

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 19
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0015	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 21-Apr-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC MID ATLANTIC IPT NORTH 9324 VIRGINIA AVENUE BLDG Z-144 NORFOLK VA 23511	CODE N40085	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. N40085-15-R-8731	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 18-Dec-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 <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.) REMEDIAL ACTION OPERATIONS (RAO)/LONG TERM MANAGEMENT (LTM) MULTIPLE AWARD CONTRACT (MAC) FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY (AOR). THE AREA INCLUDES; "NEW ENGLAND" AREA (DEFINED AS CONNECTICUT, MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW HAMPSHIRE, RHODE ISLAND AND VERMONT), AND THE "MID-ATLANTIC AREA" (DEFINED AS DELAWARE, NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA) This Amendment is issued to incorporate a revised Section L and M. In addition, one question and response to the related proposal. All other terms and conditions remain the same. Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL:	EMAIL:	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 21-Apr-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 0015

Question and Answer

1. Please provide the name of the company who is currently performing the security/fire monitoring and the current annual cost for providing this scope item?

Government Response: F & M Mechanical & Electrical Contracting, Incorporated, 301 Jan Way, Calverton, New York 11933. The annual amount for Calendar year 2015 was \$480.00.

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

5252.215-9300 CONTENT OF PROPOSALS (JAN 2003)

General Solicitation Requirements

- a. The Non-Cost proposal and the price proposal shall be submitted in separate volumes. The non-cost proposal shall not contain any cost/pricing information. The non-cost proposal presented by the offeror to whom the award are made will be incorporated into the contract at time of award.
- b. Offerors will complete and submit the following:
 - (1) Non-Cost/Price Factors Submission Requirements:

Non-cost/price Factors Binder: Offeror shall submit one (1) marked "Original" and five (5) copies, each in a separate three-ring binder with following characteristics:

- ... 8 1/2 x 11 format
- ... 12-point Times New Roman font
- ... 125 page limit (inclusive of all charts, forms and other documentation to the solicitation requirements), pages sequentially numbered. Price proposals are not part of the 125 page limitation.

- ... Include a cover page with Contract Number, Contract Title, Prime Contractor Name, Address, Phone Number, Fax Number, DUNS, Cage Code, Point of Contact and their phone number and email address
- ... Include only information in response to Factors 1, 2, 3 and 4 separated by tabs as applicable.
- ... A complete electronic copy of the technical proposal as a single .pdf file on a CD-ROM (include with the “original” technical submission)

(2) Price Proposal (proposed Seed Project):

Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Offerors shall submit an original and one (1) copy of the price proposal, in a separate three ring binder, that shall include the following:

- ... SF33, signed with all amendments acknowledged and executed representations and certifications (SAM), Technical Approach/Implementation Plan (10 page limit).
- ... Confirm submission of the most recent Vets 4212 Report
- ... Provide name of financial institution, point of contact, telephone number and e-mail address. Provide a signed statement of release giving the reference permission to release the information to the Navy.
- ... The price proposal shall be submitted at the same time as the technical proposal.
- ... In addition to providing a hard copy of the price proposals, offerors shall also provide one (1) non-rewritable CD with pricing information. Offerors are advised that in the event of a discrepancy between pricing information contained on the CD and the hard copy, the hard copy will govern.

Non Cost/Price Proposal

The solicitation requires the evaluation of the following factors:

Factor 1 – Management Approach

Factor 2 – Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm

Factor 3 – Safety

Factor 4 – Past Performance

Price

Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor:

Factor 1, Management Approach:

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements.

- (1) Submit a narrative that discusses the following topics: Describe the Offeror’s ability to manage multiple projects simultaneously; address how offeror will provide labor, materials, equipment, subcontractors, and project management for sites. Offerors

demonstrating an ability to manage projects with limited field seasons and challenging locations *may* receive higher ratings. Examples may include work in severe weather conditions, remote locations, and/or within required regulatory limitations due to natural habitat, migratory or mating seasons, endangered species, or other similar protection measures as may have been imposed by federal, state, or local governments. Offeror information provided shall not exceed five (5) pages total.

- (2) Indicate the type and percentage of work the Offeror will self-perform. Offeror must meet the requirements of DFARS 52.219-14, Limitation on Subcontracting. Explain how you will manage your subcontracts under multiple projects at varying locations. Information provided shall not exceed three (3) pages. Submit Attachment 6 as part of this factor.
- (3) Discuss general quality control procedures, identifying how Remedial Action Operation and Long-Term Management quality will be managed and maintained. Information provided shall not exceed five (5) pages. Explain how you will manage and control the three phases of the Quality Control Program (i.e., preparation phase, initial phase, Follow-up phase) to assure a highly performing QC program is provided. Discuss how you define the activities for which the three phases of control are performed, and discuss the actual inspection activities and documentation of inspections at each phase.
- (4) Provide documentation that a safety program is in place that meets the requirements of the most recent US Army Corps of Engineers Safety and Health Requirements Manual, EM-385-1-1 and OSHA 29 CFR 1910.120, Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response. Information shall not exceed three (3) pages.

Factor 2, Recent, Relevant Experience of the firm:

Definitions and qualifying information:

- (a) “Relevant experience” pertains to the type of work completed by an offeror that is relevant to the project requirements as set out in the subject RFP. Generally, projects submitted will be considered “relevant” if they are for similar services or types of work as required by the RFP, and are comparable to the subject project in terms of project size, scope, and complexity (ranging from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000). Projects offered as “relevant experience” will be determined to be “not relevant” if they evidence little or no similarity to the services or types of work required by the RFP and are not comparable in terms of project size, scope, and complexity. Note that once a relevancy determination is made, a further delineation regarding the “degree” of relevancy for the projects offered may be made by reviewing officials.

Further “degrees” of relevancy for the projects determined to be relevant will be as follows:

Highly Relevant: Past/present project offered as relevant corporate experience involved essentially the same effort as the project required by the current RFP in terms of size, scope, and complexity

Moderately Relevant: Past/present project offered as corporate experience involved much of the same effort, although not identical, as the project required by the current RFP in terms of the size, scope, and complexity

Minimally Relevant: Past/present project offered as relevant corporate experience involved some of the same effort as the project required by the current RFP in terms of the size, scope, and complexity.

- (b) A “project” is defined as a single function contract or task order under an indefinite quantity or on-call contract.
- (c) The term “substantially complete” shall mean that more than 80% of the project has been performed.
- (d) “Within the past five (5) years” shall mean from the date of the submission for this procurement to five (5) years prior.
- (e) “Long Term Management” (LTM) occurs when the selected remedy has achieved the cleanup goals (possibly done under the remedial action or RAO phase) and the hazardous substances remain at the site above levels that would allow unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. LTM may include long term monitoring, implementation and/or management of land use controls (LUCs), maintenance of the final remedy, and preparation of the five year review.
- (f) “Relevant Experience” pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed or substantially completed, within the past five (5) years by the offeror, that are comparable to the types of work covered by this RFP in terms of size, scope and complexity.
- (g) “Remedial Action” (RA) may include, but are not limited to the construction of various soil, sediment, and/or groundwater remediation systems that functions as containment (e.g. soil cover, RCRA cap, slurry wall, pump and treatment system); in-situ treatment (e.g. natural attenuation, soil vapor extraction, enhanced bio-remediation, air-sparging) or ex-situ treatment (air stripping, constructed wetlands, off site disposal, stabilization, solidification)
- (h) “Remedial Action Operation” (RAO) is the phase of the CERCLA process when the remediation system (possibly constructed under the remedial action phase) is in place and is operating, or the chemical or biological processes are occurring leading to the cleanup objective. RAO may include active remediation, monitoring, operation, and optimization for extended periods of time to reduce contaminants to site cleanup standards; along with the implementation and management /maintenance of Land Use Controls (LUCs).
- (i) “Relevant Remedial Action Operation ” (RAO) projects means work performed similar to the types of work and volume of work as defined under Remedial Action Operation (RAO) completed or been substantially completed within the past five (5) years by the offeror that are comparable to the types of work covered by this RFP in

terms of size, scope and complexity. Each individual RAO task order will typically range from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000.

- (j) “Relevant Long Term Management” (LTM) projects means work performed similar to the types of work and volume of work as defined under Long Term Management (LTM) completed or been substantially completed within the past five (5) years by the offeror that are comparable to the types of work covered by this RFP in terms of size, scope and complexity . Each individual LTM task order will typically range from \$100,000 to \$500,000 annually.
- (i). Solicitation Submittal Requirements.
- (1) Submit three (3) relevant Remedial Action Operation (RAO) projects and three (3) relevant Long Term Management (LTM) projects. The offeror shall submit a total of six (6) projects. The offeror should submit projects that best demonstrate the offeror’s or team’s relevant environmental services experience to the RFP requirements may be submitted. Projects must have been completed or substantially completed within the last five (5) years. Offeror (OR YOUR TEAM member) must have been the prime contractor for each project; subcontractor experience will not be considered. NOTE: For the purposes of this solicitation, the term “TEAM” shall be defined as two or more companies which form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential PRIME CONTRACTOR for the purposes of contract performance under the subject solicitation. A team member is one of more of those companies. A team member is NOT a subcontractor for the purposes of this solicitation. This definition shall be used and applied consistently throughout this solicitation. At least one (1) Remedial Action Operation project submitted must be \$400,000 or above, and at least one (1) Long-Term Management project submitted must be \$300,000 annually or above. Failure to submit at least one (1) Remedial Action Operation project \$400,000 or above, and at least one (1) Long-Term Management project \$300,000 annually or above, puts Offeror at risk of receiving a lower rating or an UNACCEPTABLE rating.
 - (2) Complete the “Relevant Experience Individual Project Data Sheet” (**Attachment 1**) for each project. Each Project Data Sheet package may not be longer than six (6) pages in length.
 - (3) Submit two (2) examples of actual LTM environmental reports that have been prepared and submitted to local, state or federal agencies. The two (2) reports should be directly associated with any two (2) of the relevant projects submitted for Factor 2. These reports should be submitted as separate attachments and do not count toward the total page restriction for Project Data Sheets. (May be provided by CD)
 - (4) Complete and submit a “Relevant Experience Project Checklist” (**Attachment 2**) that covers all of the relevant projects submitted for this factor. This Checklist will serve as the contractor’s self-assessment of the type of services contained in each of the relevant projects. This Checklist does not count towards the total page restriction for Project Data Sheets. LTM Reports developed in accordance with CERCLA

requirements should also be annotated on the “Relevant Experience Project Checklist.”

- (5) Joint venture offers must include two (2) projects performed by the joint venture as existing OR relevant projects from each firm comprising the joint venture. The Small Business Administration (SBA) determines the validity of a joint venture under an 8(a) Program.
- (6) Projects may include work with federal, state, or local governments, as well as private industry. Firms are responsible for providing project description and applicable experience in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of project relevancy.

Factor 3, 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; 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 2012, 2013 and 2014, 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. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.
 - (2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: For the three previous complete calendar years 2012, 2013 and 2014, submit your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA DART Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.
 - (3) Technical Approach for Safety: Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety Narrative shall be limited to two pages. **NOTE: In the event the prime will perform all work with its in-house staff, that is NO subcontractors will be used at any level, provide this information in your narrative to document why the required information concerning subcontractors is not included in your proposal. Failure to provide the required information or an affirmative statement that the offeror shall perform all work itself without subcontractors will be considered a material defect rendering the proposal UNACCEPTABLE for this factor.**

All information outlined above in (1), (2), and (3) MUST be provided or the proposal will be considered UNACCEPTABLE. If information is not available in the submitted narratives, provide a reason for missing required information.

Factor 4, Past Performance:

Definitions

Past Performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror satisfied its customers' requirements in the past and complied with applicable laws and regulations.

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

- (1) For each project submitted under Factor 2; 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), Attachment C, 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.
- (2) 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 (Section J), 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, LeeArjetta W. Hamilton, via email at leearjetta.hamilton@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.
- (3) Also include performance recognition documents received within the last (5) years such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.
- (4) 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), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

- (5) 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 Past Performance Questionnaire to be used is included in Section J.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

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 contract; to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contract to the offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value—the proposal most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.
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 tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror.
4. As stated in the solicitation, all technical factors when combined are of equal importance to the performance confidence assessment (past Performance) rating; and all technical factors and the performance confidence assessment (past performance) rating, when combined are approximately equal to price.
5. Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions. Proposals may be found to have either a significant weakness or multiple weaknesses that impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal. The evaluation report must document the evaluation

board's assessment of the identified weakness(s) and the associated risk to successful contract performance resulting from the weakness(s). This assessment must provide the rationale for proceeding to award without discussions.

B. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

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

Factor 1 – Management Approach

Factor 2 – Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm

Factor 3 – Safety

Factor 4 – Past Performance

Price

The distinction between relevant experience and past performance is relevant 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 relates to how well a contractor has performed.

2. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors (Factors 1, 2 and 3) are of equal importance to each other and, when combined, are equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment rating determined from the evaluation of Factor 4.

All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined are approximately equal to price. The importance of price will increase if the offeror's non-cost/price proposals are considered essentially equal in terms of overall quality, or if price is so high as to significantly diminish the value of a non-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award will be made to the responsible offeror whose offer forms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered.

3. Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor

(a) Price (Proposed Seed Project):

- (1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Offerors shall submit an original and one (1) copy of the price proposal, in a separate three ring binder, that shall include the following:
 - i. SF33, signed with all amendments acknowledged and executed representations and certifications (SAM), Technical Approach/Implementation Plan (10 page limit).
 - ii. Confirm submission of the most recent Vets 4212 Report

- iii. Provide name of financial institution, point of contact, telephone number and e-mail address. Provide a signed statement of release giving the reference permission to release the information to the Navy.
 - iv. The price proposal shall be submitted at the same time as the technical proposal.
 - v. In addition to providing a hard copy of the price proposals, offerors shall also provide one (1) non-rewritable CD with pricing information. Offerors are advised that in the event of a discrepancy between pricing information contained on the CD and the hard copy, the hard copy will govern.
- (2) Basis of Evaluation: The Government will evaluate price based on costs submitted for the "Seed Project" included in the solicitation. The offerors shall provide a complete breakdown of the sample project tasks in the form of an Technical Approach/Implementation Plan (IP) and Cost Proposal (CP). The work breakdown structure shall contain detailed line item s costs necessary to complete the project. Further, proposals shall include, but not limited to travel, direct labor costs, overhead (field/home), indirect costs, subcontract costs, material costs, equipment cost, bond cost, profit, etc. The IP shall provide a justification for the line items in the CP. The Government intends to award the "Seed Project" via Task Order 0001 to the successful offeror determined to be most advantageous to the Government, cost and technical factors considered. A maximum of four (4) additional offerors may simultaneously receive an award as a result of this solicitation. 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.
 - (iv) Comparison of market survey results.

Factor 1, Management Approach:

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements.

- (5) Submit a narrative that discusses the following topics: Describe the Offeror's ability to manage multiple projects simultaneously; address how offeror will provide labor, materials, equipment, subcontractors, and project management for sites. Offerors demonstrating an ability to manage projects with limited field seasons and challenging locations *may* receive higher ratings. Examples may include work in severe weather conditions, remote locations, and/or within required regulatory limitations due to natural habitat, migratory or mating seasons, endangered species, or other similar protection measures as may have been imposed by federal, state, or local governments. Offeror information provided shall not exceed five (5) pages total.
- (2) Indicate the type and percentage of work the Offeror will self-perform. Offeror must meet the requirements of DFARS 52.219-14, Limitation on Subcontracting. Explain how you will manage your subcontracts under multiple projects at varying locations.

Information provided shall not exceed three (3) pages. Submit Attachment 6 as part of this factor.

- (3) Discuss general quality control procedures, identifying how Remedial Action Operation and Long-Term Management quality will be managed and maintained. Information provided shall not exceed five (5) pages. Explain how you will manage and control the three phases of the Quality Control Program (i.e., preparation phase, initial phase, Follow-up phase) to assure a highly performing QC program is provided. Discuss how you define the activities for which the three phases of control are performed, and discuss the actual inspection activities and documentation of inspections at each phase.
- (4) Provide documentation that a safety program is in place that meets the requirements of the most recent US Army Corps of Engineers Safety and Health Requirements Manual, EM-385-1-1 and OSHA 29 CFR 1910.120, Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response. Information shall not exceed three (3) pages.

(ii)Basis of Evaluation

- (1) The evaluation will consist of an assessment of a firm's ability to manage multiple projects at various sites.
- (2) Evaluating contract management will also include assessing a firm's quality control procedures and proposed subcontractor management practices.
- (3) Higher ratings **may** be given for demonstration of the following:

Demonstrated ability to manage projects with limited field seasons at various times of the year and/or in challenging locations. Examples may include work in severe weather conditions, remote locations, and/or within required regulatory limitations due to natural habitat, migratory or mating seasons, endangered species, or other similar protection measures as may have been imposed by federal, state, or local governments.

Demonstrated ability to provide a high performing quality control program using the three phases of quality control.

Factor 2, Recent, Relevant Experience of the firm:

Definitions and qualifying information:

- (k) "Relevant experience" pertains to the type of work completed by an offeror that is relevant to the project requirements as set out in the subject RFP. Generally, projects submitted will be considered "relevant" if they are for similar services or types of work as required by the RFP, and are comparable to the subject project in terms of project size, scope, and complexity (ranging from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000). Projects offered as "relevant experience" will be determined to be "not relevant" if they evidence little or no similarity to the services or types of work required by the RFP

and are not comparable in terms of project size, scope, and complexity. Note that once a relevancy determination is made, a further delineation regarding the “degree” of relevancy for the projects offered may be made by reviewing officials.

Further “degrees” of relevancy for the projects determined to be relevant will be as follows:

Highly Relevant: Past/present project offered as relevant corporate experience involved essentially the same effort as the project required by the current RFP in terms of size, scope, and complexity

Moderately Relevant: Past/present project offered as corporate experience involved much of the same effort, although not identical, as the project required by the current RFP in terms of the size, scope, and complexity

Minimally Relevant: Past/present project offered as relevant corporate experience involved some of the same effort as the project required by the current RFP in terms of the size, scope, and complexity.

- (l) A “project” is defined as a single function contract or task order under an indefinite quantity or on-call contract.
- (m) The term “substantially complete” shall mean that more than 80% of the project has been performed.
- (n) “Within the past five (5) years” shall mean from the date of the submission for this procurement to five (5) years prior.
- (o) “Long Term Management” (LTM) occurs when the selected remedy has achieved the cleanup goals (possibly done under the remedial action or RAO phase) and the hazardous substances remain at the site above levels that would allow unlimited use and unrestricted exposure. LTM may include long term monitoring, implementation and/or management of land use controls (LUCs), maintenance of the final remedy, and preparation of the five year review.
- (p) “Relevant Experience” pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed or substantially completed, within the past five (5) years by the offeror, that are comparable to the types of work covered by this RFP in terms of size, scope and complexity.
- (q) “Remedial Action” (RA) may include, but are not limited to the construction of various soil, sediment, and/or groundwater remediation systems that functions as containment (e.g. soil cover, RCRA cap, slurry wall, pump and treatment system); in-situ treatment (e.g. natural attenuation, soil vapor extraction, enhanced bio-remediation, air-sparging) or ex-situ treatment (air stripping, constructed wetlands, off site disposal, stabilization, solidification)
- (r) “Remedial Action Operation” (RAO) is the phase of the CERCLA process when the remediation system (possibly constructed under the remedial action phase) is in place and is operating, or the chemical or biological processes are occurring leading to the

cleanup objective. RAO may include active remediation, monitoring, operation, and optimization for extended periods of time to reduce contaminants to site cleanup standards; along with the implementation and management /maintenance of Land Use Controls (LUCs).

- (s) “Relevant Remedial Action Operation ” (RAO) projects means work performed similar to the types of work and volume of work as defined under Remedial Action Operation (RAO) completed or been substantially completed within the past five (5) years by the offeror that are comparable to the types of work covered by this RFP in terms of size, scope and complexity. Each individual RAO task order will typically range from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000.
- (t) “Relevant Long Term Management” (LTM) projects means work performed similar to the types of work and volume of work as defined under Long Term Management (LTM) completed or been substantially completed within the past five (5) years by the offeror that are comparable to the types of work covered by this RFP in terms of size, scope and complexity . Each individual LTM task order will typically range from \$100,000 to \$500,000 annually.

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements.

- (7) Submit three (3) relevant Remedial Action Operation (RAO) projects and three (3) relevant Long Term Management (LTM) projects. The offeror shall submit a total of six (6) projects. The offeror should submit projects that best demonstrate the offeror’s or team’s relevant environmental services experience to the RFP requirements may be submitted. Projects must have been completed or substantially completed within the last five (5) years. Offeror (OR YOUR TEAM member) must have been the prime contractor for each project; subcontractor experience will not be considered. NOTE: For the purposes of this solicitation, the term “TEAM” shall be defined as two or more companies which form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential PRIME CONTRACTOR for the purposes of contract performance under the subject solicitation. A team member is one of more of those companies. A team member is NOT a subcontractor for the purposes of this solicitation. This definition shall be used and applied consistently throughout this solicitation. At least one (1) Remedial Action Operation project submitted must be \$400,000 or above, and at least one (1) Long-Term Management project submitted must be \$300,000 annually or above. Failure to submit at least one (1) Remedial Action Operation project \$400,000 or above, and at least one (1) Long-Term Management project \$300,000 annually or above, puts Offeror at risk of receiving a lower rating or an UNACCEPTABLE rating.
- (8) Complete the “Relevant Experience Individual Project Data Sheet” (**Attachment D**) for each project. Each Project Data Sheet package may not be longer than six (6) pages in length.
- (9) Submit two (2) examples of actual LTM environmental reports that have been prepared and submitted to local, state or federal agencies. The two (2) reports should be directly associated with any two (2) of the relevant projects submitted for Factor 2. These reports should be submitted as separate attachments and do not count toward the total page restriction for Project Data Sheets.

- (10) Complete and submit a “Relevant Experience Project Checklist” (**Attachment E**) that covers all of the relevant projects submitted for this factor. This Checklist will serve as the contractor’s self-assessment of the type of services contained in each of the relevant projects. This Checklist does not count towards the total page restriction for Project Data Sheets. LTM Reports developed in accordance with CERCLA requirements should also be annotated on the “Relevant Experience Project Checklist.”
- (11) Joint venture offers must include two (2) projects performed by the joint venture as existing OR relevant projects from each firm comprising the joint venture. The Small Business Administration (SBA) determines the validity of a joint venture under an 8(a) Program.
- (12) Projects may include work with federal, state, or local governments, as well as private industry. Firms are responsible for providing project description and applicable experience in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of project relevancy.

(ii) **Basis of Evaluation:**

- (1) The Government’s evaluation will assess the contractor’s recent (within the past five years) and relevant experience with respect to size, scope, and complexity.
- (2) Projects submitted by Joint Ventures in which the joint venture partners performed together (either as joint venture partners or in a prime-sub relationship), will be given more weight than submitted projects in which the Joint Venture firms did not perform together.
- (3) Higher ratings may be given for demonstration of the following:
 - (a) Offeror’s (and team members) demonstrated knowledge and experience with projects anticipated for this RAOMAC in NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic’s “New England area (Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island) and NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic’s “Mid Atlantic area” (New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware) in terms of codes, specific state & federal environmental regulations, laws, permit requirements, construction materials, general practices, topography and subsurface conditions, etc.
 - (b) Specific type of RAO/LTM work: While there are many examples of environmental restoration RAO/LTM work, the following specific types of environmental restoration RAO/LTM types are deemed more important to this RFP than others. Therefore, ensure that you provide your firm’s (and team members) experience, if any, in the following types of work, which are listed in descending order of importance (weight).
 1. Treatment plant operation & optimization: Provide experience with the operation and optimization of groundwater (especially complex, multiple treatment trains) treatment facilities including operating, maintaining, monitoring, repairing and incidental construction support. Provide the size,

- duration and yearly operation and maintenance cost of the treatment facility, and task order or contract pricing. Optimization experience shall include optimizing equipment performance, monitoring requirements and overall system protectiveness (containment of site plume, etc). Include significant recommendations (alternate technologies, studies, groundwater modeling efforts) and how they were incorporated into the facilities' operation in order to reduce costs or improve protectiveness. Provide experience with RAO/LTM systems start up and shut down support including the transition of the facility to other parties for operation and maintenance.
2. Site management & remedy maintenance: Experience with site management and maintenance including, but not limited to, protection of human health and the environment, site security, disposal of investigation derived wastes, decommissioning of wells, sampling, and construction support required for ensuring the protection of an existing remedy (i.e. installation of fencing, landfill maintenance and erosion control, provision of warning signs)
 3. Technical Reports: Experience with the preparation of RAO/LTM technical reports (i.e. annual reports, Operation and Maintenance Manuals, site sampling results reports, 5 year review reports) for each site noted above.
- (c) Offerors (and team members) shall demonstrate experience working multiple projects simultaneously typical of those ordered by indefinite delivery/indefinite type contracts.

Factor 3, Safety:

- (ii) **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; 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 2012, 2013 and 2014, 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. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.
 - (2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: For the three previous complete calendar years 2012, 2013 and 2014, submit your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA DART Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) **Technical Approach for Safety:** Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety Narrative shall be limited to two pages. **NOTE: In the event the prime will perform all work with its in-house staff, that is NO subcontractors will be used at any level, provide this information in your narrative to document why the required information concerning subcontractors is not included in your proposal. Failure to provide the required information or an affirmative statement that the offeror shall perform all work itself without subcontractors will be considered a material defect rendering the proposal UNACCEPTABLE for this factor.**

All information outlined above in (1), (2), and (3) MUST be provided or the proposal will be considered UNACCEPTABLE. If information is not available in the submitted narratives, provide a reason for missing required information.

(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:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government

(1) **Experience Modification Rate (EMR):** The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) **OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate:** The Government will evaluate the OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety: The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation. **NOTE: In the event the prime will perform all work with its in-house staff, that is NO subcontractors will be used at any level, provide this information in your narrative to document why the required information concerning subcontractors is not included in your proposal. Failure to provide the required information or an affirmative statement that the offeror shall perform all work itself without subcontractors will be considered a material defect rendering the proposal UNACCEPTABLE for this factor.**

All information outlined above in (1), (2), and (3) MUST be provided or the proposal will be considered UNACCEPTABLE. If information is not available in the submitted narratives, provide a reason for missing required information.

Factor 4, Past Performance:

Definitions

Past Performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror satisfied its customers' requirements in the past and complied with applicable laws and regulations.

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

- (6) For each project submitted under Factor 2; 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), Attachment 4, 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.
- (7) 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 (Section J), 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, LeeArjetta W. Hamilton, via email at leearjetta.hamilton@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.

- (8) Also include performance recognition documents received within the last (5) years such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.
- (9) 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), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.
- (10) 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: The degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g., PPIRS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source) reflect a trend of satisfactory performance considering:
- A pattern of successful completion of tasks;
 - A pattern of deliverables that are timely and of good quality;
 - A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc.);
 - Recency of tasks performed that are identical to, similar to, or related to the task at hand; and
 - A respect for stewardship of Government funds

Projects submitted by Joint Ventures, where the joint venture partnerships performed together (either as joint venture partners or in a prime-sub relationship), *may* be given more weight than projects submitted where the Joint Venture firms did not perform together.

In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance, the offeror may be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance. Rather, the offeror will receive an NR (No Rating).

(End of Summary of Changes)