

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 13
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 25-May-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY COMMANDER NAVFAC ATLANTIC 6506 HAMPTON BLVD NORFOLK VA 23508-1278	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. N62470-16-R-6004	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 08-Apr-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 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 _____ 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.) N62470 16 R 6004 CONSTRUCT FUELS STORAGE 1. Provide responses to PPIs 7 – 59 2. Provide revised Bid Schedule 3. Revise Section 00100 – Bidding Schedule/Instructions to Bidder, Section 6 Evaluation Factors for Award, Factor 1 – Corporate Experience				
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 25-May-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 0003

Amendment 0003 is being issued for the following:

1. Provide responses to PPIs 7 – 59
2. Provide revised Bid Schedule
3. Revise Section 00100 – Bidding Schedule/Instructions to Bidder, Section 6 Evaluation Factors for Award, Factor 1 – Corporate Experience

Provide Responses to PPI's 7 - 59

- 7) INQUIRY: Specification section 00 73 04 Paragraph 1.13 h states “under the US-Djibouti Access Agreement, Article V, a copy of which is located at the end of this section.” There was no agreement attached at the end of this specifications section. Please provide us a copy of this agreement.

RESPONSE: Specification section 00 73 04 has been amended. All language referring to the agreement has been removed.

- 8) INQUIRY: This project has PCCP paving requirements and we don't see any specification section that covers this scope of work. Please tell us where the PCCP paving for this project is specified in the specifications.

RESPONSE: Provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings

- 9) INQUIRY: Would you extend the date to 15 April 2016 for us to submit Attachments A, B, and C? We have been vigilant in monitoring fbo and discovered the solicitation release on Monday, 11 April vice 8 April 2016 as recorded on the SF1442. We are consulting with our USA partners and will need additional time.

RESPONSE: A time extension for the site visit is not being offered.

- 10) INQUIRY: Page 8 of 43, Special Joint Venture (JV) Requirements states that the JV agreement “shall be furnished . . . in its original language version along with a certified English translation of the notarized JV.” If the original language is, in fact, in English, please confirm that a certified English translation copy of the notarized JV is not additionally necessary.

RESPONSE: If the original language of the notarized legal document that establishes the JV is in English then a certified English translation is not additionally necessary.

- 11) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. S-101; please provide the thickness of the top slab of the pump house tank.

RESPONSE: Sheet S-407, Detail A1 - 500mm thickness for top slab of tank/floor of pumphouse.

- 12) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. S-101; please provide the height of the pump house building.
RESPONSE: Sheet A-301, Section C4 - 3400mm top of wall height above top of slab/floor of pumphouse.
- 13) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. S-409 and S-415; the expansion joints (EJ) are shown on the drawings while the control joints are not, so please provide the drawings which show the locations of the control joints.
RESPONSE: All joints shown are control joints unless otherwise noted by expansion joint callout. See notes on both plans.
- 14) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. A-601; the dimensions of the four doors of the Pump House 5 & 6 building in the Door Schedule is 914x2133x44 mm, however Drawing no. A-201 is showing one door is 914x2133x44 mm on Elevation A2 and another door is 1828x2133x44 mm on Elevation B2, so please clarify.
RESPONSE: On sheet A-601 Door Schedule, door P101.1 is indicated as pair of 914 x 2133 doors. Pair indicates that there are two doors of this size. Note that this is also typical for other doors indicated as "pair" elsewhere on the Door Schedule.
- 15) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawings no. E-601, E-103 & E-409, we cannot locate "Service Entrance ATS 150A"; accordingly, please provide a drawing which shows the location of Service Entrance ATS 150A.
RESPONSE: Provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 16) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. E-601; please clarify/provide the NEMA Enclosure type for the Service Entrance ATS 150A.
RESPONSE: NEMA 4X Stainless Steel. Provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 17) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawings no. E-601 & E-103, please clarify/provide the rating of the Service Entrance MTS considering that Note 3 in Drawing no. E-103 is stating 800A, while Drawing no. E-601 is showing 1000A.
RESPONSE: 1000A is correct. Provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 18) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. E-503 & items 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7 of Section 33 71 02 in Volume 2 of the Specifications; please clarify/provide the MV Cable rating for the Cable Splices considering that Detail A1 of Drawing E-503 is stating 25KV, while item 2.5.1 in Section 33 71 02 is showing a cable rating of 15KV.
RESPONSE: E-503 should read 15kV. Provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 19) INQUIRY: Reference to Drawing no. E-503 & items 2.1.4 and 2.2 of Section 26 13 00 in Volume 2 of the Specifications; please clarify/provide the MV Cable rating for the Cable Bushings & Elbows considering that Detail C3 of Drawing no. E-503 is stating 25KV, while item 2.1.4 of Section 26 13 00 is showing a cable rating of 15KV.
RESPONSE: E-503 should read 15kV. Provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 20) INQUIRY: Reference to items 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 of Section 26 12 19.10 in Volume 2 of the Specifications; please clarify/confirm the Transformers required Hertz (50Hz or 60Hz).
RESPONSE: The required Hertz for the transformer is 50Hz.

- 21) INQUIRY: You are kindly requested to provide the drawing of the existing Ground Level.
- RESPONSE: The existing Ground Level can be determined from the profile views on sheets C-201 through C-204, and Grading Plan sheets C-115 through C-118..
- 22) INQUIRY: Please clarify the basis of design for the required Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) Package, and specifically provide the model & series of the desired furniture.
- RESPONSE: The FF&E package is provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 23) INQUIRY: In case there is no basis for the design of the required for the Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) Package, please clarify: what product line is considered the minimally acceptable quality standard.
- RESPONSE: The FF&E package is provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 24) INQUIRY: Our experience based on UFCs and NFPA shows that fire suppression systems in buildings containing high amount of JP-8 or other combustible liquids, wet type water based sprinkler systems are not sufficient. Water goes low below burning liquid and fire continues. Contract documents define Hazard Classification 2 which only increases the water density and remote area of hydraulic calculation. To prepare our offer we would like get a final confirmation that these two buildings (Filter Building and Ops Building) will only be protected by a wet pipe water based system. (Otherwise a foam or alternative system will require some additional items to be added to the project.)
- RESPONSE: The design as shown on the drawings with a sprinkler system is provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings
- 25) INQUIRY: We also would like to underline that given pressure on the contract drawings for hydrant test are not "to the point" data for both buildings as code based hydrant test require two closest hydrants to both building separately. Flowrate seems quite sufficient based on our experiences, but 4 bar (58 PSI) residual pressure is critical (but sufficient), but if any significant pressure drops serving the zones occurs, on site problems may be faced in future.
- RESPONSE: Your calculations should include all pipe to the point of the water flow test results. We do not anticipate any significant water supply degradation.
- 26) INQUIRY: Site plan indicates that the distance from the Operations Building is about 8m standoff from parking and 14.5m standoff from the road. Using weight 2 a controlled perimeter would give a blast impulse of 107 psi-msec for 8 m standoff which will be much more greater than 41.1 psi-msec mentioned in the specs. Would you please clarify the required blast level?
- RESPONSE: Spec section 08 11 16 paragraph 1.2.3.3 describes a standard performance test that is acceptable to the Government in lieu of Computational and Dynamic Design Analysis described in the preceding paragraphs. Government spec notes indicate that this information is not changed to suit actual conditions. As this test is a real-world test of actual units, it has been designed to cover scenarios typical for buildings which meet the setback limits and these pressures are not changed. Note that this pressure is not to be used for Computational or Dynamic Design Analysis. Note that this is applicable to spec section 08 51 13 as well. Also note that both of these sections have been edited to remove "Computational Design Analysis Method."
- 27) INQUIRY: In the price proposal form, in "FF&E – Procurement and Installation (Item 0003)" section, reference for FF&E Package is given as DESIGN, PROCUREMENT AND INSTALLATION OF FURNITURE, FIXTURES AND EQUIPMENT in Administrative Requirements 01 30 01.2.1. Whereas, we couldn't find such section in the RFP documents. Please advise.

RESPONSE: See amended specification SECTION 01 30 01.00 20 DESIGN, PROCUREMENT, AND INSTALLATION OF FURNITURE, FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT

- 28) INQUIRY: Drawing E-602 shows the Typical Motor Start Circuit and calls for a 460-120V or 208-120V control transformer. The mechanical drawings, sheet M-602 calls for the pump motors to be 380 volt. Can you confirm the voltage of the motor and the voltage of the control transformer and space heaters?

RESPONSE: The circuit has been changed to 380V-120V as part of Amendment 1. Controls shall operate at 120V for compatibility with the controls in the existing fuel farm.

- 29) INQUIRY: Drawing M-602 shows the pump schedule and has a TDH for FP-501, 502, 503, 601, 602 and 603 as 163.4 meters. The TDH for pumps WSP-501, WSP-601 and P-707 is not shown. This information is required to properly size the pumps. Please provide the required TDH for pumps WSP-501, SP-601 and P-707

RESPONSE: Pump sizes have been incorporated in the drawings by amendment.

- 30) INQUIRY: Please advise if we have liberty to send the bid specification documents to our supplier for quotation.

RESPONSE: You have the liberty to send the bid specification documents to your supplier for quotation.

- 31) INQUIRY: There are 4 tents just inside the west extent of the project area as drawn on G-004. Please confirm these tents will be removed by the government before the start of construction.

RESPONSE: These tents are to remain and should be outside the site footprint. As can be seen on CD101, the limits of demolition to the north of the existing base roadway stop at the demolished fence that runs north and south.

- 32) INQUIRY: There are 2 gazebo structures currently on the site but not shown to be demolished. Please confirm if demo of these structures will be part of the contract.

RESPONSE: These gazebos are not included in the demolition of the project.

- 33) INQUIRY: Per note on CD101 "F Block CLUs and associated site features were removed by others. See electrical demo for power and comm demo." Please provide electrical & comm demo plans.

RESPONSE: Electrical and comm demo in this area are outside of the contract. The callout on CD101 has been removed as part of the Amended specs and drawings

- 34) INQUIRY: There is a dual security camera pole on the site site but not shown on CD101. Please provide electrical & comm demo plans to clarify if this pole is to be removed/relocated by USG or contractor.

RESPONSE: The security camera will be removed and relocated by base security. The pole lighting removal/relocation is not part of this contract.

- 35) INQUIRY: Per note on CD101 "Demolish and remove/relocate existing airfield fence and foundation." Please clarify if pole lighting will be removed/relocated with the fence.

RESPONSE: The lighting poles and lighting will remain in place.

- 36) INQUIRY: EMH 24A is shown to intercept the existing duct bank with active conductor. Is the existing ductbank concrete encased? If not, will the contractor be required to excavate around it and concrete encase the existing ductbank up to existing EMH-024 or existing EMH-023?

RESPONSE: Contractor should assume that the ductbank is concrete encased.

- 37) INQUIRY: New ductbank is shown from EMH-24A to run northwest on top of an existing ductbank. Is the intent to demo and replace the existing ductbank or to build additional ductbank next to the existing one?

RESPONSE: Ductbank information has been updated as part of Amended Specs and Drawings

- 38) INQUIRY: There are no existing grades called out on the drawings (Sheets C-115 thru C-118). Existing contour line are shown but no grades are designated. Please provide existing grades.

RESPONSE: The existing contour labels have been turned on and included as part of Amended Specs and Drawings

- 39) INQUIRY: Could you please clarify that Bank Letter of guarantee, in the amount of %10 of the contract amount, is required/sufficient for the performance guarantee?

RESPONSE: Per Section 7, page 14 - 16 in lieu of a performance and payment bond, offerors may provide a 10% Performance Guarantee from a properly certified banking institution of the contract price that meets the requirements established by the solicitation.

- 40) INQUIRY: We will be more than happy if you can extend the proposal due date min 7 days in order to provide USG more effective proposal. Please advise.

RESPONSE: Per Amendment 0002 proposal submission has been extended to 13 June 2016.

- 41) INQUIRY: Please confirm that USG standarts (UL/FM listed materials, USG specifications and etc) will be used for all applications, materails and all related works .

RESPONSE: Yes, USG standards will be used for all applications, materials, and all related works as established by the solicitation.

- 42) INQUIRY: As shown on S 407 A1 detail; Typical Wall reinforcement comment has been noted. Please can you clarify " typical Wall reinforcement detail"

RESPONSE: Typical Wall Reinf refers to the already called out reinf on the same sheet. #16 AT 200 OC EACH FACE vertical and #16 AT 300 OC EACH FACE horizontal.

- 43) INQUIRY: As shown on S 407 A1 detail ; the Project protection board will be used. Please can you clarify what is the protection board's material?

RESPONSE: Refer to Specification Section 07 12 00

- 44) INQUIRY: In structural Project in different locations water proofing membrane has been used, please can you clarify technical details of the membrane?

RESPONSE: Refer to Spec Section 07 12 00.

- 45) INQUIRY: For steel structures, would you please clarify if we will make the new design? Design criteria is given on the subject paper.(operation and filter building

RESPONSE: Yes. Refer to Specification SECTION 13 34 19 METAL BUILDING SYSTEMS

- 46) INQUIRY: Tank steel column details were given at structural projects. Would you please clarify are there any beam in tank and if possible would you please send us structural beam details, too

RESPONSE: Refer to Specification SECTION 33 56 13.13 CUT AND COVER FUEL STORAGE TANKS

- 47) INQUIRY: A 102 section A1 it has been shown that 80 mm rigid insulation will be used. In technical perspective it is not detailed enough to understand the application, could you please give more detail or a typical detail drawings?

RESPONSE: This insulation is the roof insulation and is specified in spec section 07 22 00

- 48) INQUIRY: A 204 typical stucco control joint detail c5 has been shown .Please can you clarify "secure lath through insulation and into conic Wall or to ICF fastening strip details

RESPONSE: As the exterior face of the insulated concrete form (ICF) wall will be foam board insulation, the intention of this note is to indicate that the lath must be attached to either through the insulation and to the concrete wall or the plastic or metal through-connectors/ties which many ICF manufacturer's cast into their product for attachment of finishes such as this. These are often located in the layer of board insulation.

- 49) INQUIRY: Are the elevations given on architectural drawings suitable with real ground elevations?

RESPONSE: The elevations given on architectural drawings are all relative to the Finish Floor of that building which is indicated at 0.00 for each. The actual finish floor elevation relative to the site can be found on the civil drawings. For the Operations Building and Filter Building, see sheet C-118. As the Pumphouses are constructed on top of the tanks, their finished floor can be determined from the structural drawings. Reference sheet S-407.

- 50) INQUIRY: C 105 it has been noted that bituminous concrete will be used. Can you clarify is it bituminous concrete or bituminous asphalt? If it is bituminous concrete, is it a material we can find in local conditions?

RESPONSE: Bituminous concrete pavement is the same as asphalt.

- 51) INQUIRY: Kindly request your verification which standard we should follow for exproof conduits and cabling installations?

RESPONSE: The explosionproof conduit requirements are described on the Hazardous Area plans starting on sheet E-704.

- 52) INQUIRY: Drawing E-602 shows the Typical Motor Start Circuit and calls for a 460-120V or 208-120V control transformer. The mechanical drawings, sheet M-602 calls for the pump motors to be 380 volt. Can you confirm the voltage of the motor and the voltage of the control transformer and space heaters?

RESPONSE: The circuit has been changed to 380V-120V as part of Amendment 1. Controls shall operate at 120V for compatibility with the controls in the existing fuel farm.

- 53) INQUIRY: Drawing M-602 shows the pump schedule and has a TDH for FP-501, 502, 503, 601, 602 and 603 as 163.4 meters. The TDH for pumps WSP-501, WSP-601 and P-707 is not shown. This information is required to properly size the pumps. Please provide the required TDH for pumps WSP-501, SP-601 and P-707

RESPONSE: Pump sizes have been incorporated in the drawings provided as part of Amended Specs and Drawings

- 54) INQUIRY: Paragraph 2.4.2.1 calls for the valves at the "...four valve manifold in the pumproom..." to be provided with limit switches. If this paragraph is intended to refer to the four valve manifold in the filter

building, these limit switches are not shown on the electrical or the mechanical instrumentation drawings. Are limit switches required on the four valve manifold in the filter building?

RESPONSE: Limit switches are not required at the 4-valve manifold.

- 55) INQUIRY: Drawing E406 shows three alarm horns and strobes but spec 33 09 55 2.1.15 reads alarm horn (vibrating) and siren (resonating) along with Critical and Non-Critical sequence (3.1.12). Clarify if strobes are required instead of sirens.

RESPONSE: Resonating horns are required. Strobes are not required.

- 56) INQUIRY: PRT Leak sensor conduit not shown on E-411 Detail C4

RESPONSE: Conduit C707-04 shown in detail C4 is for the leak sensor.

- 57) INQUIRY: No communication pathway shown from the pump control panel to FCC computer and no location shown for FCC computer. In fact it does not appear on Control System Block Diagram MI606.

RESPONSE: The FCC Computer is shown on MI606 Control System Block Diagram, indicated as "Personal Computer (PC) with Monitor". This computer is in the Operations Building and communicates with the Personal Computer in the Control Room via dedicated Fiber Optic Connection.

- 58) INQUIRY: Page 8 of 43, Special Joint Venture (JV) Requirements, states that the Joint Venture Agreement must include, inter alia, a statement under oath stating that the Joint Venture (JV) is in compliance at the time of proposal submission with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations. This statement must be signed under oath by all members comprising the Joint Venture." Please advise as to the following:
a. That the Joint Venture Agreement must be in compliance at the time of proposal submission with all the applicable laws, rules and regulations in the jurisdiction in which it was formed and/or created.
b. That a Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury suffices for a statement under oath.

RESPONSE: A JV must meet all of the documentation requirements in the solicitation.

- 59) INQUIRY: Section 00100 Bidding Schedule/Instructions to Bidders, 4. Inquiries, Proposal Formal and Due Date, at page eight 8 of 43, includes special Joint Venture (JV) requirements. For a Limited Liability Company for which there is a Certificate of Formation issued by a Secretary of State, please advise whether the Certificate of Formation issued by a Secretary of State, already in the English language, and bearing the Seal of the Secretary of State, eliminates the further need for a notarized legal document establishing the Limited Liability Company.

RESPONSE: A JV must meet all of the documentation requirements in the solicitation.

Revise Section 00100 – Bidding Schedule/Instructions to Bidder, Section 6 Evaluation Factors for Award, Factor 1 – Corporate Experience

FROM:

Factor 1 – Corporate Experience:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a maximum of five (5) and a minimum of two (2) construction projects that best demonstrate experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be completed within the past ten (10) years from the date of issuance of this RFP. The contracts may have been completed for the U.S. Government or other clients. To ensure a project is considered "complete," the documentation should demonstrate delivery of a final deliverable to the client.

For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is defined as demonstrating at least one of the following elements:

Similar in scope by providing for the construction of

- a. Aviation fuel cut and cover operating tank, minimum 7,500 BPL.
- b. Aviation fuel pump house, minimum 35 L/S.
- c. Aviation fuel filters building.

Offerors that demonstrate experience in multiple elements ((a)-(c) listed above) may be considered more favorably.

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole should not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors should submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment F) 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) 8-1/2" X 11" page size. DUNS numbers for the entity that performed the project shall be noted for the construction projects.

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. Failure to do so may result in a project being found non-relevant.

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 experience, projects shall be submitted for the Joint Venture partners. Projects are not required from each member of a joint venture; however, joint ventures offering relevant experience from all members may be considered more favorably. If a submitted project was performed by a JV, and not all partners from that JV are on the JV proposed for this contract, the Offeror shall specifically address what portion of the work was performed by the JV partner(s) offering on this contract. 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 SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract for the experience information of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies to be

considered. The proposal shall state specific commitments of technical resources (e.g. personnel, equipment) that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will commit to the performance of this contract. In particular, the proposal will clearly state the specific commitments of resources of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member that will be located at the worksites and company offices in the city/area of the project. The proposal shall also describe specific roles of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies in terms of the work it will either self-perform or manage on behalf of the Offeror in performance of the contract.

The Offeror must submit a minimum of two (2) relevant projects in the role of a Prime Contractor.

The Offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate construction experience under this evaluation factor. The Offeror must provide a signed letter of commitment from the subcontractor and an explanation of the meaningful involvement that the subcontractor will have in performance of this contract. Substitution of subcontractor(s) shall be avoided to the maximum extent possible, and any proposed substitutions shall have verifiable, equivalent experience to the subcontractor being replaced.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant construction 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 Construction Experience will not be considered.

Offerors must demonstrate experience with a minimum of two (2) relevant projects. Offerors who demonstrate experience with three (3) or four (4) relevant projects will be considered more favorably than offerors who demonstrate less than three (3) relevant projects. Offerors who demonstrate experience with five (5) relevant projects will be considered more favorable than offerors who demonstrate less than five (5) relevant projects.

Offerors that demonstrate experience with relevant projects contracted with the United States Government may be considered more favorably than offerors who do not demonstrate this experience.

Offerors that demonstrate experience with relevant projects located in Africa may be considered more favorably than offerors who do not demonstrate this experience.

Offerors that demonstrate experience with relevant projects that obtained a Sustainable Certification by the U.S. Green Building Council or equivalent organization may be considered more favorably than offerors who do not demonstrate this experience.

Offerors that demonstrate experience in multiple elements of relevancy ((a)-(c) listed above) may be considered more favorably than Offerors who demonstrate experience in fewer elements of relevancy.

Offerors that demonstrate experience in the role of a Prime Contractor with a relevant project will be considered more favorably than offerors who demonstrate experience in the role of a Sub-Contractor with a relevant project.

TO:

Factor 1 – Corporate Experience:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a maximum of five (5) and a minimum of two (2) construction projects that best demonstrate experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be completed within the past ten (10) years from the date of issuance of this RFP. The contracts may have been completed for the U.S. Government or other clients. To ensure a project is considered “complete,” the documentation should demonstrate delivery of a final deliverable to the client.

For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is defined as demonstrating at least one of the following elements:

Similar in scope by providing for the construction of

- a. Aviation fuel cut and cover operating tank, minimum 7,500 BPL.
- b. Aviation fuel pump house, minimum 35 L/S.
- c. Aviation fuel filters building.

~~Offerors that demonstrate experience in multiple elements ((a) (c) listed above) may be considered more favorably.~~

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole should not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors should submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment F) 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) 8-1/2” X 11” page size. DUNS numbers for the entity that performed the project shall be noted for the construction projects.

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. Failure to do so may result in a project being found non-relevant.

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 experience, projects shall be submitted for the Joint Venture partners. Projects are not required from each member of a joint venture; however, joint ventures offering relevant experience from all members may be considered more favorably. If a submitted project was performed by a JV, and not all partners from that JV are on the JV proposed for this contract, the Offeror shall specifically address what portion of the work was performed by the JV partner(s) offering on this contract. 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 SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract for the experience information of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies to be considered. The proposal shall state specific commitments of technical resources (e.g. personnel, equipment) that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will commit to the performance of this contract. In particular, the proposal will clearly state the specific commitments of resources of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member that will be located at the worksites and company offices in the city/area of the project. The proposal shall also describe specific roles of the affiliate/subsidiary/ parent/LLC/LTD

member companies in terms of the work it will either self-perform or manage on behalf of the Offeror in performance of the contract.

The Offeror must submit a minimum of two (2) relevant projects in the role of a Prime Contractor.

The Offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate construction experience under this evaluation factor. The Offeror must provide a signed letter of commitment from the subcontractor and an explanation of the meaningful involvement that the subcontractor will have in performance of this contract. Substitution of subcontractor(s) shall be avoided to the maximum extent possible, and any proposed substitutions shall have verifiable, equivalent experience to the subcontractor being replaced.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant construction 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 Construction Experience will not be considered.

~~Offerors must demonstrate experience with a minimum of two (2) relevant projects. Offerors who demonstrate experience with three (3) or four (4) relevant projects will be considered more favorably than offerors who demonstrate less than three (3) relevant projects. Offerors who demonstrate experience with five (5) relevant projects will be considered more favorable than offerors who demonstrate less than five (5) relevant projects.~~

Offerors that demonstrate experience with relevant projects contracted with the United States Government may be considered more favorably than offerors who do not demonstrate this experience.

Offerors that demonstrate experience with relevant projects located in Africa may be considered more favorably than offerors who do not demonstrate this experience.

Offerors that demonstrate experience with relevant projects that obtained a Sustainable Certification by the U.S. Green Building Council or equivalent organization may be considered more favorably than offerors who do not demonstrate this experience.

~~Offerors that demonstrate experience in multiple elements of relevancy ((a) (c) listed above) may be considered more favorably than Offerors who demonstrate experience in fewer elements of relevancy.~~

~~Offerors that demonstrate experience in the role of a Prime Contractor with a relevant project will be considered more favorably than offerors who demonstrate experience in the role of a Sub-Contractor with a relevant project.~~

(End of Summary of Changes)