

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 8
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 13-Mar-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. ACQR3871868		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. N40080-15-R-0451	
		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.) Small Business, Multiple Award Construction Contract (SB MACC) for new Construction, renovation, alteration, and repairs projects for the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Washington for installations within Washington DC, Maryland and Virginia area of responsibility. SEE PAGE 2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.				
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	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		13-Mar-2015

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0004

The purpose of this Amendment is to:

1. Provide revision to Price's Basis of Evaluation
2. Provide revision to Factor 1 – Construction Experience regarding Joint venture requirements
3. Provide revision to Factor 3 – Past Performance's Basis of Evaluation
4. Provide Responses to Request for Information
5. Provide Pre-Proposal Conference and Site Visit's attendance sheets

The Proposal Due Date Remains 31 March 2015.

1. Revision to Price's Basis of Evaluation

FROM

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate price based on the total price. Total price consists of the basic requirements and all option items (see Section 00010 of the solicitation). The Government intends to evaluate all options and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990) in Section 00100 of the solicitation. 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:

- (i) Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the RFP.
- (ii) Comparison of proposed prices with the IGCE.
- (iii) Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.

TO

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate price based on the total price. Total price consists of the basic requirement (see Price Schedule). Analysis will be performed by one or more of the following techniques to ensure a fair and reasonable price:

- (i) Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the RFP.
 - (ii) Comparison of proposed prices with the IGCE.
 - (iii) Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.
-

2. Revision to Factor 1 – Construction Experience regarding Joint venture requirements

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 are limited to a total of six (6) projects combined. The Offeror shall submit a signed copy of the Joint Venture agreement. 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 six (6) projects combined; therefore, each Joint Venture entity shall submit 1 project of each project type described above. 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.

3. Revision to Factor 3 – Past Performance’s Basis of Evaluation

FROM

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the relevant projects submitted under Factor 1 for Construction Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. 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 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), any other known sources not provided by the Offeror, and performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source that reflect a trend of satisfactory performance.

Past performance will be rated on an “acceptable” or “unacceptable” basis using the following definitions:

Past Performance Evaluation Ratings	
Rating	Description
Acceptable (A)	Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the offeror’s performance record is unknown.
Unacceptable (U)	Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

At a minimum, past performance information SHALL be obtained for each project in Factor 1 in order to receive an acceptable rating. However, an overall Marginal rating on more than one of the projects demonstrated in Factor 1 will be considered unacceptable.

In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability “unknown” shall be considered “acceptable”.

TO

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the relevant projects submitted under Factor 1 for Construction Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. 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 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), any other known sources not provided by the Offeror, and performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source that reflect a trend of satisfactory performance.

System (eSRS), any other known sources not provided by the Offeror, and performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source that reflect a trend of satisfactory performance.

Past performance will be rated on an “acceptable” or “unacceptable” basis using the following definitions:

Past Performance Evaluation Ratings	
Rating	Description
Acceptable (A)	<p>Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the offeror’s performance record is unknown.</p> <p>Satisfactory or better on any Overall Rating and no more than one Marginal or worse rating in any of the following categories: Quality, Schedule, Cost Control, Management, Regulatory Compliance, Safety, and other areas.</p>
Unacceptable (U)	<p>Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.</p> <p>Marginal or worse on any Overall Rating or Marginal or worse in more than one of the following categories: Quality, Schedule, Cost Control, Management, Regulatory Compliance, Safety, and other areas.</p>

At a minimum, past performance information SHALL be obtained for each project in Factor 1 in order to receive an acceptable rating.

In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability “unknown” shall be considered “acceptable”.

4. Responses to RFIs

9. In conjunction with the above RFI, please clarify the minimum number of new building construction, interior renovation, exterior renovation, design-build and design-bid-build projects a member of a Joint Venture must submit?

Response: See revised evaluation factor.

36. Page 13 of the RFP states that if a JV does not have shared experience, then projects may be submitted for the JV members. How many projects from each JV member is required? Three from each? Please confirm that a JV cannot use all experience from just one of the members.

Response: See revised evaluation factor.

37. The SF-1442 states this project is LPTA. How will NAVFAC evaluate proposals to determine if a contractor submits a cost that is artificially too low?

Response: See revised evaluation factor.

43. Page 16 of the RFP states that an overall "Marginal" rating on more than one of the projects will be considered unacceptable. This means that an Offeror can have a Past Performance evaluation on one of the submitted projects as "Marginal" and still be considered "Acceptable". Since "Marginal" is a lower rating than "Satisfactory", we feel that this criterion is not stringent enough. We recommend the lowest possible evaluation rating be "Satisfactory".

Response: See revised evaluation factor.

50. In recent years, the majority of projects have been awarded via design-build method. Therefore, would the government change the wording of the project requirement to require a minimum of three design-build projects rather than require three design-build and three design-bid-build? The current wording restricts the use of relevant projects.

Response: See evaluation criteria.

51. The government is requesting project experience in New Construction, Interior Renovation and Exterior Renovation. New construction (MILCON) projects are generally higher in dollar value. Will the government accept relevant projects that were awarded at a value substantially over \$10M? If this dollar value of project is accepted as relevant, it is requested that the evaluation criteria reflect this addition.

Response: See evaluation criteria.

52. With the short turnaround time between the deadline for questions and the deadline for the proposal submission, will the government grant a one week extension?

Response: Proposal due date remains unchanged at this time.

53. On the mechanical drawing where it shows the control schematic of the fans and dampers, it mentions to alarm to the BAS system. There is no reference to a BAS system in the specs and they specifically state that DDC systems are not permitted. Please clarify.

Response: The note on drawing M-601 referring to “wire to BAS” can be disregarded because it is not applicable to the scope of this project.

54. On drawing D-622 & D-631 a Instrumentation Diagram has been provided for the Influent PS and the Surge Basin .

-provide conduit and control/instrumentation wiring. (quantities of #14 or twisted shielded)

Response: See Specification 40.95.00 Process Control. Minimum wire size is #14 and minimum conduit size is 1/2". Quantities are as required by diagram. See also 26.20.00 Wiring Methods. Lengths can be estimated by PLC location. See following response.

-where is the Influent and Surge Basin PLCs located, they do not appear on the plain view of the electrical drawings

Response: Influent Pump Station PLC shall be located in the Level Alarm and Pump Control Panel. See sheet E-121. Surge Basin PLC shall be located in the pump control panel. See sheet E-131. A strip heater shall be included in Surge Basin enclosure to prevent condensation.

55. spec 40 95 33. 23 20 Fiber Optic Plant Media / please provide a drawing of cable locations and the intent of this spec

Response: This spec was inadvertently included and should be disregarded.

59. Please confirm separation sheets used within technical factors i.e. Factor 2 Safety - a separation sheet between EMR rates and DART rates, do not count towards the total page count.

Response: Yes, tabs and sub-tabs are excluded from the page limit.

5. **Pre-Proposal Conference and Site Visit's attendance sheets**

Please refer to attachment "N40080-15-R-0451-Pre-Proposal Conf-Site-Visit-Attendance"

END OF AMENDMENT 0004

(End of Summary of Changes)