

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 15
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 11-Feb-2016	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. N40080-16-R-0308	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 13-Jan-2016	
			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 <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.) N40080-16-R-0308 Regional Pest Control Services, Naval District Washington, Washington, DC Amendment 0002 to provide 1) Pre-Proposal Conference Agenda and Site Visit Sign-In Sheets; 2) Responses to RFIs 1 – 28; 3) Revised Annex 2 Spec Items 2.7.1.1, 2.7.1.2 and 2.7.1.3; 4) and Section M Technical Factor renumbered to (2). 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	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		11-Feb-2016

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:

AMD 0002; RFIS 1-28

Hereby incorporated into Amendment 0002:

1. The Pre-Proposal Conference slides, which reviewed Sections L and M of the solicitation in detail in order to emphasize that proposal instructions must be followed exactly, and the site-visit sign-in sheets are hereby incorporated into Amendment 0002. Please note that the site visits scheduled for Dahlgren and Indian Head were not accomplished on 2/9/2016 due to a change in forms for visitors that did not allow enough time for processing prior to the site visits.
2. RFI responses to RFIs 1 – 28.
3. Revised Annex 2 Spec Items 2.7.1.1, 2.7.1.2, and 2.7.1.3.
4. Section M Technical Factors is corrected to read number (2) since it was incorrectly listed as (1) in the original RFP. Section M is hereby provided in its entirety in Amendment 0002.

Responses to RFIs 1 – 28

RFI 1: RE: Factor 04 – Past Performance

“Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.”

Does this include the previous solicitation number N40080-15-R-0302 from The Naval District of Washington or is it referencing PPQs previously submitted for RFPs outside of The Naval District of Washington?

RFI response 1: As stated in the solicitation at Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, Factor 4, Past Performance, an Offeror shall not submit a PPQ when a completed CPARS is available. “Offerors shall not incorporate by reference (emphasis added) into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs” – the Offeror may submit PPQs or CPARS used in previous proposals, as long as the PPQs or CPARS is submitted in its entirety for this proposal.

RFI 2: IF PPQs are allowable from the previous N40080-15-R-0302 solicitation number for The Naval District of Washington, will the date of the previous PPQ form (September 2015) be acceptable, or will the same individuals whom filled out the PPQ be required to complete another PPQ with a 2016 date?

RFI response 2: Provide PPQs that contain the current solicitation number of N40080-16-R-0308 on them.

RFI 3: In paragraph 2.7.1.1, it states , “The PM or alternate shall be on-site during the Government's regular working hours and shall be available onsite within one hour after the Government's regular working hours.”

... Does this contract require the Project Mgr or Alternate Project Mgr to be physically on site on a daily basis?

RFI response 3: See revised Annex 2 Spec Item 2.7.1.1

RFI 4: In paragraph 2.7.1.2, it states, The Contractor shall provide a Quality Manager or designated alternate shall be on-site within during the Government's regular working hours and shall be available on-site within two hours after the Government's regular working hours.

... Does this contract require the Quality Mgr or Alternate Quality Mgr to be physically on site on a daily basis?

RFI response 4: See revised Annex 2 Spec Item 2.7.1.2.

RFI 5: Ref: Section B, B3 Prior Contract Information: Was the term of the existing contract exactly one year?

RFI response 5: Yes.

RFI 6: Was the scope of the existing contract identical to the scope in this RFP?

RFI response 6: No

RFI 7: Were the staffing requirements in the current RFP included in the existing contract (ie. PM, OM, SSHO, On-Site Supervisor, etc...)?

RFI response 7: Yes

RFI 8: How was the existing contract awarded? Was it done competitively, with multiple proposals received?

RFI response 8: The existing contract was awarded to a small business on a sole source basis.

RFI 9: Same as RFI 4 for contract prior to the existing contract?

RFI response 9: The previous contract was awarded on a sole source basis under the 8(a) program.

RFI 10: Ref: Section B, B5 100% Small Business Set Aside

The contract will cover a 100 mile radius (30,000+ square miles) and includes 9 sites, with the possibility of others being added. Was consideration given to unbundling these requirements into packages more friendly to small business performance?

RFI response 10: No, market research has shown that there are small businesses capable of accomplishing the requirement.

RFI 11: Ref: 0200000 Management and Administration (2.7.1.1 and 2.7.1.2)

The referenced sections variously refer to requirements for key personnel to be "on site" during specified regular working hours. What is the location of "on site" in the context of this regional multi-site contract.

RFI response 11: The key personnel must be on-site at one location and available within the stated timeframes.

RFI 12: The contract also requires certain response times for after-hours work and emergencies. Given the area covered and the fact that travel time between some sites can routinely exceed 2 hours, are the response times reasonable?

RFI response 12: Yes.

RFI 13: Ref: 0200000 2.7.1.4 Environmental/Energy Manager

The spec refers to an “Environmental Management System” and an “Installation Energy Plan”, but neither of these documents is attached to the RFP. Can these be furnished? Do they exist for all sites identified in the RFP?

RFI response 13: The Government will provide the Environmental Management System and Installation Energy Plan to the awardee after award.

RFI 14: Ref 1503020 2.2.1 Certification, Training and Licensing

Deliverables list requires submittal 15 calendar days prior to start. It is our understanding that licenses for applicators must be submitted at the time of proposal. Which is correct?

RFI response 14: Both are correct. See Section M Evaluation Factors for Award a.(2)(b)i.4 and Annex 2, 0200000 - Management and Administration, 2.3.3 which states that “The Contractor shall submit copies of Permits and Licenses per Section F.” Section F, Deliveries or Performance at 02/00000/2.2.1.2 states “Before work commences and as requested by the KO”. Section 1503020/2.3.1, which refers to business licenses, states “Prior to contract award. Copies of renewed licenses shall also be submitted.”

RFI 15: J-10503020-03 Integrated Pest Management Plans

Missing for NSF Arlington, USNO Wash DC, NRL Wash DC, and NSF Carderock, West Bethesda. Do they exist? Can they be furnished to us?

RFI response 15: These installations are incorporated into the Integrated Pest Management Plan for WNY. See Attachment J-1503020-03 NSA Washington IPMP, Section 1.2.1.

RFI 16: 2.7.1.3 Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO) Provide 1 competent person at each site.”

... There are no full time site employees. How is this requirement to be met?

RFI response 16: See revised Annex 2, Spec Item 2.7.1.3

RFI 17: 2.7.1.3 Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO) “Shall be on site when work is being performed.”

RFI response 17: See revised Annex 2, Spec Item 2.7.1.3

RFI 18: 2.7.1.3 Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO) his appears to mandate a minimum of 2 people for every chemical application. Is this correct?

RFI response 18: See revised Annex 2, Spec Item 2.7.1.3

RFI 19: 2.8.4 Access to Installation. Delays due to site access requirements are a concern. Please provide a list of all security/badging processes that we will need to follow for each site.

RFI response 19: Refer to Annex 2, Spec Item 2.8.41, NCACS Program for RapidGate information. There is a planned 60-day phase-in period prior to the start of performance.

RFI 20: Subcontractors:

Are offerors required to furnish copies of written sub-contract agreements?

RFI response 20: No

RFI 21: Ref: Wage Determination. The hourly rate for pest controller has been the same since about 2009. Could the Government please review the rate so that a rate increase is not necessary in the immediate future. Please verify that the wage determination is current.

RFI response 21: The Service Wage Determinations WD 15-4281 (Rev 2) dated 12-29-2015 and WD 15-2103 (Rev 2) dated 12-29-2015 provided in the solicitation are the current Wage Determinations listed by the Department of Labor.

RFI 22: Ref. Estimated Value (Current Contract). Having performed this pest work previously on most of the inventoried sites, we find the firm fixed portion to be realistic but find the indefinite quantity dollar amount to be totally out of proportion. Could the government provide copies of the IQ orders that make up this amount?

RFI response 22: See Attachment J-1503020-13 Historical Non-Recurring Work

RFI 23: Could the government provide the pricing for the year prior to what is now listed?

RFI response 23: \$407,416.37 for Recurring Work and \$31,347.29 for Non-Recurring Work. The Non-Recurring Work amount does not include any purchases made on DoD eMall using a Government Purchase Card. Prospective offers are cautioned that they should not rely on this information to determine workload as there is no assurance that workload and volume of future effort and costs will replicate past experience.

RFI 24: Ref: RFI Submittal Deadline. Verify FRIDAY 12 February. Section L handed out at Pre Proposal Conference states "COB THURSDAY 12 February 2016."

RFI response 24: Amendment 0001 updated Section L4 to read "THE RFI CUT-OFF DATE IS 2:00 p.m. Eastern on 12 FEBRUARY 2016," which is a Friday.

Reference for RFIs 25 - 28

Section M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Factor 1. Corporate Experience. on page 194 calls for submittal of a "TOTAL OF THREE (3) contracts completed within the last five (5) years...." Relevant size "Valued at \$500,000 or greater per year. However, on the next page, under ii Basis of Evaluation for the Corporate Experience factor, the second sentence says that an offer is technically acceptable if "at least one (1) relevant project similar in size scope and complexity....".

RFI 25: Please provide clarification of these apparently conflicting provisions. Are three projects required to be greater than \$500,000 per year? Or, just one?

RFI response 25: Section M numbering for Technical Evaluation is hereby revised to (2) in Amendment 0002. See Section M a.(2)(a)i. and M a.(2)(a)ii.

RFI 26: Would a \$1.5 million contract (Base year plus 2 one-year Options at \$500,000 each) count as three (3) contracts valued at \$500,000 per year?

RFI response 26: No.

RFI 27: Are contracts awarded through a competitive process weighted the same as sole source awarded contracts?

RFI response 27: The Section M evaluation factors do not weight proposals received in response to the solicitation.

RFI 28: Will any proposal citing less than three contracts greater than \$500,000 per year. Be rejected as unacceptable?

RFI response 28: In accordance with Section M a.(2)(a)(ii), Basis of Evaluation, "At least **one (1)** relevant project similar in size, scope and complexity as defined in the solicitation"

END OF RFIs 1-28

SECTION C - DESCRIPTIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The following have been modified:

ANNEX 2

0200000 CHANGED FROM:

2.7.1.1	Project Manager (PM)	<p>The Contractor shall provide a PM and designated alternate, as applicable, who has the have full authority to act for the Contractor on all contract matters relating to this contract. The PM or alternate shall be on-site during the Government's regular working hours and shall be available on-site within one hour after the Government's regular working hours.</p> <p>The PM shall have at least three years of experience in managing a workforce providing services on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity.</p>
2.7.1.2	Quality Manager	<p>The Contractor shall provide a Quality Manager or designated alternate shall be on-site within during the Government's regular working hours and shall be available on-site within two hours after the Government's regular working hours. The Quality Manager must report directly to a senior corporate official and shall not report directly to the Project Manager.</p> <p>The Quality Manager shall have fulfilled the following pre-requisite training and experiences before being hired as the Quality Manager under this contract:</p> <p>The Quality Manager shall have at least three years of experience in preparing and enforcing QMS programs on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity. The Quality Manager may be the same person as the SSHO.</p>
2.7.1.3	Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO)	<p>The SSHO must meet the requirements of EM 385-1-1 Section 1 and ensure that the requirements of 29 CFR 1926.16 are met for the project. Provide a Safety oversight team that includes a minimum of one Competent Person at each project site to function as the Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO). The SSHO or an equally-qualified Designated Representative/alternate shall be on-site at all times when work is being performed to implement and administer the Contractor's safety program and government-accepted Accident Prevention Plan. The SSHO's training, experience, and qualifications shall be as required by EM 385-1-1 paragraph 01.A.17, entitled SITE SAFETY AND HEALTH OFFICER (SSHO), and all associated sub-paragraphs.</p> <p>A Competent Person shall be provided for all of the hazards identified in the Contractor's Safety and Health Program in accordance with the accepted Accident Prevention Plan, and shall be on-site at all times when the work that presents the hazards associated with their professional expertise is being performed. Provide the credentials of the Competent Persons(s) to the Contracting Officer for acceptance in consultation with the Safety Office.</p> <p>The Contractor shall provide a SSHO whose primary duty and responsibility is to prepare and enforce the Contractor's safety program on this contract. The SSHO shall have fulfilled the following pre-requisite training and experiences before being hired as the SSHO under this contract:</p>

		<p>The SSHO shall have completed five years of satisfactory experience in preparing and enforcing safety programs on contracts of similar size and complexity in the past or three years' experience if he possesses a Certified Safety Professional (CSP) or safety and health degree. The SSHO shall have completed the OSHA 30-hour construction safety class or equivalent and maintain competency through 24 hours of formal safety and health related coursework every four years. The SSHO may be the same person as the project manager but shall have fulfilled the pre-requisite qualification and experience.</p>
--	--	--

TO:

2.7.1.1	Project Manager (PM)	<p>The Contractor shall provide a PM and designated alternate, as applicable, who has the have full authority to act for the Contractor on all contract matters relating to this contract. The PM or alternate shall be attainable by phone during normal working hours and within one hour after the Government's regular working hours.</p> <p>The PM shall have at least three years of experience in managing a workforce providing services on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity.</p>
2.7.1.2	Quality Manager	<p>The Contractor shall provide a Quality Manager or designated alternate who shall be attainable by phone during the Government's regular working hours and within two hours after the Government's regular working hours.</p> <p>The Quality Manager must report directly to a senior corporate official and shall not report directly to the Project Manager.</p> <p>The Quality Manager shall have fulfilled the following pre-requisite training and experiences before being hired as the Quality Manager under this contract:</p> <p>The Quality Manager shall have at least three years of experience in preparing and enforcing QMS programs on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity. The Quality Manager may be the same person as the SSHO.</p>
2.7.1.3	Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO)	<p>The SSHO must meet the requirements of EM 385-1-1 Section 1 and ensure that the requirements of 29 CFR 1926.16 are met for the project.</p> <p>Provide a Safety oversight team that insures work is being performed at all locations in accordance with the Contractor's safety program and government-accepted Accident Prevention Plan. The SSHO's training, experience, and qualifications shall be as required by EM 385-1-1 paragraph 01.A.17, entitled SITE SAFETY AND HEALTH OFFICER (SSHO), and all associated sub-paragraphs.</p> <p>A Competent Person shall be provided for all of the hazards identified in the Contractor's Safety and Health Program in accordance with the accepted Accident Prevention Plan. Provide the credentials of the Competent Persons(s) to the Contracting Officer for acceptance in consultation with the Safety Office.</p> <p>The Contractor shall provide a SSHO whose primary duty and responsibility is to prepare and enforce the Contractor's safety program on</p>

		<p>this contract. The SSHO shall have fulfilled the following pre-requisite training and experiences before being hired as the SSHO under this contract:</p> <p>The SSHO shall have completed five years of satisfactory experience in preparing and enforcing safety programs on contracts of similar size and complexity in the past or three years' experience if he possesses a Certified Safety Professional (CSP) or safety and health degree. The SSHO shall have completed the OSHA 30-hour construction safety class or equivalent and maintain competency through 24 hours of formal safety and health related coursework every four years. The SSHO may be the same person as the project manager but shall have fulfilled the pre-requisite qualification and experience.</p>
--	--	---

END OF SECTION C CHANGES

SECTION J - LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS

The Table of Contents has changed from:

Exhibit/Attachment Table of Contents

DOCUMENT TYPE	DESCRIPTION	PAGES	DATE
Attachment 1	NSA Washington IPMP body Aug 2011		
Attachment 10	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix B Installation PMs		
Attachment 11	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix A Maps		
Attachment 12	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix E Pesticide Equipment Inventor		
Attachment 13	NSA Bethesda IPMP		
Attachment 14	Marine Barracks IPMP		
Attachment 15	Indian Head signature page		
Attachment 16	Indian Head IPMP		
Attachment 17	Dahlgren IPMP		
Attachment 18	16R0308 ELINs Pest Control		
Attachment 19	Attachment C Offeror's Relevant Experience Input Form		13-JAN-2016
Attachment 2	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix J Emerg. Disease Vector Contro		
Attachment 20	Attachment D Past Performance Questionnaire		13-JAN-2016
Attachment 3	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix J Emerg		

Attachment 4	Disease Vector Control NSA Washington IPMP Appendix I Pesticide Discharge Mgmt Plan
Attachment 5	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix H Laws, Regs, Publications
Attachment 6	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix G Licenses, Certs, Appt Ltrs
Attachment 7	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix F Authorized Use List Pesticide
Attachment 8	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix D Program Review
Attachment 9	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix C Abbreviations & Definitions

to:

Exhibit/Attachment Table of Contents

DOCUMENT TYPE	DESCRIPTION	PAGES	DATE
Attachment 1	NSA Washington IPMP body Aug 2011		
Attachment 10	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix B Installation PMs		
Attachment 11	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix A Maps		
Attachment 12	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix E Pesticide Equipment Inventor		
Attachment 13	NSA Bethesda IPMP		
Attachment 14	Marine Barracks IPMP		
Attachment 15	Indian Head signature page		
Attachment 16	Indian Head IPMP		
Attachment 17	Dahlgren IPMP		
Attachment 18	16R0308 ELINs Pest Control		
Attachment 19	Attachment C Offeror's Relevant Experience Input Form		13-JAN-2016
Attachment 2	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix J Emerg. Disease Vector Contro		
Attachment 20	Attachment D Past Performance Questionnaire		13-JAN-2016
Attachment 21	Site Visit Sign In Sheets		

Attachment 22	Pest Control Services Pre-Proposal Conf. Agenda
Attachment 3	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix J Emerg Disease Vector Control
Attachment 4	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix I Pesticide Discharge Mgmt Plan
Attachment 5	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix H Laws, Regs, Publications
Attachment 6	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix G Licenses, Certs, Appt Ltrs
Attachment 7	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix F Authorized Use List Pesticide
Attachment 8	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix D Program Review
Attachment 9	NSA Washington IPMP Appendix C Abbreviations & Definitions

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

a. The solicitation requires the evaluation of price and the following non-price factors:

Factor 1 – Corporate Experience

Factor 2 – Technical Approach

Factor 3 – Safety

Factor 4 – Past Performance

The distinction between corporate experience and past performance is 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 pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well a contractor has performed on the contracts.

Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.

(1) Price:

- (a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The evaluated price shall be the sum of the Recurring Work and Non-Recurring Work CLINs for the base period and four (4) Option Periods. Total potential contract duration is 60 months. Provide the total price for performance of work required by the solicitation for

all contract line items, including options as presented in Section B. The Offeror shall also submit pricing information regarding the contract line items, sub-line items, and exhibit line items on the ELIN spreadsheet, Section J, Attachment J-0200000-04 Exhibit Line Item Numbers (ELINs)xls.

- (b) 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 B 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 M 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.

(2) Technical Factors:

(a) **Factor 1, Corporate Experience:**

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

Recent, Relevant project is defined as:

A pest control 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: Valued at \$500,000 or greater per year.

Scope: Proving pest control treatment for scheduled, recurring work as well as timely response to service calls and coordinating work with a customer's complex scheduling issues. Offeror shall demonstrate the ability to treat for a wide variety of pests.

Complexity: The Offeror must have the capability to perform services on multiple buildings at multiple locations.

It is the Offeror's responsibility to clearly explain and demonstrate to the Government how their work experience in each referenced contract is relevant to the contract requirements in this solicitation. If the Offeror does not clearly explain how its experience(s) is relevant to the solicitation requirements, the Government may interpret this failure to mean that the Offeror lacks recent relevant experience performing contracts of similar size, scope and complexity resulting in an unacceptable rating for this Factor. Use of Attachment C - OFFEROR'S RELEVANT EXPERIENCE INPUT FORM is **MANDATORY** and **SHALL** be used. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Do not use more than 3 pages for each experience (i.e., the Attachment 'D' form itself and not more than 2 continuation pages).

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.

Experience of proposed subcontractors will not be considered.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information 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.

- ii. **Basis of Evaluation:** Offerors will be evaluated based on their recent and relevant experience performing the RFP requirements, particularly the Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements. Corporate experience will be considered technically acceptable when the Offeror demonstrates experience performing at least **one (1)** relevant project similar in size, scope and complexity as defined in the solicitation AND demonstrates experience in all requirements identified in Annex 1503020 Spec Item 3 in the PWS. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's corporate experience for relevancy on the basis of the written information provided in the proposal. The Offeror's relative experience in all requirements identified in Annex 1503020 Spec Item 3 in the PWS is **MANDATORY** to be rated Acceptable.

(b) **Factor 2, Technical Approach:**

- i. **Solicitation Submittal Requirements:** The Offeror shall submit a narrative response that clearly demonstrates its understanding of and approach to accomplishing the requirements set forth in the RFP. The Offeror must address the four components below. These four areas must be separately tabbed under this factor.
1. **Workforce Management:**
 - Provide an explanation of how the Offeror will organize staff and retain qualified workers at management and operational levels under the contract.
 - Provide detailed Staffing Chart depicting levels of authority and chain of command to the lowest level, including subcontractors. Also, provide an organizational chart identifying management, key positions and elements of the Offeror's organization under this contract.
 2. **Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) - Demonstrate a clear understanding to IPMP requirements and describe the approach to be used to comply with the IPMP PWS requirements. The narrative should also demonstrate an understanding of required response and completion timeframes of trouble calls.**
 3. **Key personnel: Qualification requirements identified in Performance Work Statement Annex J-0200000, Spec Item, 2.7 **MUST BE** met to be rated Acceptable.**
 - **Project Manager (PM):** The PM shall have at least three years of experience in managing a workforce providing services on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity.
 - **Quality Manager:** The Quality Manager shall have at least three years of experience in preparing and enforcing QMS programs on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity. The Quality Manager may be the same person as the SSHO.
 - **Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO):** The SSHO shall have completed five years of satisfactory experience in preparing and enforcing safety programs on contracts of similar size and complexity in the past or three years' experience if he possesses a Certified

Safety Professional (CSP) or safety and health degree. The SSHO shall have completed the OSHA 30-hour construction safety class or equivalent and maintain competency through 24 hours of formal safety and health related coursework every four years. The SSHO may be the same person as the project manager but shall have fulfilled the pre-requisite qualification and experience.

- Environmental/Energy Manager: The Environmental/Energy Manager shall have a minimum two years' experience with environmental procedures similar to those of this contract; familiarity with Environmental Management Systems (EMSs); and knowledge of environmental regulations and federal energy laws and policy (including energy and water reduction requirements and renewable energy requirements) that are applicable to operations similar to those of this contract.
4. Appropriate License and Certification – Submit appropriate licenses and certifications to provide pest control services in the District of Columbia, the state of Virginia, and the state of Maryland.
- ii. Basis of Evaluation: Acceptability will be based upon the quality of the Offerors technical and management approach including the extent to which the Offeror's approach will achieve the pest control service requirements contained in the RFP.

This factor will be evaluated as an overall factor; the four areas/components are not considered subfactors. These four areas/components merely identify the minimum information an Offeror is required to address under this factor. The Government will evaluate each factor to determine whether the Offeror understands and offers an approach that will meet the RFP requirements. Offerors that fail to address the five components/areas (1 through 4) under this factor will be rated UNACCEPTABLE.

(c) **Factor 3, Safety:**

- i. 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 2013, 2014, 2015, 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. Higher EMRs may result in an Unacceptable rating.
 2. OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: For the three previous complete calendar years 2013, 2014, 2015, 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. Higher OSHA DART Rates may result in an Unacceptable rating.
 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 (single-sided) or 1 sheet of paper (double-sided).

- 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:
1. Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
 2. OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
 3. Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
 4. Other sources of information available to the Government
- 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. Higher EMRs may result in an Unacceptable rating.
 - 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. Higher OSHA DART Rates may result in an Unacceptable rating.
 - 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.
- (d) **Factor 4, Past Performance:**

- i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

IF A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION IS AVAILABLE, IT SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL. IF THERE IS NOT A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation is provided for the Offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the Offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 1. AN OFFEROR SHALL NOT SUBMIT A PPQ WHEN A COMPLETED CPARS IS AVAILABLE. IF A CPARS EVALUATION IS NOT AVAILABLE, ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed PPQs 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, Julie Monohan via email at Julie.monohan@navy.mil prior to proposal closing date.

Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

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), 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.

A copy of the blank Past Performance Questionnaire to be used for requesting client references is included as Attachment D.

- ii. Basis of Evaluation: Performance considering:
1. A pattern of successful completion of tasks;
 2. A pattern of deliverables that are timely and of good quality;
 3. A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels (task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc.);
 4. Recency of tasks performed that are identical to, similar to, or related to the task at hand; and
 5. A respect for stewardship of Government funds

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 offered under Factor 1 in order to receive an acceptable rating. However, an overall Marginal rating on more than one of the projects offered in Factor 1 will result in a rating of Unacceptable for this factor.

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”.

END OF EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

(End of Summary of Changes)