

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
1	SF1442	13B, pg. 1 of 95	N/A	The SF 1442 indicates that a bid bond is required. Since there is no seed project in the Phase I proposal, is there still a requirement for a bid bond?	See page 87 of 95 for the Phase I Pricing requirements.	No	0001
2	SF1442 - Section 0800 -	Para 3, pg. pg 88 of 95	N/A	<p>Section 00800, on Page 88 of 95, the Non-cost/price Factors submittal is limited to a maximum of 50 pages. This is insufficient due to the submittal requirements. Basis for this is as follows:</p> <p>a. Factor 1 – Technical Approach. This factor is limited to a 2 page narrative, but any agreement must be included. Generally, agreements are at least 8 pages long. This would provide a total of 10 pages.</p> <p>b. Factor 2 – Corporate Experience. Exhibit 1 is used and it is 2 pages long for each project. If both the construction contractor and design firm submit 5 projects each, then this will total 20 pages.</p> <p>c. Factor 4 – Safety. Have to provide EMR and DART rates and a technical narrative. This totals 3 pages.</p> <p>d. Factor 3 – Past Performance. The past performance form is 5 pages long. If both the construction contractor and design firm submit 5 project each, then this will total 50 pages.</p> <p>A recap of the number of pages is as follows: Factor 1 - 10 pages Factor 2 - 20 pages Factor 3 - 50pages Factor 4- 3 pages Total 83 pages</p> <p>It is possible for a contractor to submit 87 pages and be in accordance with the RFP. In order to not exceed the 50 pages, a proposal would likely have to limit the project information to only 2 projects. This would not provide sufficient information or diversity for evaluation.</p>	Factor 3, Past Performance: Past Performance Questionnaire's (PPQs) and completed CCASS/ACASS/CPARS evaluation do not count against the 50 page limitation for the technical proposal.	No	0001
3	Factor 2 - Experience	Page 89	N/A	The RFP states, "Submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) relevant construction projects ..." We would like to submit a proposal under our Mentor Protégé Joint Venture. Will the government find it acceptable if the three projects meeting the minimum criteria of \$5 million with at least one being new construction, and one being renovation come from our mentor, and the two optional projects come from us if they are less than \$5 million each?	See page 89 and 90 of 95, Factor 2 - Experience, (a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements, (1) Construction Experience: "...minimum construction value of approximately \$5 million or greater." "If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity. If the Joint Venture does not have shared experience, projects may be submitted for the Joint Venture members. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all Joint Venture members may be rated lower. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined."	N/A	0001
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Can a small business (<\$15,000,000) joint venture with a large business (>\$15,000,000) on this proposal?	Yes. The Joint must meet the requirements for project submission on page 90 of 95 in the RFP for a Joint Venture.	N/A	0001

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
5	Evaluation of Factors for Award	3.a.1.(iii)	pg. 87	<p>Solicitation States: Offerors must have a single bonding capacity up to \$20M:</p> <p>Question: It seems unusual that the single award bond capacity would be \$20M for a \$99M MATOC particularly when the past experience projects are to have a minimum construction value of approximately \$5 million or greater.</p> <p>Question: Would you consider reducing the single award bonding capacity (i.e. \$15M or \$10M)?</p>	No. The Offeror needs to demonstrate their firm can receive a bond up to the upper limit of the task order range, which \$20M. This requirement remains at \$20M	No	0002
6	00800 Special Contract Responses	Project Description 2nd Paragraph	pg. 81	<p>Projects descriptions provided in in the 2nd paragraph vary significantly with those in the Factor 2 - Experience projects found on page 89.</p> <p>Question Would a Design-Build Alternative Energy construction project at a DoD Installation with a construction value exceeding \$5M be considered a relevant project? Would a parking garage at DoD Installation or VA Medical Center with a construction value exceeding \$5M be considered a relevant project?</p>	Projects will be evaluated based on the relevancy criteria noted under Factor 2 .	No	0003
7	Evaluation of Factors for Award	Factor 2 - Experience (a) (1)	pg. 90	<p>Solicitation States: If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in performance of th contract.</p> <p>Question: We are currently in a Department of Defense approved Mentor-Protége Agreement. Will NAVFAC consider recent and relevant project experience of the Mentor (large) firm acceptable under its evaluation of Factor 2 and Factor 3; and the proposal clearly demonstrates that the Mentor firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract?</p>	Yes, the Government will consider the experience of the Mentor for a DoD or SBA approved Mentor-Protégé Agreement. If the Offeror utilizes the Mentor's experience as their own, then the Offeror <u>must</u> provide a copy of thier DoD or SBA <u>Approved</u> Mentor-Protégé Agreement with their technical proposal. A DoD or SBA approved Mentor-Protégé Agreement does not count against the page limitations for Factor 2, Experience and Factor 3, Past Performance.	No	0002
8	Factor 2 - Experience	a.1 - Construction Experience	pg. 89	<p>A major renovation is defined as, "a project which includes complete mechanical, electrical, and fire protection repair/replacement and replacement of interior finishes."</p> <p>Question – For a single project to be considered relevant, does the renovation need to include allof these scopes of work, or would a combination a two or three of these scopes suffice? For example, would a renovation project valued at \$6M that included electrical, HVAC, and structural work be considered relevant?</p>	Projects will be evaluated based on the relevancy criteria noted under Factor 2 .	No	0003
9	800	8	pg. 91	<p>In an effort to avoid increasing our customer's workload, as well as ensuring a timely and complete proposal, could Past Performance Questionnaires submitted in previous proposals be utilized in this proposal provided they were completed on NAVFAC/USACE Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ-0) forms?</p>	Yes, a PPQ that was previous completed a customer/client for different sollicitaiton/RFP may be submitted for a project that the offeror submits for Factor 2 - Experience. However, you cannot incorporate this PPQ by reference in your proposal submission.	No	0002

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
10	800	3.a3(1)(iv)	pg. 87	<p>The reference states that we are to provide: "Proof of the Offeror's filled out Representations and Certifications and Active and Inactive Exclusions from the System for Award Management (SAM)."</p> <p>1. What constitutes this proof? On SAM.gov, under "Entity Record" is a subcategory for "Reps & Certs." Is a printout of this what you require? If so, do you need each of the fields expanded? E.g., the first item is FAR 52.203-11. If you click the hyperlink, you get paragraphs a. thru e. There are nearly 50 of these links. If each is expanded, there are 42 pages for our Reps & Certs. The unexpanded printout is 3 pages long, but provides no details.</p> <p>2. Alternatively, would you prefer to have only a printout of the unexpanded "Entity Record" included? Further, do you also want us to include the Reps & Certs info from the solicitation Section 00600?</p> <p>3. For the Active/Inactive Exclusions, we anticipate printing the SAM.gov pages for each exclusion. Is this sufficient?</p>	<p>1. Certifications and Representations printed from Sam constitutes proof.</p> <p>2. Items in Section 00600 must be completed and provided with th price proposal.</p> <p>3. Yes the print out for active/inactive exclusions is sufficient.</p>	No	0002
11	800	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors	pg. 88	<p>The reference requires us to use Arial Font of 12 for factors 1 - 4. The Exhibits 1 - 3 all are formatted to use Times New Roman 10 font. May we assume we are allowed to use the fonts as provided on these forms?</p>	<p>Yes you can use the font in the forms for your proposal submission.</p>	No	0002
12	100	FAR 52.204-3	pg. 8	<p>Where do we include the information from FAR 52.204-3?</p>	<p>Yes this information needs to be submitted with the price proposal.</p>	No	0002
13	00800	Factor 1, (a)(1)	Page 89 of 95	<p>This paragraph states, in part: "The information requested in item #2 below is not included in this page limitation." We believe this applies to the 50 page limit as specified on page 88 of 93. Can you confirm?</p>	<p>Yes, you are correct signed copy of a joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, approved mentor protégé agreement (MPA), or letter of commitment for each member of the Offeror's team identified above (e.g., joint venture member, partner, team member, subcontractor, parent company, subsidiary, or other affiliated company, etc.) does not count against the 50 page limitation.</p>	No	0002
14	Factor 2 - Experience	2.8.1	pg. 89 of 95	<p>Factor 2, Experience Section , page 89 of the RFP, requires submittal of 3 to 5 relevant construction projects . The minimum construction value is mentioned as \$ 5 million and greater. Since this is a small business set aside contract and majority of the anticipated task orders would be between \$ 1 to 5 Million range, would the NAVY consider revising the project experience threshold from minimum \$ 5 million to \$ 3 million minimum?</p>	<p>Project vaule for Factor 2, Experience will remain at \$5 Million. However, see page 81 of 95, Project Description, paragraph 2 and see page 6 of 95, DELIVERY/TASK ORDER MINIMUM/MAXIMUM QUANTITY AND ORDER VALUE, for the task order range. Task Order range for this MACC is \$4 Million to \$20 Million.</p>	No	0002

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
15	Evaluation Factors for Award, Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors	1	88	For tables and graphics, are we allowed to use a font smaller than Arial 12pt as long as it is legible?	No.	No	0002
16	Evaluation Factors for Award, Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors, Factor 1 - Technical Approach, Section a(2)	5	89	If we are including a copy of a Teaming Agreement, does the Teaming Agreement count against the 50-page limitation for the Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factor?	See PPI #13.	No	0002

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC													
N69450-15-R-0606													
PPI Log													
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #						
17	Evaluation Factors for Award, Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors, Factor 2 - Experience, Section a(1)	2	90	If we are including a copy of a LEED Certification, does the certificate count against the 50-page limitation for the Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factor?	Yes a copy of a LEED Certification will count against the 50 page limitation.	No	0003						
18	Price - DELIVERY/TASK ORDER MINIMUM/MAXIMUM QUANTITY AND ORDER VALUE	6	N/A	<p>DELIVERY/TASK ORDER MINIMUM/MAXIMUM QUANTITY AND ORDER VALUE</p> <p>The minimum quantity and order value for each Deliver/Task order issued shall not be less than the minimum quantity and order value stated in the following table. The maximum quantity and order value for each Delivery/Task order issued shall not exceed the maximum quantity and order value stated in the following table.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>MINIMUM QUANTITY AMOUNT</th> <th>MINIMUM AMOUNT</th> <th>MAXIMUM QUANTITY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>\$4,000,000.00</td> <td></td> <td>\$20,000,000.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Will the minimum Task Order amount issued be \$4M? Will all Task Orders be \$4M and above? The answer to this question is important for us to know prior to putting together the proposal since we have a single Bonding Capacity of up to \$5M per project. I cannot imagine many Small Businesses having a higher single project bonding limit.</p>	MINIMUM QUANTITY AMOUNT	MINIMUM AMOUNT	MAXIMUM QUANTITY	\$4,000,000.00		\$20,000,000.00	<p>See page 81 of 95, Project Description, second paragraph: "...Task orders will be firm fixed-priced, normally in the range of \$4M to \$20M per order. However, task orders under or over these amounts may be considered if deemed to be in the Government's best interest and approved by the NAVFAC SE Chief of Contracting Office."</p> <p>Also, see Phase I, Price requirements for proof of bonding limitations: " (iii) Provide a letter from your Bonding Company indicating your company's bonding limit for a single project and aggregate bonding capacity. Offerors must have a single award bonding capacity up to \$20M."</p>	No	0002
MINIMUM QUANTITY AMOUNT	MINIMUM AMOUNT	MAXIMUM QUANTITY											
\$4,000,000.00		\$20,000,000.00											
19	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors: Factor 2 - Technical Approach (a) (1) Construction Experience; &, (2) Design Experience	Pg. 90, para. 2, last sentence; & Pg. 91, 1st full para., last sentence.	Pgs. 90 & 91	Will the Government accept applicable documentation following each related project's 2-page Exhibits 1 for projects that were validated and/or certified through USGBC or the equivalent organization or process separately from the 2-page limit?	Separate from the two page project exhibit. This information will count against the 50 page limitation for the Phase One Proposal.	No	0003						
20	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors: Factor 2 - Technical Approach (a) (1) Construction Experience; &, (2) Design Experience	Pg. 90, para. 2, last sentence; & Pg. 91, 1st full para., last sentence.	Pgs. 90 & 91	Is applicable documentation for projects that were validated and/or certified through USGBC or the equivalent organization or process included in the 50-page count?	No, they are not included in the limit. Yes, these will be included in the 50 page limit.	No	0003						

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
21	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors: Factor 2 - Technical Approach (a) (1) Construction Experience; & (2) Design Experience	Pg. 90, para. 4; & Pg. 91, 2nd full para.	Pgs 90 & 91.	Factor 2 (a) (1) Construction Experience and (2) Design Experience both indicate that, "...an Offeror utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract." If the Offeror is a Construction firm, should the discussion demonstrating meaningful involvement be submitted only at end of Factor 2 (a) (1), only at the end of Factor 2 (a) (2), or at the end of both (1) and (2)?	Factor 2 states: "If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract." If the offeror is utilizing the experience of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF 1442). The meaningful involvement of the affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies shall be described on the Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Exhibit 1).	No	0003
22	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors: Factor 2 - Technical Approach (a) (1) Construction Experience; & (2) Design Experience	Pg. 90, para. 4; & Pg. 91, 2nd full para.	Pgs 90 & 91.	Please clarify how the discussion(s) demonstrating meaningful involvement will be counted in the 50 pages.	See PPI #21.	No	0003
23	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors, Factor 1 - Technical Approach, (a) (2); & Factor 2 - Technical Approach (a) (1) Construction Experience; & (2) Design Experience	Pg. 89, para. 3; & Pg. 91, 3rd full para.	Pgs. 89 & 91	Please confirm that joint venture, partnership, teaming, and approved mentor protégé (MPA) agreements, or letters of commitment are to be included under Factor 1 – Technical Approach (2) exclusively.	Yes, fully executed and signed joint venture, partnership, teaming and approved mentor protégé agreements are to be submitted under Factor 1 - Technical Approach. These does not count against the 50 page limitation.	No	0003
24	Evaluation Factors for Award, 3. a. (1) (i) - (v)	N/A	Pgs. 86 - 87	Please clarify which of the following items will be included or excluded from the 50-page count: Tabs, Title/Cover Pages, Proof of the Offeror's filled out Representation and Certifications and Active and Inactive Exclusions from the System for Award Management (SAM), and Proof of Vet's 100 Registration.	These items do not count against the 50 page limitation.	No	0003
25	Section 00100, Clause 52.204-3 through 52.227-15	N/A	Pgs. 8 - 12.	Please clarify if these Clauses are to be completed and included in the Phase I offer, and whether they are included in the 50-pages.	Clauses to be completed are to be submitted with the price proposal. Therefore, do not count against the 50 page limitation.	No	0003

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
26	Phase I Non-Cost/Price Factors;" Factor 2 - Technical Approach (a) (1) Construction Experience; & (2) Design Experience	Pg. 89, Para. 8 & Pg. 90, Para. 6	Pgs. 89 & 90	Please clarify if projects submitted are to be 100% complete or if they can be substantially complete, and what percentage that they must be substantially complete.	Per the RFP, projects must be completed.	No	0003

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
27	PPI Question #17, 19 and 20	N/A	N/A	Doesn't your answer to PPI question #17 and #19 contradict your answer to PPI #20?	Please see PPI #17, #19, and #20 above.	No	0005
28	800	para 1	pg. 84	Item 7 on page 8 speaks of the VETS-100 report to be filed annually. As we are submitting as a legal joint venture with no prior contracts as the JV, would we be required to file this report with \$0 current revenue?	Yes.	No	0005
29	00800	3.a3(1)(iv)	Page 87 of 95	The response provided for RFI #10 was partially unclear. Specifically, what are we required to submit from SAM for our Reqs & Certs? The response states: "Certifications and Representations printed from Sam constitutes proof." This guidance doesn't tell us "what" to print from SAM. 1. Do we simply click on "Reqs & Certs" on the Entity Dashboard, then print the resulting screen? (3 pages) 2. Do we expand each of the Reqs & Certs FAR & DFAR clauses to show the responses entered? (42 pages) 3. Do we print the report we get when clicking the "Download FAR Report" or "Download FAR & DFARS Report" links? (25 and 36 pages, respectively) With the many options available, we want to ensure we provide you with the information you need to effectively evaluate our proposal.	Expand the FAR and DFARS reports and print out.	No	0005
30	Factor 2- Experience	1) Construction Experience	page 89	The RFP states that project should have a minimum construction value of approximately \$5M or greater. Is a project with a construction value of \$4.9M considered approximately \$5M?	Factor 2 states: "approximately \$5 million". Each project will be evaluated individually against the criteria for a relevant project.	No	0005
31	Price (Phase 1)	1) Solicitation Submittals	page 87	If the offeror is a Joint Venture, should each party submit proof of Vet's Registration? The JV does not have a separate VET's Registration.	Yes, both firms in a JV should separate VET's registration if the JV does not have one.	No	0005
32	Factor 3 Experience	a) Solicitation Requirements	page 91	If the project is a design/build contract, can a CCASS evaluation be utilized for the past performance for a design experience project?	Per Factor 3: "If a completed AE Contractor Appraisal Support System (ACASS) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 2 for design experience. If there is not a completed CCASS or ACASS evaluation then submit Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment B) for each project included in Factor 2 for both Construction Experience and Design Experience."	No	0005

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
33	Factor 3 Experience	a) Solicitation Requirements	page 92	Can a previous questionnaire be utilized that is not in the USACE/NAVFAC PPQ-O format?	No.	No	0005

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
34	2.a.1	Para 1	page 89 of 95	The RFP states "For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as new construction or major renovation of a variety of projects including, but not limited to: Administrative Facilities, Training Facilities, Child Development Centers, BEQs, Dormitories, Hangars and other similar facilities with a minimum construction value of approximately \$5 million or greater." Will a Dining Facility with a construction value of more than \$5 million be considered a similar facility and therefore considered relevant?	Projects will be evaluated based on the relevancy criteria noted under Factor 2.	No	0005
35	2.a.1	Para 1	page 89 of 95	The RFP states "For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as new construction or major renovation of a variety of projects including, but not limited to: Administrative Facilities, Training Facilities, Child Development Centers, BEQs, Dormitories, Hangars and other similar facilities with a minimum construction value of approximately \$5 million or greater." Will a Medicial Office Facility with a construction value of more than \$5 million be considered a similar facility and therefore considered relevant?	Projects will be evaluated based on the relevancy criteria noted under Factor 2.	No	0005
36	2.a.1	Para 1	page 89 of 95	For the purpose of complying with the requirements of this RFP, would a MAJOR ADDITION/ALTERATION, which involves the demolition and repair of an existing facility and tie-in to that existing facility's systems be considered a relevant major renovation project?	Projects will be evaluated based on the relevancy criteria noted under Factor 2.	No	0005
37	Eval Factors for Award	3. c, Phase 1 Non-Cost/Price Factors	88 of 95	Please confirm inside cover/title page, table of contents, tab sheets, sub-factor tab sheets, separation sheets within factors are not included in the 50 page limitation count?	See PPI #24.	No	0005
38	N/A	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that a Small Business firm teaming with a Large Business firm is considered a Large Business and is not eligible for award?	It depends on the teaming arrangement.	No	0005
39	PPI # 6 & 8	N/A	N/A	Please advise if Factor 1 in the responses to PPI # 1 and 8 are correct or should it be Factor2?	Yes, Factor 2. This has been corrected on the previous PPI responses.	No	0005

TN/MS/FL PANHANDLE MACC							
N69450-15-R-0606							
PPI Log							
PPI #	SECTION OF RFP	PARAGRAPH REFERENCE	DRAWING NUMBER (IF APPLIC)	QUESTION	ANSWER	RFP / SOLICITATION ATTACHMENT Yes or No	ACQ AMENDMENT #
40	PPI # 11	N/A	N/A	Please advise if the Offerors are permitted to use Times New Roman 10 font for all Technical Factors responses or only for Exhibits 1-3? The response to PPI # 11 can be taken to imply the entire Technical Proposal. Most/all NAVFAC technical proposals permit/allow Times New Roman minimum 10 font.	Please see what the requirements are in the RFP for font size.	No	0005