

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 15
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 27-Feb-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. ACQR3863534		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVAL FACILITIES ENG COMMAND 1314 HARWOOD ST WASHINGTON 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. N40080-14-R-0161	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 27-Feb-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 type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" 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 _____ 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.) P190 ADVANCED ENERGETICS RESEARCH LAB COMPLEX, NAVAL SUPPORT FACILITY INDIAN HEAD, MD The purpose of this amendment is to accomplish the following: 1. Incorporate the project description in the Instructions to Offerors. The revised Instructions to Offerors is hereby incorporated in this amendment. All other terms and conditions remain the same.				
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 27-Feb-2015	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION 00100 - BIDDING SCHEDULE/INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

INSTRUCTIIONS TO OFFERORS

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

Project Description: P190 ADVANCED ENERGETICS RESEARCH LAB COMPLEX, NAVAL SUPPORT FACILITY INDIAN HEAD, MD

The goal of this project is to construct a low-rise building to accommodate explosive materials for Phase 2 of the Advanced Energetics Research Laboratory Complex at NSF Indian Head for Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), Indian Head Division (IHD). The building includes laboratory and chemical storage space.

This project will provide Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) features and comply with AT/FP regulations and physical security mitigation in accordance with DoD Minimum Anti-Terrorism Standards for Buildings.

Built-in equipment includes a building grounding system, uninterruptable power supply system, emergency generator, conductive and non-conductive flooring, chemical showers, fume hoods, explosives hood, explosive resistant outlets, explosive resistant lighting, compressed gas cylinder cage, a combination freight/passenger elevator, fire alarm system, covered loading dock and lighting protection system.

Special costs include post construction contract award services, reinforced concrete partitions and explosive-safety window glazing.

Operation and maintenance support information is included in this project.

Sustainable design principles will be included in the design and construction of the project in accordance with Executive Order 13423 and other laws and executive Orders. Facilities will meet LEED ratings and comply with the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Low Impact Development will be included in the design and construction of this project as appropriate.

Demolition includes Building #600 for a total of 3,930 m2. Building #600 requires decontamination of explosives prior to demolition.

Facilities will be designed to meet or exceed the useful service life specified in DoD Unified Facility Criteria. Facilities will incorporate features that provide the lowest practical life cycle cost solutions satisfying the facility requirements with the goal of maximizing energy efficiency.

The Contract Completion Date (CCD) is 862 calendar days after contract award.

INQUIRIES, PROPOSAL FORMAT AND DUE DATE

1. Pre-Proposal Inquiries (PPIs) shall be submitted in writing. **All inquiries shall be submitted in MS Word using the attached PPI Form (Attachment F).** Submit all inquiries via email to the following addresses: Monique.Mohamed@navy.mil and Elias.Stamatiades@navy.mil.

Pre-proposal inquiries will be accepted up to **19 March 2015**. Responses to PPIs will be published via solicitation amendment.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION:

Phase I

1. This will be a Two-Phase procurement. Instructions are for Phase I only. The Government will select a maximum of five of the most qualified Offerors to compete in Phase II. Phase II instructions will be issued only to Offerors selected to compete for Phase II.
2. The Offeror shall submit **two (2)** separately bound copies of its Phase One Proposal addressing Phase I Evaluation Factors 1, 2, and 3 as prescribed in the Evaluation Factors for Award section of this solicitation. **All proposal text documents shall be formatted on 8.5 x 11 inch paper with one inch margins using 11 point, Times New Roman font. All proposal text documents shall be on numbered pages and outlined in alpha-numeric format.** Follow all instructions as stated in the Solicitation Submittal Requirements for each factor.
3. All proposals and copies shall be packaged in a sealed box. Please include, with proposals, one cover letter indicating your Point of Contact, mailing address, e-mail address, and phone number for this offering.
4. All proposal packages shall be mailed or hand delivered to:
NAVFAC Washington-Building 212
1314 Harwood Street, SE
Washington Navy Yard
Washington, DC 20374
Attention: Monique Mohamed and Elias Stamatiades
* If hand delivering, address package as if mailing, and deliver to
First floor mailroom of Building 212
5. Facsimile copies will NOT be accepted.
6. **All Phase One proposals must be received prior to 2:00 PM on 31 March 2015.** Any proposals submitted after the time set for receipt will be stamped with the date and hour of receipt and held unopened until after award. The file shall be documented in accordance with FAR 14.304-4.
7. Government points of contact for this RFP are Monique Mohamed and Elias Stamatiades. Inquiries during the proposal preparation period shall be submitted by email to: Monique.Mohamed@navy.mil and Elias.Stamatiades@navy.mil. Pre-proposal Inquiries (PPI) shall be submitted in writing. Offerors shall use the PPI Form Attachment (F) contained herein when submitting inquiries via email to the following addresses: Monique.Mohamed@navy.mil and Elias.Stamatiades@navy.mil. **Pre-proposal inquiries will be accepted until 2:00pm, on 18 March 2015.** Responses to PPI's will be published via solicitation amendment.

8. The Government reserves the right to reject any or all proposals at any time prior to award, to negotiate with any or all Offerors, and to award to the Offeror submitting the proposal determined by the Government to be the most advantageous. **OFFERORS ARE ADVISED THAT AN AWARD MAY BE MADE WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS.** Therefore, proposals should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms. Offerors should not assume that they will be contacted or afforded an opportunity to qualify, discuss or revise their proposals prior to award.

9. The following milestones are established for this procurement:

Issue Solicitation:	27 February 2015
Site Visit:	TBD (Phase II)
PPI Cut-off Date:	19 March 2015 by 2:00 PM EST
Phase I Proposal Due Date/Time:	31 March 2015, 2:00 PM EST
Construction Completion date:	862 days after notice of award

10. The subject project is Design-Build with specifications provided. Task Order will be awarded to the Offeror representing the best value to the Government, price and other factors considered, using the Best Value Trade-off process and in accordance with Evaluation Factors for Award.

11. The total design-build budget amount is \$13.2 million.

EVALUATION FOR AWARD

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

Non-Cost/Price Evaluation Factors:

For Two-Phase DB procurements, Factors 1-3 will be evaluated in Phase I, and Factors 4-7 will be evaluated in Phase II. Factor 1 will only be rated Acceptable or Unacceptable. If an Offeror is rated Unacceptable in Factor 1, then they will not be considered for Phase II. In making the best value award decision after Phase II, the government will consider Factors 2-7 and price.

Non-Cost/Price Evaluation Factors

Phase I:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach

Factor 2 – Experience

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Phase II:

Factor 4 – Safety

Factor 5 – Technical Solution

Factor 6 – Energy and Sustainable Design

Factor 7 – Small Business Utilization

... Subfactor 7A – Past Performance in Utilization of Small Business Concerns

... Subfactor 7B – Small Business Participation

Price

2. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation Factors 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are approximately equal in importance and when combined are equal to Factor 3 Past Performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment factor. The Subfactors in Factor 7 are equal in importance to each other. 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 in importance 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.

3. Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.**(a) Price:****(1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:****I. TBD (prior to Phase Two)****(2) Basis of Evaluation:**

The Government will evaluate price based on the total price. Total price consists of the basic requirements and the option item. The Government intends to evaluate the option and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990). In accordance with FAR 52.217-5, evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s). Analysis will be performed by one or more of the following techniques to ensure a fair and reasonable price:

- ... Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the RFP.
- ... Comparison of proposed prices with the IGCE.
- ... Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.
- ... Comparison of market survey results.

(b) Non-cost/price Factors:

NON-PRICE EVALUATION FACTOR:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The composition and management of the firms proposed as the design-build (DB) team for this contract will be evaluated in this factor.

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

- (1) Provide a narrative describing the proposed primary construction firms and primary design firms for this contract and the rationale for proposing this arrangement. Provide the role, responsibilities, and contractual relationships between the various firms (see FAR Subpart 9.6). The narrative shall also include a simple organizational chart that clearly identifies the lines of authority between the entities. If the experience of an entity is being claimed in Factor 2, that entity must be named in the above narrative and organizational chart.

The technical approach narrative shall be limited to one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages) including the organizational chart. The information requested in item #2 below is not included in this page limitation.

- (2) In addition to the narrative, the Offeror shall submit a 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.).

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The assessment of the Offeror's technical approach will be used as a means to evaluate the organizational structure and teaming relationships proposed by the Offeror. This factor will be rated on an Acceptable or Unacceptable basis.

Factor 2 – Experience:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

- (1) Construction Experience:

Submit a minimum of one (1), maximum of three (3), relevant construction projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size (square feet), scope (dollar value), and complexity to the RFP. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as:

- ... Size: Approximately 21,000sf
- ... Scope: Approximately \$13.2M
- ... Complexity: New construction inclusive of laboratory space where research and development of up to 5 pounds of advanced energetics material is conducted.

Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors shall submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. If the same project is being used to demonstrate construction and design experience, submit separate Project Data Sheets for construction and design. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be expanded; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP. In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. Provide applicable documentation on projects that were validated and/or certified through U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) or the equivalent organization or process.

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 three (3) projects combined.

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.

(2) Design Experience

Submit a minimum of one (1), maximum of three (3), relevant design projects for the design team that best demonstrates design experience on relevant projects that are similar in size (square feet), scope (dollar value), and complexity to the RFP. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as:

- ... Size: Approximately 21,000sf
- ... Scope: Approximately \$13.2M
- ... Complexity: New construction inclusive of laboratory space where research and development of up to 5 pounds of advanced energetics material is conducted.

Projects submitted shall be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP. For design-build projects, the design portion of the contract shall have been completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

A project is defined as a complete design effort performed under a single task order or contract/subcontract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors shall submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. If the same project is being used to demonstrate construction and design experience, submit separate Project Data Sheets for construction and design. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be expanded; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this. In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. Provide applicable documentation on projects that were validated and/or certified through U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) or the equivalent organization or process.

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.

The Offeror may utilize experience of a design subcontractor to demonstrate design experience under this evaluation factor. The Offer must provide a supporting joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment and an explanation of the meaningful involvement for the design subcontractor.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant construction and design projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The Government will only review three projects for construction and three for design. Any projects submitted in excess of the three (3) for Construction Experience and three (3) for Design Experience will not be considered.

Proposals that demonstrate collective experience of relevant projects for construction and design may be considered more favorably.

Projects that demonstrate experience with explosive decontamination of laboratory space prior to demolition may be considered more favorably than those that do not.

Relevant projects where the Offeror and the proposed design firm(s) have previously worked together may be considered more favorably than those that have not worked together.

Relevant projects that demonstrate design-build experience may be considered more favorably than those that do not.

Relevant projects that demonstrate experience with sustainable features may be considered more favorably than those that do not.

Factor 3 – Past Performance:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

If a completed Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 2 for construction experience. 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. The Offeror should provide completed Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) in the proposal. 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. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror shall complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). The Government may make reasonable attempts to contact the client noted for that project(s) to obtain the PPQ information. However, Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to help ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Monique Mohamed at Monique.Mohamed@navy.mil and Elias Stamatziades at Elias.Stamatziades@navy.mil.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 2 – Experience. Offerors may also address any adverse past performance issues. Explanations shall not exceed two (2) double-sided pages (or four (4) single-sided pages) in total.

The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the references unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor.

Performance award or additional information submitted will not be considered.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the relevant projects submitted under Factor 2 – Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. More emphasis will be placed on more relevant projects. In addition to the above, 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. 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 Contractors who are part of a partnership or joint venture 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.

The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, the source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the Contractor's performance. 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 Offeror's probability to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP.

Offerors lacking relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance and will receive an Unknown Confidence rating.

Factor 4 – Safety

(a) 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 (3) [2012, 2013, 2014] previous complete calendar years, submit your EMR (which compares your company's annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a three (3) 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 (3) [2012, 2013, 2014] previous complete calendar years, 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.

(b) 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 Enterprise Safety Applications Management System (ESAMS), 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.

Factor 5 – Technical Solution

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

In response to this factor, the Offeror shall certify that they have fully analyzed all requirements of the solicitation. It is noted that the Government strongly prefers to maintain the site layout, building footprint, building location, floor plan, and other requirements expressed in the RFP. Offerors are highly encouraged to follow this information. These requirements must be followed where they directly affect the Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board (DDESB) Final Site Approval Concurrence for site plan and building construction within the Restricted Area of NSF IHD, and for any other constraints specifically described within the RFP as directly related to DDESB approval for construction within the NSF IHD restricted area.

The Offerors' response to the Technical Solution Factor shall be in a narrative manner not exceeding 6 single sided or 3 double sided pages. Up to three (3) conceptual drawings may be provided to supplement the narrative (i.e. floor plan, exterior elevation, and site plan). The narrative should address understanding of DDESB/NOSSA requirements/process, structural/blast analysis required, ATFP requirements, compliance with LEED requirements, compliance with all mandated energy requirements including EPACT 05 and EISA 07, Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, proposed energy improvements and any other information necessary to demonstrate a technical solution. Drawings should

include any variations in: site layout, elevations, basic floor plan lay out, or any other information necessary to demonstrate technical compliance.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the information provided in the narrative and conceptual drawings (if included) considering the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of the architectural and engineering requirements of the project. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical solution to determine adherence to the technical requirements of the RFP.

Factor 6 – Energy and Sustainable Design

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Provide the following information, which describes how the project will meet or exceed the following sustainable design contract requirements.

(1) EPAAct 2005 Energy Efficiency Narrative:

Using the guidance outlined in Part 3 of this RFP, provide a detailed narrative to describe whether the proposed solution will meet or exceed the goal of a 30% energy reduction using the ASHRAE Std 90.1-2007, Appendix G, Building Performance Rating Method, excluding receptacle and process loads. Provide the proposed percent energy reduction. Provide the assumptions the Offeror will use to obtain a high-performance building, which will comply with these energy reduction goals. Describe the Offeror's proposed building with regards to building orientation, shape, fenestration, solar heat gain coefficients (SHGC), wall and roof insulation values (U-values), HVAC systems, water heating systems, lighting systems, and control systems. Organize/divide the assumptions into four areas; building orientation and configuration, building envelope, mechanical systems, and electrical systems. If the Offeror cannot achieve the 30% reduction within the budget identified, the Offeror shall state what percent energy reduction is proposed within their proposal. Do not exceed two (2) double-sided pages (or four (4) single-sided pages). *Note: Building performance rating and percent energy reduction are calculated in terms of energy rather than energy cost.*

(1a) Whole Building Energy Simulation:

Provide a Whole Building Energy Simulation summary following the procedure outlined in LEED 2009, Credit EAc1 – Optimize Energy Performance, Option 1 – Whole Building Energy Simulation, except utilize the “Baseline Building Performance Rating” shown in the RFP, Part 6, to demonstrate the percentage improvement in the “Proposed Building Performance Rating”. Provide a completed Performance Rating Method Compliance Report, Table 3, page 279-283 in the LEED 2009 Reference guide for New Construction. Utilize the default simulation factors and energy rates included in the RFP, Part 6.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's response to the Energy and Sustainable Design Factor considering the proposed energy savings.

EPAAct 2005 Energy Efficiency Narrative: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed energy budget reduction relative to EPAAct 2005 energy efficiency goals, including evaluation of assumptions.

Whole Building Energy Simulation: The Government will evaluate the Whole Building Energy Simulation to determine the validity of the design assumptions, thoroughness of the Energy Simulation, and the percent improvement above the Government's "Baseline Building Performance Rating".

Factor 7 – Small Business Utilization

SUBFACTOR 7.A – PAST PERFORMANCE IN UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Proposals that do not include responses addressing ALL elements of the requirements stated below (a. through d.) must include an explanation why that element is not addressed.

- a. Provide performance evaluation ratings (i.e., SF1420, DD2626, or equivalent) obtained on the implementation of small business subcontracting plans for all of the offeror's projects referenced under Factor 3, Past Performance. Recently completed project evaluations are desired, however, in the absence of recently completed project evaluations, interim ratings for projects that are 80% complete may be considered. If more than three (3) evaluation ratings are provided, only the first three (3) will be considered. In addition, the Government may consider past performance information on other projects as made available to the Government from other sources (such as the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support Systems (CCASS)), Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support System (ACASS) and Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)).
- b. Provide small business subcontracting history. Large businesses with Federal prime contracting experience shall provide final or current Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts (SF294) or Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISR's) on prime (only) contracts submitted under Factor 3, Past Performance. If Factor 3 submitted contracts are not prime contracts, submit SF294s or ISRs for contracts of similar scope performed as the prime contractor. If goals were not met on any submitted contracts, an explanation for each unmet goal is required. Large Businesses with no documented SF294/ISR history shall submit a subcontracting history on Attachment (C), Small Business Past Performance. If more than three (3) reports are provided, only the first 5 reports will be considered.
- c. Small Business proposers shall provide a subcontracting history on Attachment (C), Small Business Past Performance.
- d. If an Offeror is utilizing past performance information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the solicitation), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will have meaningful participation of all members in the management of the subcontracting program/plan by identifying the personnel or resources from the member companies that will be dedicated to managing the plan, and an organization chart which demonstrates the reporting chain within the membership.

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, Partnership LLC or other entity consisting of more than one entity, provide past performance information, elements a. through d., for each individual business entity(ies) that will be responsible for managing the subcontracting program/plan.

Proposals including information on any of the following additional elements may be rated higher, based on the evaluated extent to which the information addresses the basis of evaluation in paragraph (ii):

- a. Provide information on national-level, and industry-issued awards that offerors received for outstanding support to SB concerns within the past five (5) years. Include purpose, issuer, and date of award(s). National and industry-issued awards received beyond five (5) years will not be considered.
- b. Provide information on previous, existing, planned or pending mentor-protégé agreements (MPA) under any Federal Government, or other, program held within the last five years. Information should include, at a minimum, the members, objectives, period of performance, and major accomplishments during the MPA.
- c. Provide information on past use of Community Rehabilitation Program (CRP) organizations certified under the AbilityOne Program by SourceAmerica, or the National Industry for the Blind (NIB). Information should include the contract type, type of work performed, period of performance, and number of employed severely handicapped persons.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The extent to which the proposal demonstrates the proposer's level of past performance in utilizing Small Business (SB) concerns, AbilityOne, Mentor-Protégé Agreements, and other socio-economic programs, as defined in FAR Parts 26.1 and 26.2, in subcontracting, and in meeting established Small Business subcontracting goals.

SUBFACTOR 7.B – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total acquisition, the extent of work you will perform as the prime contractor. If submitting an offer as a Joint-Venture, identify the percentage of work each member will be responsible for and indicate the size status of each member, e.g., LB, SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, etc.

If you are a Large Business, submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan for this project in the format provided in Attachment D for this factor, to include all information required in the attachment. If you are a Small Business, submit a subcontracting participation breakdown in the format provided in Attachment D for this factor. All proposers: To demonstrate commitment in using small business concerns, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan or subcontracting participation breakdown may list all subcontractors by name. If the proposed Small Business Subcontracting goals do not meet the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, include a detailed explanation describing the actions taken to arrive at that determination, along with an explanation for the goals that actually were proposed. For proposals submitted on design-build solicitations, the proposer must identify its designer/design team in its Subcontracting Plan or Small Business Participation Breakdown.

Firm commitments to subcontract to multiple companies: The Offeror may provide a demonstration of commitments in planned subcontracts by listing multiple names of companies that will be used to support specific small business category (i.e., SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB and SDVOSB).

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The following will be evaluated on all proposals:

- a. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates maximum practicable participation of SBs in terms of the total value of the acquisition, including options.

- b. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a commitment to use SB concerns that are specifically identified in the proposal, including but not limited to use of mentor protégé programs.
- c. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates SB participation in a variety of industries expected during the performance of work.
- d. The realism of the proposal to meet the proposed goals.

The following will be evaluated on proposals submitted by Large Business firms:

- a. The extent to which the proposal provides Small Business Subcontracting goals that meet or exceed the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, and utilization of AbilityOne CRP organizations. Proposals that provide goals exceeding the NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets may be rated higher. The proposed goals and NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are expressed as a percentage of total subcontracted values. The minimum NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are as follows:

	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
SB	66.80%	66.94%	67.07%
SDB	17.27%	17.44%	17.62%
WOSB	15.30%	15.45%	15.61%
HUBZone	8.94%	9.03%	9.12%
VOSB	3.03%	3.06%	3.09%
SDVOSB	3.03%	3.06%	3.09%

- b. The extent to which the proposer's Small Business Subcontracting Plan establishes reasonable efforts demonstrating the subcontracting targets can be met during the performance of the contract:

(END OF EVALUATION FOR AWARD)

(End of Summary of Changes)