

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 5
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 10-Aug-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVAL FACILITIES ENG COMMAND WASHINGTON 1314 HARWOOD ST SE, BLDG 212 WASHINGTON NAVY YARD DC 20374	CODE N40080	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N40080-13-R-2090	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 30-Apr-2015	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) N40080-13-R-2090 MDIA Facility Support Services (FSS), Quantico, Virginia Amendment 0003 to 1) provide responses to RFIs 1-10; 2) provide Section J Attachments for 1503050 Grounds and 1800000 Environmental; 3) update Section M.A.4; and 4) extend proposal due date to September 3, 2015, with RFI cut-off of August 17, 2015. See Continuation Page.				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL:	EMAIL:	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 10-Aug-2015

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following items are applicable to this modification:**SUMMARY OF CHANGES (REVISED)****SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

RFIS 1-10 RESPONSES

Q1. RFP No. N40080-13-R-2090 issued 1 May 2015 (“RFP”), pp. 220 through 221 of 226, Section b(1) entitled, “Technical Factors,” “Factor 1 – Corporate Experience.”

Referring to subparagraph (a):

Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Submit a TOTAL OF THREE (3) contracts performed within the last five (5) years preceding the release date of the solicitation that best demonstrates your corporate experience in successfully performing contracts of similar size, scope and complexity to this requirement.

Referring to the same subparagraph (a) above, please define the phrase “best demonstrates” your corporate experience in the context of a LPTA evaluation?

A1. Refer to Section M.B.3.b.1.a. Recent, Relevant project is defined as: A facility support services contract completed by the offeror within the last five years preceding the release date of the solicitation similar in nature to the solicitation based on a comparison of size, scope, and complexity.

Q2. Please define “performed”. Does that mean both ongoing and completed contracts?

A2. No, only completed contracts.

Q3. Referring to RFP language on page 220, the following is reflected:

Recent, Relevant project is defined as:

A facility support services contract completed by the offeror within the last five years preceding the release date of the solicitation similar in nature to the solicitation based on a comparison of size, scope, and complexity.

Size: Approximately 760,000 SF or greater Building, 300 or greater \ space car garage and 70 or greater acres of grounds (Each projects provided shall include all three size requirements)

Scope: Facility Support Services in particular pest control services, grounds maintenance, janitorial services, refuse removal, street sweeping, snow removal, fire protection maintenance, generator maintenance and HVAC maintenance.

Complexity: Maintenance of building, equipment and systems in mission critical, secure facilities (secret or higher) where the mission of the facility cannot be impacted due to equipment and system failure.

In responding to this question, please consider an offeror submitting contracts/projects which in the aggregate meet the size requirements, wouldn't that show “demonstrated” experience in addressing the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and then be considered “Acceptable” in the basis of evaluation.

(I.E. Company X submits contracts A, B, and C for Corporate Experience. Contract A meets the 760,000 SF or greater Building and 300 or greater space garage, but does not meet the 70 or greater acres of grounds. Contract B meets the 760,000 SF or greater building and the 70 or greater acres of grounds, but does not meet the 300 or greater space garage. Contract C meets the 300 or greater space garage and 70 or greater acres of grounds but not the

760,000 SF or greater Building. Individually none of the contracts meet all the criteria, but as a whole, these contracts demonstrate that the company overall meets and has experience in all the criteria).

A3. This information is not currently available. The Government will provide a response in a subsequent amendment.

Q4. In responding to this question, please consider an offeror submitting a combination of contracts/projects which in the aggregate meet all the requirements (Size, Scope and Complexity), wouldn't that show "demonstrated experience in addressing the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS)?"

(I.E. Company X submits contracts A, B, and C for Corporate Experience. Contract A meets the Size and Scope criteria, but not the Complexity criteria. Contract B meets the Size and Complexity but not the Scope criteria. Contract C only meets the Scope and Complexity criteria but not the Size criteria. Individually none of the contracts meet all the criteria, but as a whole, these contracts demonstrate that the company overall meets and has experience in all the criteria).

A4. This information is not currently available. The Government will provide a response in a subsequent amendment.

Q5. Same reference to "Recent, Relevant project" language above. Will an experience contract/project that involves multiple buildings in multiple locations which in the aggregate exceeds 760,000 SF, meet the Size requirement of, "Approximately 760,000 or greater Building?"

A5. This information is not currently available. The Government will provide a response in a subsequent amendment.

Q6. Same question for the Size requirement of, "300 or greater space car garage?"

A6. This information is not currently available. The Government will provide a response in a subsequent amendment.

Q7. Same question for the Size requirement of, "70 or greater acres of grounds?"

A7. This information is not currently available. The Government will provide a response in a subsequent amendment.

Q8. Referring to RFP language on page 221 of 226, the following is reflected:

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 partners may be rated Unacceptable. Offerors are limited to a total of three (3) projects combined. The Offeror shall submit a signed copy of the Joint Venture agreement indicating the proposed participation of each Joint Venture member. Offerors contemplating a Joint Venture shall show evidence in their proposal that the joint venture agreement has been received by the SBA prior to proposal due date if SBA's approval is required. Teaming arrangements are not considered Joint Venture agreements.

If the Joint Venture that is submitting a proposal is a newly formed SBA 8(a) approved Mentor Protégé Joint Venture, and the protégé does not have the experience that meets the criteria for Recent and Relevant, but the Mentor has experience that does meet all experience criteria requirements, will the Mentor Protégé JV be rates acceptable?

The SBA's Mentor Protégé program was designed to help Protégés with no experience obtain work by using the experience of the mentor. Since this is a Joint Venture, unlike a teaming arrangement or sub/prime agreement, the mentor cannot walk away. The mentor is legally bound to the protégé and is obligated to see that all contract requirements are fulfilled and completed per the Statement of Work.

A8. Language has been modified. See updated Section M – B. Evaluation Factors for Award.

Q9. We are well qualify to perform the Facilities Support Services at Russell- Knox Building, Quantico, having had over 30 years of experience in maintain multi-story buildings for the Federal Government and commercial enterprises. We have reviewed RFP N4008013R2090 issued by NAVFAC Washington and find the requirements of Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award, B.3.b.(1) Factor 1, Corporate Experience, limits competition and establishes minimum experience criteria that does not have justification when you compare the MDIA facility requirements with industry norms and the requirements for similar contracts. The Navy has establish three threshold requirements which require EACH of three recent (within 5 years) contracts. to be 760,000 SF or Greater Building Area, 300 or greater space parking garage and 70 acres or larger. This significantly restricts competition without improving the quality or capabilities of successful offeror. Further, the provision that subcontractor experience cannot be counted further limits the ability of a small business to qualify.

It is suggested that the corporate experience requirements be modified to allow any offeror that has any one or multiples of these criteria be judged to have acceptable experience for that particular contract. The Navy is providing a specific competitive advantage to the incumbent, or the very few, if any, of other offerors who would have 3 projects that meet all of the three criteria.

The challenge of a multi-story government building with mission critical operations are widely performed both in DoD, GSA and commercial industry. There are hundreds of million square feet and thousands of acres of projects, of similar nature, that are more demanding that those of MDIA. The GAO has decided on such matters many times (see B-403209, Oct. 4, 2010 for example) which requires the government contracting agency to prove that such requirements are necessary and determinative in meeting agency's needs.

There is a large cadre of qualified small businesses who have the capacity and experience to fully meet the MDIA mission requirements. However, the Agency, by establishing such specific combined experience requirements, is providing to the incumbent and, possibly a few other potential offerors, a competitive advantage, and thus restricting competition and, will not be receiving the best value or lowest cost.

Will the Government consider modifying the Corporate Experience criteria in order to open this contract to more competition and/or allow for subcontractor Corporate Experience to be credited?

A9. This information is not currently available. The Government will provide a response in a subsequent amendment.

Q10. Will the follow-on cover all aspects of the incumbent EML/ BMAR JV contract? (N4008010D1003)? I think the incumbent has been extended a few years. If so, will the new requirement take a portion of the work, and then the EML/BMAR will continue with the rest? Or, is the new requirement cover all of the EML/BMAR JV contract?

A10. The new requirement will take a portion of the work, and EML/BMAR will continue with the remainder.

SECTION A - SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time has changed from 24-Aug-2015 12:00 AM to 03-Sep-2015 02:00 PM.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

SECTION M

A BASIS FOR AWARD

FROM:

- 4 The number of proposals to be evaluated for technical acceptability may be limited to the five lowest priced offers at the discretion of the contracting officer. If the number of proposals to be evaluated is limited, technical proposals shall be provided to the evaluator(s) without any identification of prices or any rank order of prices. If no proposals are found to be technically acceptable within the first group of proposals, then the process described will be conducted again as many times as necessary, until such time as the Government identifies a technically acceptable proposal.

TO:

- 4 The number of proposals to be evaluated for technical acceptability may be limited to the three lowest priced offers at the discretion of the contracting officer. If the number of proposals to be evaluated is limited, technical proposals shall be provided to the evaluator(s) without any identification of prices or any rank order of prices. If no proposals are found to be technically acceptable within the first group of proposals, then the process described will be conducted again as many times as necessary, until such time as the Government identifies a technically acceptable proposal.

B EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

FROM:

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 partners may be rated Unacceptable. Offerors are limited to a total of three (3) projects combined. The Offeror shall submit a signed copy of the Joint Venture agreement indicating the proposed participation of each Joint Venture member. Offerors contemplating a Joint Venture shall show evidence in their proposal that the joint venture agreement has been received by the SBA prior to proposal due date if SBA's approval is required. Teaming arrangements are not considered Joint Venture agreements.

TO:

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 are limited to a total of three (3) projects combined. The Offeror shall submit a signed copy of the Joint Venture agreement indicating the proposed participation of each Joint Venture member. Offerors contemplating a Joint Venture shall show evidence in their proposal that the joint venture agreement has been received by the SBA prior to proposal due date if SBA's approval is required. Teaming arrangements are not considered Joint Venture agreements.

(End of Summary of Changes)