.X)

The contractor that is awarded the tasks/projects assigned to the Omaha District MM Design Center shall plan for an onboard review of the draft SI report at the District office in Omaha, NE. This onboard review shall take place after the contractor has received comments on the internal draft version.

South Pacific Division Range Support Center Projects: Southwest IMA Region (Tasks 4.X)

The contractor that is awarded the tasks/projects assigned to the South Pacific Division Range Support Center shall plan for an onboard review of draft programmatic work plan and the internal draft SI report at the South Pacific Division USACE Headquarters, San Francisco, Ca. This onboard review shall take place after the contractor has received comments on the draft WP and after receiving comments on the internal draft SI Report. The contract shall be expected to provide a CD of the draft version at the conclusion of the onboard review.

4.0 SUBMITTALS AND CORRESPONDENCE:

Computer Files. All final text files generated by the Contractor under this task order shall be furnished to the Contract Officer in Microsoft Word 6.0 or higher software. Spreadsheets shall be provided in Microsoft EXCEL format. All final CADD drawings shall be in Microstation 95 or higher. All GIS data shall be in ESRI (Arcview/Arcinfo) format. All chemical sampling data submittals shall be IAW DID MR 005-10 except as noted above. These documents shall be submitted on CD or DVD.

PDF Deliverables. In addition to the paper and digital copies of submittals, the final version of any and all reports and/or plans shall be submitted, uncompressed, on CD or DVD in PDF format along with a linked table of contents, linked tables, linked photographs, linked graphs and linked figures, all of which shall be suitable for viewing on the Internet. PDF files shall be produced from source documents wherever possible.

Review Comments. Various reviewers will have the opportunity to review submittals made by the Contractor under this contract. The Contractor shall review all comments received through the Technical or Project Manager/Contracting Officer and evaluate their appropriateness based upon their merit and the requirements of the PWS. The Contractor shall issue to the Project Manager a formal, annotated response to each. The Contractor shall not non-concur with a comment without discussing with the PM and/or comment maker.

Public Affairs. The Contractor shall not publicly disclose any data generated or reviewed under this contract. The Contractor shall refer all requests for information concerning site conditions to the subject FUDS Geographic USACE Corps of Engineers District with a copy furnished to the Technical Manager. Reports and data generated under this contract are the property of DoD and distribution to any other source by the Contractor, unless authorized by the Contracting Officer, is prohibited.

Submittals: The contractor shall furnish copies of the plans, maps, and reports as identified in table below, or as specified in this PWS, to each addressee listed below in the quantities indicated.

Document Distribution: For the purposes of determining when documents get submitted to specific organizations, the attached document distribution table is provided.

Document Description	HTRW CX		MM Design Center		District PM		MM CX		HQ USACE
	Hard CD Copy		Hard CD Copy		Hard CD Copy		Hard CD Copy		CD
CSM:									
Draft	2		3		6		2		
Working Final	2		3		6		2		1
TPP Memorandum:									
Draft	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	1
Final Memorandum	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	1
SI Work Plan:									
Draft	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	1
Final	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	1

SI Report:									
Draft	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	
Draft Final	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	1
Final	1	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	1

Notes:

1. The number of final copies distributed may vary from that shown above

Period of Performance: All work shall be completed by 30 November 2006

Milestones:

TPP Memorandum (accepted)

Work Plan (accepted)

Field Work Completed

Final SI Report (accepted)

Milestones will be considered met or completed when the appropriate QC documentation has been submitted and QA completed and the submittal and/or product is accepted.

Points of Contact:

Program Manager:

Bradford McCowan

CEHNC-OE-CX

US Army Engineering and Support Center

P. O. Box 1600

4820 University Square

Huntsville, AL 35807

256-895-1174

Bradford.L.McCowan@hnd01.usace.army.mil

Huntsville Center MMRP SI Regional Program Manager

Chris Cochran

CEHNC-OE-DC

US Army Engineering and Support Center

P. O. Box 1600
4820 University Square
Huntsville, AL 35807
256-895-1696
Chris.Cochrane@hnd01.usace.army.mil

Omaha District MMRP SI Regional Program Manager

Robert Zaruba
CENWO-PM-HB (ZARUBA)
106 South 15th Street
Omaha, NE 68102-1618
(402) 221-7659
Robert.K.Zaruba@nwo02.usace.army.mil

SPD Range Support Center MMRP SI Regional Program Manager

Monique Ostermann
CESPA-EC-EG (Ostermann)
4101 Jeff Plaza NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
(505) 342-3475 Monique.M.Ostermann@spa02.usace.army.mil

Baltimore District MMRP SI Regional Program Manager

Leland Reeser
CENAB-EN-HN (Reeser)
10 South Howard Street
Room 10040D
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 962-2186
Leland.H.Reeser@nab02.usace.army.mil

5.0 REFERENCES

- 5.1 Basic Contract
- 5.2 USACE, 2004 - HTRW Chemical Data Quality Management (CDQM) Policy for Environmental Laboratory Testing, September 30, 2004
- 5.3 DoD Quality Systems Manual (DoD QSM) (latest version).
- 5.4 USEPA, 1992 - Guidance for Performing Site Inspections under CERCLA; Interim Final, September 1992, PB92-963375, EPA 9345.1-05
- 5.5 EM 200-1-3, Requirements for the Preparation of Sampling and Analysis Plans
- 5.6 ER 1110-1-263, Chemical Data Quality Management for Hazardous, Toxic, Radioactive Waste Remedial Activities
- 5.7 DOD's Interim Policy on Perchlorate Sampling, 29 September 2003, http://www.epa.gov/swerffrr/pdf/perchlorate_sampling_interim_policy_9-23-03.pdf.
- 5.8 DoD Interim Guidance on Sampling and Testing for Perchlorate, 5 February 2004, <http://www.navylabs.navy.mil/Archive/PerchlorateInterim.pdf>.
- 5.9 DAIM, Department of Army Guidance for Addressing Potential Perchlorate Contamination, 11 June 2004, <http://www.itrcweb.org/armyguidance.pdf>.
- 5.10 DOD Memorandum on Definitions Related to Munitions Response Actions, 18 December 2003, http://www.epa.gov/fedfac/pdf/MRP_Definitions_12-18-03.pdf.
- 5.11 Military Munitions Center of Expertise Technical Update Munitions Constituent (MC) Sampling March 2005.