

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 11
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 13-Jan-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY COMMANDER NAVFAC ATLANTIC NAVY CRANE CENTER NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD BLDG 491 PORTSMOUTH VA 23709-5000	CODE N62470	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. N62470-15-R-3000	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 28-Oct-2014	
			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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input 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>2</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.) SOLICITATION N62470-15-R-3000, 4-25 TON PORTAL CRANES, PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD & INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE FACILITY, BANGOR AND BREMERTON, WA This amendment is issued to extend the proposal due date to 11 February 2015 and revise the solicitation, Deliveries or Performance, Paragraph F.5 Periods of Performance, Evaluation Factors for Award, Paragraph 2, and clause 52.211-11 as shown on the continuation pages. 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 13-Jan-2015	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION SF 1449 - CONTINUATION SHEET

SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time has changed from 07-Jan-2015 02:00 PM to 11-Feb-2015 02:00 PM.

The following have been modified:

DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCEF.1 LOCATION

As identified in ATTACHMENT C-Specification N62470-15-R-3000, mobilization, delivery, and installation under this solicitation and resultant contract is onboard the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard & Intermediate Maintenance Facility, Naval Complex, Bremerton, Washington, and Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Naval Base Kitsap, Bangor, Washington.

F.2 CONTRACT TERM

The initial contract term of performance is for one year. The entire duration of the contract if all options are exercised is 4 years (48 months). There are three option periods with a twelve month period of performance.

F.3 CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE

Contractor's performance will be evaluated using the respective contractor performance evaluations report entry system location on the website <http://www.cpars.gov/>. Prior to commencement of work the contractor is required to provide the government with the name, phone number and e-mail address of the "Contractor's Representative" that will be responsible for receipt and review of draft performance evaluations prepared by the government in the appropriate system. It is the contractor's responsibility to keep this contract information current.

F.4 DATA REQUIREMENTS

Contract Data Requirements are identified as Exhibit A and the forms are provided in Attachment JF-1.

F.5 PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE

CRANE	LOCATION (PSNS & IMF, Naval Base Kitsap)	ANTICIPATED ORDERING PERIOD	ANTICIPATED PERFORMANCE PERIOD
53	Bangor, Washington	Base Year	36 months from date of delivery order award
54	Bangor, Washington	Option Year 1	24 months from date of delivery order award
51	Bremerton, Washington	Option Year 2	24 months from date of delivery order award

52	Bremerton, Washington	Option Year 3	12 months from date of delivery order award
----	-----------------------	---------------	--

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
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.

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

(a) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

- Factor 1 – Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm
- Factor 2 – Safety
- Factor 3 – Small Business Utilization
 - Subfactor 3.A. – Past Performance in Utilization of Small Business Concerns
 - Subfactor 3.B. – Small Business Participation
- Factor 4 – Past Performance on Recent, Relevant Projects

The distinction between experience and past performance is that experience pertains to the volume of work completed by a contractor that is comparable to the types of work described under the definition of recent, relevant

projects, 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. The relative order of importance of the non-price evaluation factors and subfactors is the technical factors (e.g. Factors, 1, 2, 3 and their respective subfactors) are of equal importance to each other respectively and, when combined are equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment factor (Factor 4). When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factors and past performance/performance confidence assessment factor combined (i.e., the non-price evaluation factors) are approximately equal to price.

The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-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-price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforms 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

(1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Submit one original price proposal with (2) copies. Submit one copy of the price proposal on CD. The price proposal must be separate from the non-price proposal and clearly labeled as price. The price proposal shall include the following:

- (a) Completed SF1449, Solicitation/Contract/Order for Commercial Items
- (b) Completed Price Schedule, Section B and Exhibit Line Items, with pricing for each crane, transportation, and crane removal in each period of performance. Exhibit Line Items shall be submitted in hard copy and Microsoft Excel format on the CD.
- (c) Bid Bond
- (d) Copy of Contractor Representations and Certification from the System for Award Management (SAM) website at www.sam.gov
- (e) The latest three year complete fiscal year financial statements, certified by an independent accounting firm, if available, or at least by an authorized officer of the organization. Submit evidence of availability of working/operating capital, which will be used for the performance of the resultant contract. For Joint Venture arrangements discuss the financial responsibilities among the companies.

(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 (i.e. the total of CLINS 0001 through 0004 and including their associated ELINS, Exhibits A through D, as described in 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 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."

(b) Non-price Factors:

(1) **Factor 1 Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm:**

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The offeror must comply with the following instructions and provide the following information.

Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The offeror shall provide a minimum of one (1) and a maximum of five (5) examples of recent and relevant contracts. The offeror shall clearly demonstrate recent and relevant experience of the firm on contracts similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements described in the Request for Proposal (RFP) completed within the last five (5) years preceding the release date of the solicitation. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as involving a crane with a 25 ton or greater main hoist, luffing boom hoist, rotating upper works, and onboard diesel engine. The projects presented should also demonstrate the ability to perform all of the following (all abilities are not anticipated to be demonstrated in every project): site survey/investigation, design, fabrication, rail survey, demolition/removal of existing cranes and equipment, runway/equipment electrification, assembly, crane installation, crane testing and operational training. It is the offeror's responsibility to choose projects which best demonstrate experience with the above noted abilities and reflect the offeror's ability to successfully accomplish the RFP requirements

Given the nature of the work required by this solicitation, it is anticipated that the Offeror may be Joint Venture, Partnership, LLC or other entity consisting of more than one entity. The Offeror may utilize recent, relevant experience of a subcontractor, partner, team or Joint Venture (JV) member that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate past performance required under this evaluation factor. Major aspects mean 10% or more of the dollar value of the work required by the solicitation. Any supporting agreements, including Joint Venture agreements, evidencing the relationship between two or more business entities (e.g. letters of intent, teaming agreements, etc.) shall be submitted with the proposal.

If the offeror is a Joint Venture recent and relevant experience should be submitted for contract completed by the Joint Venture entity. Contracts submitted by Joint Ventures, where the Joint Venture firms performed together (either as partners or in a prime-sub relationship) may be viewed more favorably than contracts submitted in which the Joint Venture firms did not perform together. If the Joint Venture does not have such experience, relevant experience shall be submitted for each Joint Venture partner. JV Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) recent and relevant contracts.

Contracts performed by the offeror as either a prime contractor or a Joint Venture may be considered more favorably than those submitted for evaluation performed by a subcontractor. If the offeror uses a proposed subcontractor(s) to demonstrate corporate experience, the offeror must: provide a letter of commitment from the subcontractor and the subcontractor's DUNS number if available; submit at least one (1) contract for the proposed subcontractor(s); and, demonstrate how the proposed subcontractor will use that corporate experience in the performance of the contract.

If the offeror uses affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33) to demonstrate recent, relevant experience the offeror shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will have meaningful involvement in the performance of this contract. Meaningful involvement is demonstrated when the proposal: 1) clearly states the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member company's specific commitment of technical resources (e.g. personnel, equipment) that will be provided or relied upon for contract performance; and 2) describes specific aspects of the project that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member company will self-perform or manage on behalf of the Offeror in performance of the contract.

Failure to submit letters of intent, teaming agreements (including Joint Venture agreements), meaningful involvement, or other evidence of commitment may result in the Government not evaluating the recent, relevant experience of the subcontractor, partner, team, or JV member.

For each contract the offeror shall complete the **Recent, Relevant Experience Questionnaire included as Attachment K**. All information shall be provided as requested on the form.

IMPORTANT: It is the offeror's responsibility to clearly explain and demonstrate to the Government how its work experience, and the experience of each teaming partner (if applicable) in each submitted contract is relevant to the contract requirements in this solicitation. If the offeror does not clearly explain how its experience(s) is/are relevant to the contract requirements in this specification, the Government may determine that the submitted contract experience is not relevant.

The Recent, Relevant Experience submittal shall be limited to no more than 15 pages, not including the Recent, Relevant Experience Questionnaire(s).

- (ii) **Basis of Evaluation:** The standard for Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm has been met when the offeror has demonstrated adequate experience in successfully performing contracts of similar size, scope and complexity to this requirement within the last five (5) years preceding the release date of the solicitation. The assessment of the offeror's recent and 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 review only five (5) contracts. Any projects submitted in excess of the five (5) contract limit will not be considered.

The write-up for each project should not exceed three (3) pages. On one additional page, identify all major subcontractors and their participation to complete the project. Suppliers of major fabricated components (such as girders, crane control systems) should also be included; however, material supplier information is not required. In addition to the written portion, a general arrangement drawing of the crane shall be included. If applicable, the project description should include a specific brief account of unusual crane complexities and unusual mobilization challenges such as low head room constraints, extreme height, facility remaining operational during crane install, and/or hazardous material abatement.

(ii) **Basis of Evaluation:** The Government will evaluate the offeror's capability in performing projects similar in size, scope and complexity to the RFP.

(2) **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.

(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.

(3) **Factor 3 Small Business Utilization:**

Factor 3 consists of two Subfactors, 3A, Past Performance in Utilizing Small Business Concerns, and 5B, Small Business Participation. The evaluation of Subfactors 3A and 3B are of equal importance to the determination of the Factor 3 Rating.

Definitions: "SB" as used herein, is intended to include Small Business concerns, Small Disadvantaged Business concerns (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business concerns (WOSB), Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business concerns (HUBZone), Veteran-Owned Small Business concerns (VOSB), and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business concerns (SDVOSB). All small business programs are self-certifying programs with the exception of HUBZone certifications, see HUBZone SB Certifications below. Small Business Program requirements and definitions may be found in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), Part 19.

HUBZone SB Certifications: Offerors are reminded that HUBZone SB concerns must obtain formal certification from the Small Business Administration (SBA) if they expect to receive the evaluation benefits associated with the HUBZone SB programs either as a prime or subcontractor(s). For more information on the HUBZone SB

certification requirements and available benefits, contact your local SBA representative. Certified HUBZone SB firms are listed on the Small Business Administration Dynamic Small Business Search (DSBS) website at http://dsbs.sba.gov/dsbs/search/dsp_dsbs.cfm. It is the responsibility of the prime contractor to periodically check the CCR as certifications are subject to change.

SUBFACTOR 3.A – PAST PERFORMANCE IN UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Proposals that do not include responses addressing ALL elements of the requirements stated below (a. through g.) must include an explanation why that element is not addressed.

- a. Provide performance evaluation ratings (i.e., SF1420, DD2626, or equivalent) obtained on the implementation of small business subcontracting plans for all of the offeror's contracts referenced under Factor 4, Past Performance. Recently completed project evaluations are desired. If more than five evaluation ratings are provided, only the first five will be considered. In addition, the Government may consider past performance information on other projects as made available to the Government from other sources (such as the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support Systems (CCASS)), Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support System (ACASS) and Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)).
- b. Provide small business subcontracting history. Large businesses with Federal prime contracting experience shall provide final or current Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts (SF294) or Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISR's) on prime (only) contracts submitted under Factor 4, Past Performance. If Factor 4-submitted contracts are not prime contracts, submit SF294s or ISRs for contracts of similar scope performed as the prime contractor. If goals were not met on any submitted contracts, an explanation for each unmet goal is required. Large Businesses with no documented SF294/ISR history shall submit a subcontracting history on Attachment (XX), Small Business Past Performance. If more than five (5) reports are provided, only the first 5 reports will be considered
- c. Small Business proposers shall provide a subcontracting history on Attachment D, Small Business Past Performance.
- d. If an Offeror is utilizing past performance information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the solicitation), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will have meaningful participation of all members in the management of the subcontracting program/plan by identifying the personnel or resources from the member companies that will be dedicated to managing the plan, and an organization chart which demonstrates the reporting chain within the membership.

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, Partnership LLC or other entity consisting of more than one entity, provide past performance information, elements a. through f., for each individual business entity(ies) that will be responsible for managing the subcontracting program/plan.

Proposals including information on any of the following additional elements may be rated higher, based on the evaluated extent to which the information addresses the basis of evaluation in paragraph (ii):

- a. Provide information on national-level, and industry-issued awards that offerors received for outstanding support to SB concerns within the past five (5) years. Include purpose, issuer, and date of award(s). National and industry-issued awards received beyond five (5) years will not be considered.
- b. Provide information on previous, existing, planned or pending mentor-protégé agreements (MPA) under any Federal Government, or other, program held within the last five years. Information should include, at a minimum, the members, objectives, period of performance, and major accomplishments during the MPA.

c. Provide information on past use of Community Rehabilitation Program (CRP) organizations certified under the AbilityOne Program by SourceAmerica, or the National Industry for the Blind (NIB). Information should include the contract type, type of work performed, period of performance, and number of employed severely handicapped persons.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The extent to which the proposal demonstrates the proposer's level of past performance in utilizing Small Business (SB) concerns, AbilityOne, Mentor-Protégé Agreements, and other socio-economic programs, as defined in FAR Parts 26.1 and 26.2, in subcontracting, and in meeting established Small Business subcontracting goals.

SUBFACTOR 3.B – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total acquisition, the extent of work you will perform as the prime contractor. If submitting an offer as a Joint-Venture, identify the percentage of work each member will be responsible for and indicate the size status of each member, e.g., LB, SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, etc.

If you are a Large Business, submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan for this project in the format provided in Attachment E for this factor, to include all information required in the attachment. If you are a Small Business, submit a subcontracting participation breakdown in the format provided in Attachment F for this factor. All proposers: To demonstrate commitment in using small business concerns, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan or subcontracting participation breakdown may list all subcontractors by name. If the proposed Small Business Subcontracting goals do not meet the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, include a detailed explanation describing the actions taken to arrive at that determination, along with an explanation for the goals that actually were proposed. For proposals submitted on design-build solicitations, the proposer must identify its designer/design team in its Subcontracting Plan or Small Business Participation Breakdown.

Firm commitments to subcontract to multiple companies: The Offeror may provide a demonstration of commitments in planned subcontracts by listing multiple names of companies that will be used to support specific small business category (i.e., SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB and SDVOSB).

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The following will be evaluated on all proposals:

a. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates maximum practicable participation of SBs in terms of the total value of the acquisition, including options.

b. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a commitment to use SB concerns that are specifically identified in the proposal, including but not limited to use of mentor protégé programs.

c. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates SB participation in a variety of industries expected during the performance of work.

d. The realism of the proposal to meet the proposed goals.

a. The extent to which the proposal provides Small Business Subcontracting goals that meet or exceed the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, and utilization of AbilityOne CRP organizations. Proposals that provide goals exceeding the NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets may be rated higher. The proposed goals and NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are expressed as a percentage of total subcontracted values. The minimum NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are as follows:

	FY 2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018
SB	66.80%	66.94%	67.07%	67.20%
SDB	17.27%	17.44%	17.62%	17.79%
WOSB	15.30%	15.45%	15.61%	15.77%
HUBZone	8.94%	9.03%	9.12%	9.21%
VOSB	3.03%	3.06%	3.09%	3.12%
SDVOSB	3.03%	3.06%	3.09%	3.12%

Attachment E – Small Business Past Performance

Attachment F – Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

Attachment G – Small Business Offeror Small Business Participation Breakdown

(4) **Factor 4 Past Performance:**

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: IF A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION IS AVAILABLE FOR THOSE PROJECTS THE OFFEROR INCLUDES IN ITS PROPOSAL FOR FACTOR 1, RECENT, RELEVANT EXPERIENCE, 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 relevant project included in its proposal for Factor 1, Recent, Relevant 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 shall complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ (provided as an attachment) 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, Barbara Spruill, via email at barbara.t.spruill@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.

The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification and additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the reference's unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 1 – Recent, Relevant Experience and may address any adverse performance issues

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.

Offerors lacking relevant past performance history or whose history is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance and will receive an Unknown Confidence rating. For this evaluation, less than two relevant projects to evaluate is considered too sparse a performance record to reasonably assign a confidence assessment rating and will be rated as unknown confidence.

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

(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”

52.211-11 LIQUIDATED DAMAGES--SUPPLIES, SERVICES, OR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (SEP 2000)

(a) If the Contractor fails to deliver the supplies or perform the services within the time specified in this contract, the Contractor shall, in place of actual damages, pay to the Government liquidated damages of \$1,400 for each calendar day of delay.

(b) If the Government terminates this contract in whole or in part under the Default--Fixed-Price Supply and Service clause, the Contractor is liable for liquidated damages accruing until the Government reasonably obtains delivery or performance of similar supplies or services. These liquidated damages are in addition to excess costs of repurchase under the Termination clause.

(c) The Contractor will not be charged with liquidated damages when the delay in delivery or performance is beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the Contractor as defined in the Default--Fixed-Price Supply and Service clause in this contract.

(End of clause)

(End of Summary of Changes)