

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1   11
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0005	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 30-Jun-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. ACQR3903260		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC MID ATLANTIC 9324 VIRGINIA AVENUE NORFOLK VA 23511-3095	CODE N40085	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) <b>See Item 6</b>		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N40085-16-R-2216	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 03-Jun-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>3</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.)				
Grounds Maintenance and Landscaping Services at Norfolk Naval Shipyard (NNSY), Portsmouth, Virginia and Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia.  This amendment is issued to incorporate the site visit log -in sheet. And, also to incorporate revisions to Section L - Content of Proposals, and Section M.2 - Evaluation Factors.  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	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		30-Jun-2016

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

## SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

**5252.215-9300 CONTENT OF PROPOSALS (JAN 2003)**

(a) The technical non-cost and the price/cost proposal shall be submitted in separate volumes. The non-cost proposal shall not contain any cost/pricing information, except for salary information provided on resumes. The non-cost proposal presented by the offeror to whom the award is made will be incorporated into the contract at time of award.

(b) Offeror shall submit the following information:

(1) Four (4) completed signed solicitation packages (SF 33 and Amendments, if applicable), including executed representations and certifications (SAM), and cost/prices in Section B and any accompanying exhibits

A-H.

(2) Four (4) copy of the technical proposal.

(3) Confirm submission of the most recent Vets 4212 Report.

(4) Provide current financial statements and data, including financial institution, point of contract and phone number.

(c) **NON-COST ROPOSAL.** Each technical proposal shall be precise, detailed, and complete as to clearly and fully demonstrate a thorough knowledge and understanding of the requirements. At a minimum, the proposal must contain sufficient detail so that it may be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation factors provision, Section M.

The non-cost proposal shall be in 8-1/2 x 11 format, font size 12 Time New Roman, limited to 75 pages, inclusive of all charts, resumes, forms and other documentation responsive to the solicitation requirements. Cost/Price proposals are not part of the 75 page limitation. The non-cost proposal shall be submitted in three-ring binders, with a cover page including name of prime contractor, DUNS and CAGE numbers for prime, address, phone, email and fax numbers, contract number and point of contact. The offeror shall outline the general plan of work and methods to be employed, describing each work task at the level necessary to convey a complete understanding of the proposed approach to the reviewer. Accordingly, the offeror shall provide a narrative description that addresses each of the following factors:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach /Management

Factor 2 – Corporate Experience

Factor 3 – Safety

Factor 4 – Past Performance

NOTE: 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.

**Factor 1, Technical Approach/Management:**

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The offeror shall submit a narrative response that clearly demonstrates its understanding of and approach to accomplishing the complexity and magnitude of service requirements set forth in the performance objectives and standards of the Performance Work Statement. Each of the topics below must be included in the narrative and tabbed in the technical proposal and discussed separately.

a. Phase-In Transition Plan. Describe what you will do to “start-up” for performance of this contract. The phase-in transition period is 30 days as per F.2 of the RFP. Include a schedule of key events from contract award until contract commencement; personnel actions and responsibilities of key personnel.

b. Workforce Management. Provide the following: (1) describe the lines of management authority, supervision, span of control and accountability, including the relationship between overall management (corporate and on-site), administration, and subcontractors. (2) provide an Organization chart of your proposed organization and workforce project management plan. (3) describe your plan to manage the priorities at both sites.

c. Quality Management. Provide a one page summary of your “Quality Management System” that will be used to ensure full compliance with all performance objectives and standards as described in (0200000 – Management and Administration).

**Factor 2, Corporate Experience:**

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a minimum of one (1) up to a maximum of five (5) projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the work requirements specified in the RFP. Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be ongoing or have been completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

The attached Corporate Experience Form (Section J) 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 and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP as described above.

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 shall be submitted for each Joint Venture partner. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract.

The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The offeror will not be found acceptable on the basis of the proposed subcontractor's experience only.

### **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 2013, 2014 and 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. 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 2013, 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. 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.

### **Factor 4, Past Performance:**

(i) See Solicitation Submittal Requirements below:

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 (insert applicable factor number, usually Factor 1, and insert factor title, usually Corporate Experience). 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 (Section J), which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely

submission of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Susan Roberts, via email at susan.roberts2@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.

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

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 (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), 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 in Section J.***

**Price:**

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Offerors shall submit an original and one copy of the price proposal in a separate three ring binder. Each price proposal shall contain Exhibits A through E and Section B (CLINs 0001 through 0010). Also included in the binders should be the signed SF33, amendments, and executed representations and certifications (SAM). Confirm submission of the most recent Vets 4212 Report and provide current financial statements and data, including financial institution. 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.

(ii) Offerors are solicited on an "all or none" basis and FAR 52.215-1, INSTRUCTION TO OFFEROR – COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION" in Section L, is hereby modified. Failure to submit offers for all line items shall be cause for rejection of the offeror.

**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

The following have been modified:

BASIS FOR AWARD**M.1 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 lowest priced, technically acceptable offer.

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 proposal with the lowest evaluated price.

**In order to permit efficient competition, the Navy will utilize the following methodology: Proposals will initially be screened for price and placed in order of price (lowest priced to highest price). The Navy will then evaluate the technical factors of the three (3) lowest priced proposals. The Navy will make award to the lowest priced technically acceptable proposal from among the three (3) lowest priced proposals. However, if no proposals are found to be technically acceptable within the first group of proposals, the Navy, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to increase the number of proposals it will review, until the Government identifies a technically acceptable proposal. Accordingly, under this methodology, the technical factors of some proposals may not be evaluated by the Navy. If discussions are deemed necessary by the Contracting Officer, all proposals will be evaluated (both technical and price) for the purpose of establishing a competitive range.**

**NOTE: Offerors MUST be evaluated as technically ACCEPTABLE under factors 1, 2, 3 and 4 in order to be considered technically acceptable overall.**

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.

## M.2 Evaluation Factors

- a. Technical Evaluation Factors 1 through 4 are listed below:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach/Management

Factor 2 – Corporate Experience

Factor 3 – Safety

Factor 4 – Past Performance

### **Factor 1, Technical Approach/Management:**

- (i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The offeror shall submit a narrative response that clearly demonstrates its understanding of and approach to accomplishing the complexity and magnitude of service requirements set forth in the performance objectives and standards of the Performance Work Statement. Each of the topics below must be included in the narrative and tabbed in the technical proposal and discussed separately.
- a. Phase-In Transition Plan. Describe what you will do to “start-up” for performance of this contract. The phase-in transition period is 30 days as per F.2 of the RFP. Include a schedule of key events from contract award until contract commencement; personnel actions and responsibilities of key personnel.
- b. Workforce Management. Provide the following: (1) describe the lines of management authority, supervision, span of control and accountability, including the relationship between overall management (corporate and on-site), administration, and subcontractors. (2) provide an Organization chart of your proposed organization and workforce project management plan. (3) describe your plan to manage priorities at both sites.
- c. Quality Management. Provide a one page summary of your “Quality Management System” that will be used to ensure full compliance with all performance objectives and standards as described in (0200000 – Management and Administration).
- (ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Technical Approach/Management factor shall be evaluated based upon the following criteria:

- (a) The proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the performance objectives and standards.
- (b) The proposal provides a feasible technical approach with the capability to, at least, meet solicitation performance objectives and standards.
- (c) The proposal offers a low to moderate performance risk to the Government.

### **Factor 2, Corporate Experience:**

- (i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a minimum of one (1) up to a maximum of five (5) projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the work requirements specified in the RFP. Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be ongoing or have been completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

The attached Corporate Experience Form (Section J) 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 and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP as described above.

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 shall be submitted for each Joint Venture partner. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract.

The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The offeror will not be found acceptable on the basis of the proposed subcontractor's experience only.

- (ii) Basis of Evaluation: The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The Government will only review five projects. Any projects submitted in excess of the five (5) for Experience will not be considered.

### **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 2013, 2014 and 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. 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 2013, 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. 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.

- (ii) Basis of Evaluation: The following will be used as a guide in rating the overall acceptability of each proposal:

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 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.

**Factor 4, Past Performance:**

(i) See Solicitation Submittal Requirements Below:

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 (insert applicable factor number, usually Factor 1, and insert factor title, usually Corporate Experience). 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 (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, Susan Roberts, via email at [susan.roberts2@navy.mil](mailto:susan.roberts2@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.

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. 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.

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 in Section J.***

(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

**Price:**

- (1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Offerors shall submit an original and one copy of the price proposal in a separate three ring binder. Each price proposal shall contain Exhibits A through E and Section B (CLINs 0001 through 0010). Also included in the binders should be the signed SF33, amendments, and executed representations and certifications (SAM). Confirm submission of the most recent Vets 4212 Report and provide current financial statements and data, including financial institution. 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.
- (2) 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.
  - (iv) Comparison of market survey results.

Proposals will be evaluated for completeness and reasonableness as follows:

- (1) Completeness. All pricing information required by the solicitation has been provided, all mathematic computations are correct and the pricing application understood, prices are on an “all or none” basis, and failure to submit a price on an item or a number of items may cause this factor and the entire offer to be determined unacceptable.
- (2) Reasonableness. Price analysis comparisons indicate the offered price to be fair and reasonable, balanced across option years, and balanced between fixed-price and IDIQ items.

Unreasonable, unbalanced or incomplete pricing may cause a proposal to be determined unacceptable.

(End of Summary of Changes)