

**SOLICITATION NO: N62473-15-R-2485
PHASE ONE**

**INDEFINITE DELIVERY INDEFINITE QUANTITY (IDIQ) MULTIPLE AWARD
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (MACC) SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE FOR NEW
CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND RENOVATION OF GENERAL BUILDING
CONSTRUCTION AT VARIOUS GOVERNMENT INSTALLATIONS LOCATED IN
CALIFORNIA, ARIZONA, NEVADA, UTAH, COLORADO, AND NEW MEXICO**

Questions & Answers

December 29, 2015

Question 1: This Multiple Award Construction Contract is a small business set-aside. Part of the evaluation criteria includes submitting construction experience consisting of building renovation with a construction cost of \$8,000,000 or more, however, we believe that renovation contracts of over \$8,000,000 for small businesses are not common. We request that this criteria be revised to: At least (1) relevant construction project shall demonstrate the Offeror's experience in performing primarily renovation/repair of existing buildings where relevant projects may have a total construction cost of **\$3,000,000** or more.

Answer: We do not intend on changing the criteria as stated in the RFP. This requirement is necessary as we have projected renovation projects within the specified task order range. NAVFAC SW currently has General Construction MACCs in place to cover the projects under the task order range specified in this MACC.

Question 2: The construction experience proposal submission requirements require that projects submitted be 100% complete within the last five years. Since relevant projects are defined as having construction costs of over \$8,000,000 and this MACC is geared towards small business, we request this requirement be changed to projects complete within the last ten (10) years.

Answer: We do not intend on extending the 5 year consideration nor change the criteria requiring the project be 100% complete for relevant Experience and relevant Past Performance. The 5 year consideration is based on the completion date of the construction and design project and is calculated by counting back five years from the initial RFP issuance date (December 21, 2015). The construction project and the design of the project must be 100% complete as of the date of the initial RFP issuance (December 21, 2015).

Question 3: Where do I acquire the plans and specs for this bid?

Answer: This is a two-phase design-build procurement. Please read the posted RFP requirements and submit in accordance with the stated proposal submission requirements.

Question 4: In order to be considered relevant, do Design-Build projects need have construction costs greater than or equal to \$8,000,000?

Answer: Yes, please read the posted RFP requirements and submit in accordance with the stated proposal submission requirements. Please review the definitions and requirements for a relevant project in accordance with the posted RFP.

January 7, 2016

Question 5: The RFP requires that we provide applicable documentation in the Experience Section on projects that were validated and/or certified through the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) or an equivalent organization or process. Please verify this is not included in the page count for the project data sheets.

Answer: The certification is not part of the two-page limitation for Exhibit B. Although, the evaluation factor doesn't say it, the Exhibit specifically states the documents do not count toward the page limitation.

January 12, 2016

Question 6: In reference to Factor 3, Past Performance, the MACC Frequently Asked Questions state that a signed copy of the Past Performance Questionnaires must be provided. Since the Government's intent is to ensure the validity of the signature, will the Government accept *certified* digital signatures (with the certification statement alongside of the signature)?

Answer: Certified digital signatures are acceptable on Past Performance Questionnaires. However, the PPQ must have either a hand-written or digital signature.

Question 7: The RFP's Factor 2 indicates that in the event that the prime is a joint venture, experience must come from each JV member or the offeror "may be rated lower". Will the government allow approved mentor-protégé JVs specifically to submit experience from only the mentor partner, and do so without receiving a lower rating? We feel that this is in keeping with the distinction the SBA makes between regular JVs and mentor-protégé JVs, and that doing so will result in more well-qualified proposals available for the government's review.

If this request is not acceptable to the government, can the government clarify what it means by the Factor 2 language "may be rated lower" and by what standard it will use to determine whether to attach a lower rating to an offeror for Factor 2?

Answer: Factor 2 states that if the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects submitted by the JV entity. If the JV entity does not have shared experience, then projects may be submitted for the members, with no more than five projects combined. It is correct that the Factor states that Offeror's who fail to submit experience for all JV members may be rated lower. It is the Offeror's decision what projects to submit.

Please note that the solicitation (in section 00100, paragraph 10) states that only Mentor Protégé Agreements (MPA) formally approved by the Small Business Administration (SBA) will be considered for this procurement. The MPA must be approved by SBA prior to the original proposal due date.

Offerors submitting as a JV for this requirement shall submit a copy of the JV agreement with their proposal. If the Offeror is determined to be a prospective awardee, the JV agreement will be approved prior to award. All JV agreements must comply with 13 C.F.R. 121.

Question 8: The RFP's Factor 2 (a.(2), paragraph 1) indicates that offerors may submit qualifications for more than one design team. (For example: paragraph 1, sentence 2 in the above-referenced section: "...performed by the design firm(s) as the...".) The basis of evaluation in Factor 2 (b. paragraph 1) indicates that the government will only review a maximum of five design experience projects. Minimum experience requirements also apply to this Factor (a.(2) paragraph 3), minimum requirements which would/may prevent offerors from submitting more than one design firm and adhering to the maximum of five projects limitation. (1) How many design firms may offerors propose? (2) If more than one firm is permitted, may each design firm present 3-5 projects, with each design firm meeting the "minimum" design experience requirements noted in Factor 2?

Answer: (1) Per the evaluation factor, submit a minimum of three and maximum of five "relevant design projects for the design team". The factor also states that the "design team" shall meet the minimum requirements. Offerors may propose multiple lead design firms, which would comprise the "design team". Please note that the evaluation factor also states that "failure to submit relevant projects for all proposed Lead Design Firms may result in a lower rating."

(2) The evaluation factor remains unchanged, with a maximum total of five design projects, regardless of the number of design firms proposed.

Question 9: We were notified by Fedbizops that there was a change to this RFP dated today. In checking the website we did not notice any apparent changes to the RFP. There was a new posted date (January 7) for Q&A, however the document was identical to the Q&A posted previously dated December 29th. Please clarify what changes were made to the RFP today.

Answer: There was no change to the RFP.