

From: [Hesford, Brian D CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#)
To: [Rostermundt, Stephanie A CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#); [Evans, Kali L CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#); [Leptien, David B CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#); [Miller, Sarah J CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#)
Cc: [Comparato, Shanna M CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#); [Howland, Timothy J CIV USARMY CENWO \(US\)](#)
Subject: RE: W9128F-18-2-0011 questions
Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 9:31:46 AM
Attachments: [11 June revised NWO-FOA CESU 18-XX CR Tasks.docx](#)

1-• The project description synopsis on Grants.Gov. website (24 mitigation sites only) does not match the attached PWS project description (24 mitigation sites and 71 evaluative testing sites). Which is correct? Does the PWS hold the correct information?

Answer: Yes, the PWS holds the correct information. Attached is the revised FOA with appropriate project description, my apologies for the mistake and any confusion.

2-• What has been discussed regarding Section 106 Consultation about “mitigation” previously with culturally affiliated tribes, COSHPO, and other Army stakeholders? Otherwise the 6.2 Task 2 data recovery plan reporting requirement could go “round-and-round” costing the contractor a great deal of extra time and money if there is not some previous understanding between the various parties before execution.

Answer: Each of the 24 NRHP-eligible sites for which data recovery/mitigation plans will be drafted have been the subject of Section 106 consultation regarding the effects of military training activities at these sites. The NFE will not be responsible for supporting the ongoing Section 106 consultation for these sites. As stated in the PWS (Section 6.2), there will be a preliminary draft (reviewed by the CRM) and a draft final reviewed and approved by the USAG POC (i.e. the CRM), which will then be included in the final document. The intent of the SHPO review is as a peer reviewer, not as part of the final resolution for adverse effects. If the SHPO continues to disagree with the proposed methodology, responsibility will lie with the USAG POC to continue consultations with the SHPO.

3-• Regarding 6.1, Task 1, item 4 in 4th paragraph indicates that associated artifacts will need reviewed? What exactly does the Army have in mind regarding this? Could this information not be given to NFE/contractor via data tables related to Past Perfect narratives and keywords too?

Answer: Reviewing all relevant information, including the artifact collections - either by reviewing the artifact analysis data, photographs, or visibly looking at the material remains themselves, is part of the background research that will be conducted under Task 1. Several of these sites were first recorded and/or last visited over 20 years ago (see Project #'s in Enclosure 1). The data contained is only as good as that provided in the site documentation. Therefore, it may be necessary to view the physical artifacts which are located in Building 2420 on Fort Carson.

4-• Regarding Task 2, what exactly does the Army view as “mitigation”? What is the specific adverse effect that will need to be considered (this will influence the nature of the data recovery plan in my mind)?

Answer: The 24 NRHP-eligible sites have been the subject of ongoing Section 106 consultation concerning effects related to military training (e.g., vehicle entries) at these sites. Per the PWS, the intent of Task 2 is to develop a mitigation plan that will support the resolution of adverse effects (as related to military training, and possibly natural impacts) in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, and no longer be required to protect the site.

5-• What percent constitutes a valid testing or excavation unit sample for site excavation/mitigation in the mind of the Army?

Answer: There is no set percentage; as stated in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, the appropriate testing and excavation methodology proposed in plans will be sufficient for the evaluation of "needs data" sites and/or the mitigation of NRHP-eligible sites based on the type of site, number of features, research questions to be answered, etc.

6-• Assume there should be recommendations for Tribal consultation within data recovery plans too?

Answer: Yes. Data recovery/mitigation plans, as well as research designs, should always recommend Tribal

consultation for sites that may be of concern to federally organized, culturally affiliated Native American Tribes. Under no task in this PWS is it anticipated or expected that the NFE will consult with Tribes.

7-• Assume there should be recommendations for a cultural landscape assessment too?

Answer: Yes, data recovery plans/mitigation plans, as well as research designs, should always consider the cultural landscape.

8-• First page of SOW says, "NFE personnel shall identify themselves as an NFE employee when answering or placing calls on a Government telephone and when leaving outgoing or incoming messages on voice mail..." This statement (and several below) makes it seem that the NFE will be working on Fort Carson?

Answer: This is standard language in all of our PWS/SOW's. Section 2.0 of the PWS does not state the Government will provide office space to the NFE. As such, paragraphs 4 - 6 on page 1, as well as Sections 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.6, 1.3.7, 1.3.8, 1.3.9, 1.3.10, and 1.3.11 are not relevant to the tasks under this PWS. Visitation to the installation does require an extended access pass, a daily access pass can be obtained at Gate 1, Building 6012 with valid vehicle registration, insurance and driver identification.

9-* 1.3.3 – Suggests that NFE personnel will need to access Ft. Carson? Why, if Gov. will be providing all needed as part of 2.2.

Answer: The NFE may decide it is necessary to access the Curation Facility on Fort Carson where the archaeological collections are housed and/or may decide site visits are required to adequately draft the research designs and/or mitigation plans.

10-* 1.3.4 – Suggests fieldwork is needed? Are folks anticipating a need to visit sites as part of writing plans? If so, need Gov. to provide maps so logistics such as travel time can be factored into bid.

Answer: If the NFE decides that site visits are required in order to adequately draft the research designs and/or mitigation plans, then Section 1.3.4 states how downrange access shall be obtained.

11-* 1.3.5 – 1.3.11, 2.3 – Why a CaC and requisite training or a hand receipted radio?

Answer: With regard to the CAC and requisite training, see response to question #8 above. If the NFE decides that site visits are required in order to adequately draft the research designs and/or mitigation plans, then the Government will furnish a handheld radio to the NFE (Section 2.3). This is a safety precaution, as there is very limited cellular service available at the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

12-* 2.2 Applicable site documentation will be given to contractor only after award? (how does one cost out a project without this info in first place...I guess we have the approximate # so it matters little)

Answer: The site numbers, as well as site type and theme, have been provided in Enclosures 1 and 2, which is enough information to calculate an approximate cost.

13-* Deliverable schedule under "Archaeological Site Evaluation Research Design (Preliminary Draft), PWS Sec 6.1" indicates 30 research designs per month. So in the end, there will be 71 printed Task 1 research designs and not 71 in one all encompassing document? Same with the 5 p/month in Task 2, so a total of 95 electronic documents?

Answer: Yes, each research design and mitigation plan is a standalone document.

If any of the answers above warrant revising the PWS, please let me know, thanks.

V/r,
Brian

Brian Hesford
Project Manager/Trusted Agent
Environmental Remediation Branch
USACE Omaha District
Office: 402-995-2759

Cell: 402-631-3246

-----Original Message-----

From: Rostermundt, Stephanie A CIV USARMY CENWO (US)

Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:41 PM

To: Evans, Kali L CIV USARMY CENWO (US) <Kali.L.Evans@usace.army.mil>; Hesford, Brian D CIV USARMY CENWO (US) <Brian.D.Hesford@usace.army.mil>; Leptien, David B CIV USARMY CENWO (US) <David.B.Leptien@usace.army.mil>; Miller, Sarah J CIV USARMY CENWO (US) <Sarah.J.Miller2@usace.army.mil>

Cc: Comparato, Shanna M CIV USARMY CENWO (US) <Shanna.M.Comparato@usace.army.mil>; Howland, Timothy J CIV USARMY CENWO (US) <Timothy.J.Howland@usace.army.mil>

Subject: W9128F-18-2-0011 questions

Below are questions for the above referenced solicitation. Please provide responses NLT 10AM 14 June 2018.

Please vet any responses received from the Customer to be sure they are in complete sentence format, not specific to a particular IHE/NFE, answers are definitive, and do not include terms such as “we” “us” “prefer”. If any of the answers include information that conflicts with or is contradictory to the information in the current SOW/FOA, please provide an updated version with your responses.

- The project description synopsis on Grants.Gov. website (24 mitigation sites only) does not match the attached PWS project description (24 mitigation sites and 71 evaluative testing sites). Which is correct? Does the PWS hold the correct information?
- What has been discussed regarding Section 106 Consultation about “mitigation” previously with culturally affiliated tribes, COSHPO, and other Army stakeholders? Otherwise the 6.2 Task 2 data recovery plan reporting requirement could go “round-and-round” costing the contractor a great deal of extra time and money if there is not some previous understanding between the various parties before execution.
- Regarding 6.1, Task 1, item 4 in 4th paragraph indicates that associated artifacts will need reviewed? What exactly does the Army have in mind regarding this? Could this information not be given to NFE/contractor via data tables related to Past Perfect narratives and keywords too?
- Regarding Task 2, what exactly does the Army view as “mitigation”? What is the specific adverse effect that will need to be considered (this will influence the nature of the data recovery plan in my mind)?
- What percent constitutes a valid testing or excavation unit sample for site excavation/mitigation in the mind of the Army?
- Assume there should be recommendations for Tribal consultation within data recovery plans too?
- Assume there should be recommendations for a cultural landscape assessment too?
- First page of SOW says, “NFE personnel shall identify themselves as an NFE employee when answering or placing calls on a Government telephone and when leaving outgoing or incoming messages on voice mail...” This statement (and several below) makes it seem that the NFE will be working on Fort Carson?
- * 1.3.3 – Suggests that NFE personnel will need to access Ft. Carson? Why, if Gov. will be providing all needed as part of 2.2.

- * 1.3.4 – Suggests fieldwork is needed? Are folks anticipating a need to visit sites as part of writing plans? If so, need Gov. to provide maps so logistics such as travel time can be factored into bid.
- * 1.3.5 – 1.3.11, 2.3 – Why a CaC and requisite training or a hand receipted radio?
- * 2.2 Applicable site documentation will be given to contractor only after award? (how does one cost out a project without this info in first place...I guess we have the approximate # so it matters little)
- * Deliverable schedule under “Archaeological Site Evaluation Research Design (Preliminary Draft), PWS Sec 6.1” indicates 30 research designs per month. So in the end, there will be 71 printed Task 1 research designs and not 71 in one all encompassing document? Same with the 5 p/month in Task 2, so a total of 95 electronic documents?

Please contact us if you have any questions.

Stephanie Rostermundt | Contracting & Grants Officer

US Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District

Environmental Remediation Branch

1616 Capitol Avenue

Omaha, NE 68102

Phone: 402-995-2083