



PRE-PROPOSAL SITE VISIT AGENDA

SOLICITATION NUMBER: N69450-16-R-1607
PROJECT TITLE: WHARF BRAVO STRUCTURAL REPAIRS
LOCATION: NS GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

DATE: APRIL 13, 2016, 08:00 am Eastern time

<i>Welcome/Introductions</i>	<i>Harold Teague</i>	<i>Contract Specialist, Guantanamo Bay</i>
<i>Project Overview</i>	<i>Otis Davis</i>	<i>Construction Manager, Guantanamo Bay</i>
<i>Technical Description of Work</i>	<i>Otis Davis</i>	<i>Construction Manager, Guantanamo Bay</i>
<i>Contractual Background</i>	<i>Harold Teague</i>	<i>Contract Specialist, Guantanamo Bay</i>
<i>Contract Procedures</i>	<i>Harold Teague</i>	<i>Contract Specialist, Guantanamo Bay</i>
<i>Selection Criteria</i>	<i>Otis Davis</i>	<i>Construction Manager, Guantanamo Bay</i>
<i>Tour Site</i>	<i>Otis Davis</i>	<i>Construction Manager, Guantanamo Bay</i>

NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS:

- **YOUR GENERAL QUESTIONS ARE ENCOURAGED AND WILL BE ANSWERED, IF POSSIBLE, DURING THE SITE VISIT. TECHNICAL OR COMPLEX QUESTIONS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED AS A PPI TO OLISHA.COSTA@NAVY.MIL.**
- **MINUTES OF THE CONFERENCE WILL BE POSTED ON NECO.**
- **THE SOLICITATION REMAINS UNCHANGED UNLESS AN AMENDMENT IS ISSUED.**

AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions – Contracting Officer/Contract Specialist

a. Attendance Roster

Please take a moment to sign the attendance roster. Minutes of the Pre-Proposal Conference will be posted on NECO.

b. NECO Registration

Register at – <https://www.neco.navy.mil>. All information pertaining to this procurement will be posted to NECO.

c. Amendments

Be advised that nothing said today or any responses given today, including at the site visit, will be binding or change the requirements of the solicitation unless the solicitation is amended in writing by issuance of an official amendment. If an amendment is issued, it will be posted on NECO and normal procedures relating to the acknowledgement and receipt of solicitation amendments shall apply.

2. Project Overview – Project Manager

a. Project Description

The contractor will be required to perform structural repairs at Wharf Bravo, NS Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. This solicitation will result in a competitive negotiated Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) Design-Bid-Build construction contract. The scope of this project is to provide repair and maintenance measures designed to promote long-term life and serviceability of Wharf Bravo including repair of steel sheet pile, repair sections of spalled concrete, replacement of steel fender framing, replacement of missing chains on camels and cleaning and recoating and/or replacing deteriorated mooring fittings. The project includes installation of new steel sheet pile wall in order to create a single linear facility. The project also includes soil stabilization to meet current site seismic requirements and will occur in the area behind the existing sheet pile wall.

b. Construction Project Magnitude

The estimated project magnitude for this project is between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000. Offerors should not assume that the funding for this project will be increased. Notification should be given to the Contracting Officer prior to the proposal submission date if an offeror believes the RFP requirements cannot be met within the stated range.

c. Options

There are no options under this solicitation.

d. Completion Time/Liquidated Damages

The contract resulting from this solicitation will allow a completion time in calendar days from date of award as shown below, which includes the initial 15 days allowed for mailings, submission and approval of insurance, bonding and other requirements set forth in the award. The completion time for this project is based on our assessment of the design and construction requirements for this project. However, if you believe that these requirements will require a longer period for completion or will result in additional proposal costs to meet the date, please notify the Contracting Officer prior to the proposal due date.

Project completion date: 880 days from date of contract award.

CLIN 0001: Wharf Bravo Structural Repairs

Phase I (North End Wharf Repairs) - Completion Date: 440 days from date of contract award

Phase II (South End Wharf Repairs) - Completion Date: 880 days from date of contract award.

Within the overall project schedule, the contractor shall commence and complete the required work in phases. The contractor shall complete each phase of the work within the number of calendar days stated, or within the dates specified, in the following schedule:

Schedule start day: The day designated as the beginning of a particular phase; the number listed is the number of calendar days from the award of contract unless a specific calendar date is provided.

Completion day: The day designated as the end of a given phase and the day the work in that phase must be completed; the number listed is the number of calendar days from the award of the contract unless a specific calendar date is provided.

Phase	Description	(a) Schedule Start Date	(b) Completion Date
I	North End Wharf Repairs	0	440 days
II	South End Wharf Repairs	441 days	880 days

If the work of a particular phase is complete and accepted before the scheduled completion day, the contractor shall immediately begin work on the subsequent phase unless otherwise restricted.

The liquidated damages in the following amounts will be assessed for each calendar day of delay:

During Phase I – CLIN 0001: Wharf Bravo Structural Repairs - \$7,450

During Phase II – CLIN 0001: Wharf Bravo Structural Repairs - \$7,450

3. Technical Description of Work – Project Manager

(More detailed description of work to be presented orally)

4. Contract Background – Contracting Officer

- a. Solicitation was posted to <https://www.neco.navy.mil> on 7 April 2016. Solicitation # N69450-16-R-1607.
- b. The awarded proposal will be incorporated into the contract.
- c. CAUTION – Today’s Q&As are not contractually binding.

5. Contractual Procedures - Contract Specialist

a. The Source Selection Process

1. The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contract; to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contract to the offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value—the proposal most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.

2. As stated in the solicitation, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. In addition, if the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

3. The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror.

4. As stated in the solicitation, all technical factors when combined are of equal importance to the performance confidence assessment (past performance) rating; and all technical factors and the performance confidence assessment (past performance) rating, when combined are approximately equal to price.

5. Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions. Proposals may be found to have either a significant weakness or multiple weaknesses that impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal. The evaluation report must document the evaluation board’s assessment of the identified weakness(s) and the associated risk to successful

contract performance resulting from the weakness(s). This assessment must provide the rationale for proceeding to award without discussions.

b. Evaluation Factors

1. The solicitation requires the evaluation of price and the following non-cost/price factors:

Factor 1 Construction Experience and Personnel Qualifications

Factor 2- Past Performance

Factor 3- Technical Approach

Factor 4- Safety

The distinction between corporate experience and past performance is that corporate experience pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work covered by this requirement, in terms of size, scope and complexity. Past performance relates to how well a contractor has performed on relevant projects.

2. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors and subfactors is the technical factors, e.g. Factors 1, 3, and 4 and their respective subfactors are of equal importance to each other and, when combined are equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment factor, Factor 2. When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factors and past performance/performance confidence assessment factor combined (i.e., the non-cost/price evaluation factors) are approximately equal to price.

The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-cost/price proposals are considered essentially equal in terms of overall quality, or if price is so high as to significantly diminish the value of a non-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered.

6. Selection Criteria – Project Manager

Factor 1- Construction Experience and Personnel Qualifications:

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

(1) Construction Experience: Submit Construction Experience Project Data Sheets for a minimum of two to a maximum of five *Relevant Projects*. Offeror shall clearly demonstrate project experience that contains the salient qualities of repair of wharf and pier structures, installation of wharf sheet pile, and soil stabilization by deep soil mixing, and any other characteristics that further emphasize their experience. All projects must meet the definition of a Relevant Project to be considered. If a joint venture/partnership arrangement is

being proposed, include copies of agreements and letters of commitment signed by an Officer of each firm with the authority to bind the company. Agreements must include company name, DUNS number, address, point of contact, email address, phone number and fax numbers. The agreements shall demonstrate the relationship between firms, the percentage of work that each firm will complete, and the type of work each firm will perform. The experience of any member for the joint venture/partnership will be evaluated as that of the Offeror. The Offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate construction experience under this evaluation factor. Offerors relying on the specialized experience of subcontractors must submit copies of the agreements and letters of commitment. The agreements and letters must be signed by officers with authority to bind the companies, and should clearly identify the company names, DUNS numbers, and point of contact information (address, email, phone, and fax).

DEFINITION OF A RELEVANT PROJECT: Renovation or new construction of a pier or wharf, at an approximate of \$10M or higher. Each relevant project must include at least one of the following minimum mandatory features, and the relevant projects, when combined, must include ALL of the following minimum mandatory features: (i) concrete deck construction or repair; (ii) installation of new sheet pile and reinforced concrete cap; and (iii) soil stabilization by deep soil mixing.

Relevant projects must have been completed by the offeror, within the past seven (7) years from the date of the RFP.

(2) Personnel Qualifications: Submit resumes for a construction Project Manager and a Site Superintendent that clearly demonstrate project experience that contains the salient qualities of repair of wharf and pier structures, installation of wharf sheet pile, and soil stabilization, and any other characteristics that further emphasize their experience. Resumes shall include the following: (i) professional licenses and certifications, if any; (ii) number of years of experience; (iii) firms they have worked for; and (iv) a description of projects that they have worked on including their role on these projects. Resumes for each individual shall be limited to two pages in length. All projects must meet the definition of a Relevant Project to be considered.

Construction Project Manager – responsible for all construction project management. Must meet the following minimum requirements: (i) seven years of construction management experience; two years of experience serving as Construction Project Manager; and (ii) experience on at least one relevant project. Resume must include documentation to demonstrate relevancy of experience project(s).

Project Site Superintendent – responsible for all on-site construction operations. Must meet the following minimum requirements: (i) seven years of experience as a Site Superintendent on construction projects; and (ii) experience on at least one relevant project. Resume must include documentation to demonstrate relevancy of experience project(s).

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the experience of projects submitted for this factor to assess the offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the RFP, the offeror's approach and understanding of the requirement, and the offeror's experience successfully executing and managing Relevant Projects similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirement. An Offeror that demonstrates relevant project experience as a prime contractor may be rated higher than an Offeror relying on subcontractor relevant experience.

Projects that are not submitted on the mandatory Construction Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment C) will not be evaluated. If a project form exceeds two pages, only the first two pages will be evaluated. For resumes that exceed two pages in length, only the first two pages will be evaluated.

The Government will evaluate the experience of key personnel submitted for this factor to assess the personnel's capability to meet the requirements of the RFP, the personnel's approach and understanding of the requirement, and the personnel's experience successfully executing and managing Relevant Projects similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirement. Personnel that demonstrate experience in excess of the requirements may be rated higher.

Factor 2 – Past Performance:

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Past Performance Questionnaire included in the solicitation is provided for the offeror to submit to the client for all construction experience projects. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed Past Performance Questionnaires should be submitted with your proposal. If the offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ (Attachment D), which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Olisha Costa via email at olisha.costa@navy.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

Also include performance recognition documents received within the last seven (7) years such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

As part of its past performance submission, if the Offeror foresees negative past performance information for any contract submitted, it shall submit a discussion of significant problems encountered and corrective action taken. Safety and environmental violations and their corrective actions shall also be discussed.

The Government may use information obtained from sources other than the offeror's proposal, including past performance information on other past projects. The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary/affiliate) identified in the offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

This factor focuses on how well the offeror performed on relevant projects. The Government will evaluate the quality of the offeror's past performance based on awards, customer letters of commendation, or customer performance evaluations for the projects submitted under Factor 1 (Offeror Corporate Experience). This evaluation is separate and distinct from the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination. The assessment of the offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the relative capability of the offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any and all sources including sources outside of the Government.

The degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g., PPIRS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), performance recognition documents, and information obtained for any other source) reflect a trend of satisfactory performance will be determined considering:

- A pattern of successful completion of projects;
- A pattern of deliverables that are timely and of good quality;
- A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels (task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc.):
- Tasks that are identical to, similar to, or related to the task at hand; and
- A respect for stewardship of Government funds:

Offerors lacking relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance. However, the proposal of an offeror with no relevant past performance history, while rated Unknown Confidence (Neutral) in past performance, may not represent the most advantageous proposal to the Government.

Offerors lacking relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance. However, the proposal of an offeror with no relevant past

performance history, while rated Unknown Confidence (Neutral) in past performance, may not represent the most advantageous proposal to the government.

Factor 3 - Technical Approach

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

OCONUS Work Plan: Provide a narrative demonstrating the Offeror's ability to successfully carry out construction projects in OCONUS locations. The narrative shall include:

- The Offeror's plan for shipping materials and equipment to and from Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Materials and equipment are not available locally and must be provided at the contractor's expense. Provide a plan of major equipment that is anticipated to be needed, major construction materials, and an anticipated plan for transporting to the worksite.
- The Offeror's plan for berthing and medical arrangements. As it is anticipated, no beds will be available, the Contractor shall construct new temporary housing facilities (man camp) in accordance with the RFP SECTION 00 73 01 for all prime and subcontractor workers required to complete this project. Provide a detailed plan of the temporary housing facilities including but not limited to housing capacity, design criteria, occupancy, shipping, delivery, and installation.
- The Offeror's medical plan of action. Describe how the Offeror will provide and sustain a healthy workforce which includes all employees and labor force.
- The Offeror's plan for Labor acquisition and sustainment. Local labor is unavailable and must be provided at the contractor's expense. Provide a detailed plan of your expectations of the staffing requirements for this project, your source of labor for execution of the work, and management of personnel for the duration of the contract. Offerors that demonstrate prior experience establishing international labor agreements may be evaluated more favorably.
- The Offeror's plan for operation and demobilization of a concrete batch plant.
- Provide any other aspects of OCONUS work that the Offeror feels is critical to a successful project.

Phasing Schedule and Narrative: Provide a detailed phasing schedule that demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the phasing requirements contained in the technical specifications. Provide a narrative discussing the specifics of the Offeror's proposed construction phasing plan. Include in the narrative major milestones of the construction schedule and any other salient aspects that illustrate that the Offeror's proposal meets the phasing requirements contained in the technical specifications, takes into account the requirements of the Statement of Work and is otherwise acceptable to the Government. Provide a narrative describing how the contractor intends to coordinate with both the Public Works and School Departments on scheduling construction to accommodate existing use of the proposed construction sites.

Narrative shall not exceed ten (10) double-sided pages (or twenty (20) single-sided pages). Up to three (3) conceptual drawings may be provided to supplement the narrative. Conceptual drawings will not count towards the page limitation.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's OCONUS work plan, phasing schedule and phasing narrative considering the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirements of the project. The Government will evaluate the offerors logistical ability to mobilize and ship materials and equipment through a well thought out Work Plan. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Offeror's technical approach that will give the Government a high level of confidence that the work will be performed in accordance with the technical requirements of the RFP.

Factor 4 – Safety

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture; however, only one safety narrative is required. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR): For the three previous complete calendar years [2012, 2013, 2014], submit your EMR (which compares your company's annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a three year period). If you have no EMR, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the EMR and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: For the three previous complete calendar years [2012, 2013, 2014], submit your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA DART Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach for Safety: Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety Narrative shall be limited to two pages.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures for itself and its subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall safety record, the Offeror's plan to select and monitor subcontractors, any and innovative safety

methods that the Offeror plans to implement for this procurement. The Government's sources of information for evaluating safety may include, but are not limited to, OSHA, NAVFAC's Facility Accident and Incident Reporting (FAIR) database, and other related databases. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete safety information regarding these submittal requirements rests with the Offeror. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR): The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: The Government will evaluate the OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety: The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation.

7. Wrap up – Contracting Officer

Point of Contact: Procuring Contract Specialist: Olisha Costa
Email: olisha.costa@navy.mil

All questions must be submitted in writing, using the PPI Log located in the Additional Documents section of NECO. Keep the PPI Log in excel format when submitting. Government responses will be posted in the PPI Log and uploaded in the Additional Documents section of NECO. The title of the PPI Logs will be dated, so please be sure to locate the most current version. No individual replies back will be made. See page 4 of the RFP for specific instructions.

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: 12 May 2016 at 2:00 pm Eastern Time. Any extensions will be posted to NECO as an amendment.

If hand-delivering proposals, you must submit an AMAG Form by email at least three days in advance to Olisha Costa, which has been posted to NECO under Additional Documents. You must also complete the Base Access Pass Registration form (Attachment C) and give to the Pass and ID office on the day of delivery. Make sure to bring appropriate ID. See pages 5-6 of the RFP for specific instructions regarding hand carried proposals.

Ultimately, it is the contractor's responsibility to ensure timely proposal submission to the specified location. Due to heightened security, it is recommended that you allow sufficient time to get into the building and turn in your proposal.

8. Site Tour

At the site, please stay together as a group so that any questions asked and any responses given can be heard by all.