## Florence, Elaine J CIV NAVSUP FLC Jacksonville, 220

**From:** (b) (6) [redacted]
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 30, 2017 16:28
**To:** (b) (6) [redacted] Nelson, Darryl Q CIV NAVSUP FLC Jacksonville, 220; Florence, Elaine J CIV NAVSUP FLC Jacksonville, 220
**Subject:** FW: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract
**Signed By:** (b) (6) [redacted]

Darryl, Elaine,

There is an amended question from the hill, please see below.

V/R,
(b) (6) [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 1:01 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

Any update on this? I've also been told by MCM that they believe Seward is poaching their employees which is in violation of the procurement rules. Can you also look into that? Does MCM have an avenue to protest/complain if they feel that way and prove it?

Thanks,
(b) (6) [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 12:37 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

(b) (6) [redacted]

Put the questions in the system for staffing, will forward the response once I have it. Thanks!

V/R,
(b) (6) [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]

Sent: Friday, May 19, 2017 12:28 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

(b) (6) [redacted]

We've been told by MCM that Seaward is in the process of getting their personnel approved to work in GTMO. Seaward submitted the clearance form (known as SECNAVs?) for its employees. Apparently the SECNAV allows employees access to the base. MCM believes that these employees are not employed by Seaward and in fact work for another company called Madison. We were told that GTMO would not permit anyone on the base without a proper SECNAV, and that submitting incorrect information (i.e. employment by Madison and not Seaward) would result in the denial of the SECNAV.

Can you guys verify / provide some assurances that GTMO/Navy is following regular protocols and not relaxing SECNAV requirements? Can you also confirm that the personnel have the proper SECNAVs before making a decision to allow them on the base? We were told that Captain Culpepper at GTMO will be making the decision as to whether the SECNAVs are proper and whether to relax the requirement when the personnel arrives at the base.

Thanks,
(b) (6) [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 5:03 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Cc: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

(b) (6) [redacted]

(b) [redacted] nd I will look into it and get back to you. I am not sure.

V/r,
(b) (6) [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 4:57 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

I understand MCM filed a protest for the contact. Is that protest still under review? If so, what is the timeline for a decision?

Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2017 3:50 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Cc: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

(b) (6) [redacted]

(b) (6) [redacted] has been involved with this item of interest. He has also had queries from Senator Rubio's office as well. I have attached the document that he sent to his office.

There was a recent brief provided to Jonathan Arias (Senator Rubio's MLA) as well.

Here is some of the info from that meeting:

BLUF: The incumbent contractor for a GTMO port ops contract lost the re-compete and protested two times and was denied. The succeeding contractor has not performed to the contract due a foreign worker issue; the incumbent contractor received a bridge contract to keep services going until 1 June.

Main points:
- The new Port Ops services contract at GTMO was awarded by Fleet Logistics Center Jacksonville on 27 Oct 16 to Seaward Services. Afterwards, the incumbent contractor, MCM, protested the award to GAO, the protest was denied. Later, MCM filed a protest in the Court of Federal Claims, where it was denied.
- On 31 Jan 17, an email from Seaward told the contracting officer that the foreign national workers that previously worked for MCM were not available to Seaward. Seaward stated that their proposal assumed that these workers would be available during the transition from MCM's contract and that this was not expected.
- On 1 Feb 17, the contracting officer issued a stop work order to Seward and issued a bi-lateral bridge contract to MCM to pick up the port ops services until the Seaward contract was at full capability.
- On 1 Feb 17, the contracting officer issued a cure notice to Seward to detail their plan to deliver services in accordance with the contract. The current plan is to have Seaward assume contract responsibilities on 1 Jun 17.
- MCM has asked for a final contracting officer's decision at least one level above the current contracting officer. This decision will come from NAVSUP Global Logistics Center but could go back to Court again if MCM is not satisfied with the remedies offered.

I don't have any other or new information. If I receive anything though I will make sure you are updated.

V/r,
(b) (6) [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 5:14 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

FYI - attached is another letter from MCM.

-----Original Message-----
From (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 4:31 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

Any update on this? Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 5:22 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

(b) (6) [redacted]

I will talk with the guys and the office and I will make sure the right person gets a hold of you.

Vr
(b) (6) [redacted]

---

From (b) (6) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 5:08:59 PM
To: (b) (6) [redacted]
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] GTMO port operations contract

(b) (6) [redacted]

I'm reaching out on a local request. Please let me know if there is someone else I should reach out to. Thanks.

We've been contacted by a constituent company, MCM Corporation, which currently has the NAVSUP contract for port operations at the GTMO Naval Base. Seaward Services has subsequently been award the contract when it was re-competed. We were told by MCM that on the day of the turnover of port operations, Seaward showed up completely unprepared and the port was immediately shut down. At the request of the Navy, MCM restarted port operations and was given a one month extension to their current contract to continue operations. At the end of February, NAVSUP again extended MCM's contract for another 90 days because Seaward was still not ready to assume operations of the port nor has hired the appropriate personnel. MCM believes this is simply giving Seaward additional time to comply with the contract requirements. Can we get some clarification as to why Seaward keeps getting extensions to comply with the contract? I understand that the Navy can determinate the contract for!

default upon a "catastrophic performance failure." MCM feels that some of those solicitation requirements were relaxed to benefit Seaward.

Lastly, MCM believes Seaward is recruiting MCM's employees in violation of the contract requirements and pressuring them to leave the company. I've attached a letter from MCM to NAVSUP outlining their concerns. Can we get an update on the steps the Navy is taking to ensure isn't violating the contract if these allegations are true?

Thanks in advance,

(b) (6) [redacted]

---

(b) (6) [redacted]