

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 13
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 23-Aug-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FEAD P.O. BOX 1855 BLDG. 2004 BARNETT AVE. QUANTICO VA 22134		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-1010
			X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 18-Jul-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-1010 Demolish Buildings 2112, 2130, 2131, MCB Quantico, VA The purpose of this amendment is to change POCs and answer RFIs. SEE CONTINUATION PAGE				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
			TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 23-Aug-2016

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 point of contact for this solicitation is hereby changed from Elizabeth Mudd and Jacqueline Stader to Daniel Calvo, daniel.calvo1@navy.mil, 202-685-8086. Please send all future correspondence to Daniel Calvo.

Below are responses to RFI's.

Question 4: We are interested in bidding your project. However, in the specifications it says that a qualifying factor is having at least three jobs over one million. These types of jobs are few today making it unattainable for most companies. Our largest job to date is 2.5million but the majority are around 800,000. Even though we may be the best economically and possess the ability and resources to complete your project the minimum of three projects over 1 million could present a problem. Is there a chance of getting that waived if we demonstrate the ability to perform the work?

Response 4: No, technical evaluation factor relevant experience remains unchanged. Refer to Section M for size, scope and complexity requirements.

Question 5: If I understand correctly, this project is 100% small business set aside. The NAICS code listed is 238910, site preparation contractors. Given the similarity of the work performed, but on a more complex/larger scale, I wanted to inquire as to whether or not the following NAICS codes and their respective size standards also apply: 562910; 236210; & 236220.

Response 5: No, only NAICS 238910 applies to this solicitation.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. The proposal due date is hereby confirmed for 19 September 2016 at 2:00 PM EST.

SECTION A - SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The Issued By organization below has been deleted:

ROICC
BLDG. 2004 BARNETT AVE
P.O. BOX 1855
QUANTICO VA 22134-0855

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

EVALUATION FACTORS

**SINGLE BOARD
LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE**

N40080-16-R-1010

TOTAL SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE

FOR

**SOLICITATION: N40080-16-R-1010 DEMOLISH BUILDINGS 2112, 2130, 2131, SURROUNDING
ANCILLARY MINOR STRUCTURES, AND THE REMOVAL/ DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS
MATERIALS MCB, QUANTICO**

INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSER

(1) Your point of contact for all matters concerning this project is Daniel Calvo at daniel.calvo1@navy.mil or 202-685-8086.

(2) The work to be performed includes services for the demolition of buildings 2112, 2130, 2131 and surrounding ancillary minor structures; all concrete items such as slabs, sidewalks, footings, parking lot asphalt, curbs, berms, underground concrete structures, bollards, retaining walls and footings; fences; lighting or power poles with any associated conduit and/or wiring; tanks, pits, tunnels, oil/water separators with any associated piping or equipment; HVAC, electrical, and/or mechanical equipment. Pile caps and pilings shall be demolished to 3' below grade and abandoned. Utility line services to other facilities in the area that are impacted by demolition activities shall be maintained. A hazardous materials survey was conducted and a report generated. As a result of the survey, asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint and paint containing lead, materials containing lead, mercury-containing light tubes and fixtures, PCB containing light ballasts, FreonR-containing equipment, and the presence of potentially hazardous chemicals were identified. Conclusions and/or recommendations regarding location and disposal of these materials is provided in the hazmat report.

(3) The estimated cost range is between \$5,000,000.00-\$10,000,000.00 and under NAICS Code 238910.

(4) The project duration time is 365 days from date of award which includes the initial 45 days to commence work. This includes time for receipt, review and approvals of material submittals.

(5) The following milestones are established for this procurement:

Issue Solicitation:	18 July 2016
Site Visit:	25 August 2016
RFI Cut Off Date:	7 September 2016
Proposals Due:	19 September 2016

(6) Proposals shall be submitted to the FEAD, Bldg 2004, Barnett Avenue, Marine Corps Base, Quantico by **19 September at 2:00pm to Daniel Calvo at daniel.calvo1@navy.mil. Offerors are solely responsible for the timely delivery of proposals and are cautioned to plan ahead for unexpected delays.**

(7) Inquiries during the proposal preparation period should be submitted by email to Daniel Calvo at daniel.calvo1@navy.mil.

A. BASIS FOR AWARD

1. The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contracts; to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contracts to the offerors submitting the lowest priced, technically acceptable offers.
2. As stated in the solicitation, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. In addition, if the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.
3. The LPTA process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition because the best value is expected to result from selection of the technically acceptable proposals with the lowest evaluated prices.
4. An overall non-price factors rating must be at least "ACCEPTABLE" in order to be eligible for award. An "UNACCEPTABLE" rating in any factor results in the overall non-price factors proposal being rated "UNACCEPTABLE" unless corrected through discussions. An overall non-price factors rating of "UNACCEPTABLE" makes a proposal ineligible for award.
5. **The number of proposals to be evaluated for technical acceptability shall be limited to the 3 lowest priced offerors. If no proposals are found to be technically acceptable within the first group of proposals, then the process described will be conducted again as many times as necessary, until such time as the Government identifies technically acceptable proposals.**

B. SAFETY EVALUATION

1. Per NFAS 15.304(d), solicitations utilizing source selection procedures for procurements within the 50 United States and the District of Columbia shall contain a standard "Safety" technical evaluation factor. This factor shall be included as a stand-alone evaluation factor and not as a sub-factor or an element of the Past Performance evaluation factor. This action will result in the selection of contractors that have consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and the ability to properly manage and implement safety procedures for themselves and all tiers of subcontractors under their purview.
2. The safety evaluation has two elements: Experience Modification Rate (EMR), Occupational Safety and Health Association (OSHA) Days Away from Work, Job Restriction, or Transfer (DART).
3. The two elements of safety, as listed above, are not sub-factors. The evaluators should collectively consider all elements of safety when assigning an overall adjectival rating for this factor. The SSEB will need to make a qualitative determination of the rating for this factor, taking into account the risk ratings for EMR and DART.
4. Evaluators will not average the rating from the two [2014 and 2015] years for the EMR and the DART.
5. The following should be utilized by evaluators as a general guideline to evaluate the EMR and DART rates:

<u>Risk</u>	<u>EMR</u>
Very Low Risk	Less than 0.6
Low Risk	From 0.6 to less than 0.8
Moderate Risk	From 0.8 to 1.0
High Risk	Greater than 1.0 to 1.1
Extremely High Risk	Greater than 1.1

<u>Risk</u>	<u>DART Rate</u>
Very Low Risk	Less Than 1.0

Low Risk	From 1.0 to 1.99
Moderate Risk	From 2.0 to 2.99
High Risk	From 3.0 to 4.0
Extremely High Risk	Greater than 4.0

C. ADJECTIVAL RATINGS/DESCRIPTIONS

Each offeror's technical factors and past performance will be evaluated separately. Upon the conclusion of the evaluation of the technical factors, and past performance, an overall non-price factors rating of Acceptable (A) or Unacceptable (U) will be assigned to each offeror's non-price factors proposal.

- The following adjectival ratings and rating descriptions will be used to assign a rating to each technical factor. Use upper case letter ratings for major technical factor ratings. The addition of plus (+) or minus (-) to an adjective rating is not allowed.

Table A-1. Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Ratings	
Rating	Description
Acceptable (A)	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable (U)	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

The weaknesses and/or deficiencies (as defined below) of each proposal for each non-price evaluation factor which influenced the assigned adjectival rating shall be identified.

Definitions	
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Deficiency	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

2. PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Past Performance shall be evaluated when using the LPTA process, unless waived by the PCO in accordance with FAR 15.101-2(b). Past performance will be rated on an "acceptable" or "unacceptable" basis using the ratings in the following table:

Table A-2. 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. (See note below.)
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.

Note: 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.”

a. Aspects of Past Performance Evaluation. The past performance evaluation results is an assessment of the offeror’s probability of meeting the minimum past performance solicitation requirements. This assessment is based on the offeror’s record of relevant and recent past performance information that pertain to the products and/or services outlined in the solicitation requirements. There are two aspects of the past performance evaluation.

i. The first is to evaluate whether the offeror’s present/past performance is relevant or not relevant to the effort to be acquired. The criteria to establish what is considered relevant are unique to each LPTA source selection. The contractor shall submit three (3) recent examples of specific government or commercial contracts/projects your firm has performed to best demonstrate your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity. Do not utilize experience of a proposed subcontractor to demonstrate experience for your firm. A specific project is a single project or a single task order under an indefinite quantity contract or on-call type contract.

For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as follows:

Size: A demolition project valuing at least \$1,000,000.00.

Scope/Complexity: Demolition of a single building totaling at least 100,000 SF or multiple buildings and structures. Demolition must include the removal and disposal of hazardous materials within buildings. All projects must meet the size requirement.

Submitted relevant project experience shall demonstrate the following:

1) Experience as the Prime Contractor on all of the submitted projects.

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

ii. The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation performed in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror’s past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts.

b. SSEB members will review past performance information to determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to the performance confidence assessment.

D. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

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

Factor 1 – Relevant Experience
Factor 2 – Safety
Factor 3 – Past Performance

The distinction between relevant experience and past performance is 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.

2. Proposal Organization and format:

- a. The proposal submitted in response to this solicitation shall be clear, concise, and shall contain sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposals should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather should demonstrate convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the RFP. Nonconformance with the solicitation requirements, specified organization and content may result in elimination or miscalculation of the proposal. All claimed technical capabilities to meet the requirements shall be realistic and are subject to verification by the Government. Offerors should assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of the offeror's business and that the Government will base its evaluation on the information contained in the offeror's proposals.

3. Proposal Organization and Number of Copies.

- a. Factor 1: Relevant Experience
 - i. Contractors will utilize the Relevant Experience form, ATTACHMENT A. 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]. Submission shall be submitted electronically via email.
 - ii. A separate Relevant Experience form must be used for each relevant experience example submitted for Factor 1.
- b. Factor 2: Safety
 - i. Text pages 8 ½ x 11 format, minimum 10 point font.
 - ii. Safety Factor total length shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page [or two (2) single-sided pages]. Pages beyond this maximum will not be reviewed. Submission shall be submitted electronically via email.
- c. Factor 3: Past Performance
 - i. Contractors will utilize the Past Performance form, ATTACHMENT B. 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. Submission shall be submitted electronically via email.
 - ii. A separate Past Performance form must be used for each past performance example submitted for Factor 3.
- d. Price Proposal- Offeror shall submit one price package with the following characteristics:
 - i. Text pages 8 ½ x 11 format, minimum 10 point font.
 - ii. Completed SF 30 signed with all amendments acknowledged.

- iii. Price Schedule.
 - iv. Copy of Online Representation and Certifications Application (ORCA) and proof of registration in System for Award Management (SAM)
 - v. Confirmation of filing of Veterans' Employment and Training (VETS) VETS 100 and/or VETS report for the cycle.
 - vi. Bid Guarantee in accordance with FAR Clause 52.228-1 Bid Guarantee. Amount shall be at least 20 percent of the bid price but shall not exceed \$3 million.
 - vii. Include a cover page with Solicitation Number, Solicitation Title, Prime Contractor Name, Address, Phone Number, Fax Number, DUNS, Cage Code, Point of Contact, phone number, and email address.
 - viii. A complete electronic copy of the price proposal as a single .pdf file on a CD-ROM. Submission shall be submitted electronically via email.
- e. Elaborate brochures or documentation, detailed art work, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.
 - f. The proposal shall be written to the greatest extent possible on a stand-alone basis so that its content may be evaluated with a minimum of cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity. Hyperlinking of cross-references is permissible. Information required for proposal evaluation, but not provided in its designated volume or cross-referenced, is assumed omitted from the proposal.

4. Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.

a. PRICE

i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Prices will be submitted on the Price Schedule included in the solicitation.

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 solicitation bid schedule). The Government intends to evaluate all options and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990) the bid schedule of the solicitation. The sum of CLINs 0001 through 0004 will be used as calculation of the total price. The purpose of CLIN 0004 is for post award use if a modification is required for additional hazardous materials. 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:

- 1) Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the RFP.
- 2) Comparison of proposed prices with the IGCE.
- 3) Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.

b. NON-PRICED FACTORS:

Factor 1 - Relevant Experience:

i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

- iii. Each Offeror **SHALL** submit a **TOTAL of three (3)** projects that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the projects proposed for this demolition contract. Do not utilize experience of a proposed subcontractor to demonstrate experience for your firm. A specific project is a single project or a single task order under an indefinite quantity contract or on-call type contract.

For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is defined as follows:

Size: A demolition project valuing at least \$1,000,000.00.

Scope/Complexity: Demolition of a single building totaling at least 100,000 SF or multiple buildings and structures. Demolition must include the removal and disposal of hazardous materials within buildings. All projects must meet the size requirement.

Submitted relevant project experience shall be as a Prime contractor.

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

Use of the attached Relevant Experience Form (**Attachment A**) is **MANDATORY and SHALL** be used to submit project information. 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 including unique features, square footage, and methods of demolition and or HAZMAT removal. The relevancy of the project, in accordance with the parameters identified above shall also be provided.

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; therefore, each Joint Venture entity shall submit 1 project meeting the requirements listed above. **If the Joint Venture is a mentor/protégé, projects SHALL come from both entities. The protégé must demonstrate experience of least at one (1) projects described above and the experience must be that of a prime contractor.** 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 of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF30), 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:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience in performing relevant demolition projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements.

In order to receive an **ACCEPTABLE** rating, **ALL THREE (3) PROJECTS** submitted **MUST be relevant.**

Factor 2 – Safety:**i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:**

The Offeror **SHALL** submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each Contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors).

1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

For the two (2) previous complete calendar years (**2014 and 2015**), submit your EMR (which compares your company's annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a two (2) year period). If you have no EMR, affirmatively state so and explain why.

2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate:

For the two (2) previous complete calendar years (**2014 and 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.

ii. Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety. 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.

In order to receive an **ACCEPTABLE** rating, the risk level **SHALL NOT** be higher than **MODERATE RISK** for each year in BOTH EMR and DART.

The following depicts the risk ranges for the EMR and DART rates:

<u>Risk</u>	<u>EMR</u>
Very Low Risk	Less than 0.6
Low Risk	From 0.6 to less than 0.8
Moderate Risk	From 0.8 to 1.0
High Risk	Greater than 1.0 to 1.1
Extremely High Risk	Greater than 1.1

<u>Risk</u>	<u>DART Rate</u>
Very Low Risk	Less Than 1.0
Low Risk	From 1.0 to 1.99
Moderate Risk	From 2.0 to 2.99

High Risk
Extremely High Risk

From 3.0 to 4.0
Greater than 4.0

Factor 3-Past Performance:

i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

If a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation [formerly known as Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS)] is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 1 for Relevant Experience. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation then submit Past Performance Questionnaires for each project included in Factor 1 Relevant 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 should 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 contacts, Elizabeth Mudd at Elizabeth.mudd@navy.mil.

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

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 1 for Relevant 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.

Offerors may provide any performance recognition documents received within the last three (3) years such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

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.

While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

ii. Basis of Evaluation:

This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the relevant projects submitted under Factor 1 for Relevant 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)	<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 Relevant Experience in order to receive an acceptable rating. However, an overall Marginal rating on more than one of the projects demonstrated in Factor 1 Relevant Experience 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”.

IV. BEST-VALUE DECISION AND DOCUMENTATION

- a. The SSA shall select the sources whose proposals offers the best value to the Government in accordance with established criteria in Section M or (or a non-UCF solicitation).
- b. The SSA shall ensure the proposals are evaluated for acceptability but not ranked using the non-price factors.
- c. The SSA shall document the supporting rationale in the SSDD. The SSDD shall be the single summary document supporting selection of the best-value proposals consistent with the stated evaluation criteria.

V. ATTACHMENTS

A. Relevant Experience Form

B. Past Performance Questionnaire**DISCUSSIONS:**

It is the Government's intention to evaluate proposals and award without discussions with offerors, other than exchanges conducted for the purpose of minor clarifications. However, it may be necessary to conduct discussions if determined by the Contracting Officer. If conducted, the evaluation team will assist in the development of the discussion items. Discussions may be held in writing or verbally, either telephonically or in person, as necessary. Discussions will conclude with a request for a final proposal. The evaluation of discussion responses and final proposals will be documented by an evaluation team.

(End of Summary of Changes)