AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
J	1	10

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
0001	16-May-2016		

6. ISSUED BY CODE N62473

NAVFAC SOUTHWEST
SPECIALTY CONTRACTS CORE
CODE RAQ30
1220 PACIFIC HWY, BLDG 127
SAN DIEGO CA 92132-5190

7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) CODE

See Item 6

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)

CODE FACILITY CODE

X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N62473-16-R-0201
X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 28-Apr-2016
	10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
	10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer [ ] is extended, [X] 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 1 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 [ ] is not, [ ] 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.)

Title: N62473-16-R-0201, Contract Labor Support Services for Professional Support Services for NAVFAC Southwest, San Diego California

The description of this Amendment continues on page 2.

All other terms and conditions of this solicitation remain unchanged and in effect.

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 16-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 0001
1. The purpose of Amendment 0001 is to add Section M as follows:
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 EVALUATION PROTOCOL

The contract will be awarded based on best value to the Government using the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) Source Selection process (see FAR 15.101-2). This process allows the lowest price technically acceptable source selection process is appropriate when best value is expected to result from selection of the technically acceptable proposal with the lowest evaluated price.

(a) Interested Firms will respond with information requested in the RFP. The Government intends to award one contract.

(b) 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.

(c) The Government may waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposals received.

(d) 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.

(e) The Government reserves the right to make an award on any item for a quantity less than the quantity offered, at the unit cost or prices offered, unless the Offeror specifies otherwise in the proposal.

(f) Exchanges with offerors after receipt of a proposal do not constitute a rejection or counteroffer by the Government.

(g) The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced between line items or sub line items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques.

(h) All proposals shall be evaluated against the established criteria set forth herein.

(i) Costs associated with participating in any Pre-Proposal Meetings or responding to the RFP will not be compensated.

(j) 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.

(k) Proposals that have either a significant weakness or multiple weaknesses may impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal.

M.2 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options, to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option.

M.3 DEFINITIONS

The following definitions shall be utilized in the evaluation process:

ACCEPTABLE (Past Performance Evaluation): Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the offeror's performance record is unknown. (See note below.)

ACCEPTABLE (Technical Rating): Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

ADEQUACY: A proposed method or technique in the proposal that addresses solicitation requirements such that no further explanation or documentation is necessary.

DEFICIENCY: A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

OFFEROR: Except where the context in which the term is used clearly indicates otherwise, "Offeror" refers to the contractor submitting the proposal, whose name appears in Block 15A of the SF33, Solicitation, Offer and Award, and to joint venture members, teaming/partnering entities, and major subcontractors (defined as subcontractors performing 20% or more of the work).

PAST PERFORMANCE: Relates to how well an Offeror has performed; e.g., the quality of work accomplished, schedule compliance, cost control, and customer satisfaction.

PROJECT: A project may be a stand-alone contract, or an individual task order under an IQ contract. If an IDIQ contract is provided as a project and individual task orders are listed, Firms must provide the task order number, project description, task order point of contact, phone number, award date, completion date, and award amount. If this information is not provided for the task orders listed, the project will not be considered in the evaluation.

SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESS: A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE: Pertains to work currently or previously performed by an Offeror, which is the same or similar to the work that may be ordered under this contract.

STRENGTH: An aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE: Pertains to projects that are at least 80% physically complete. If an indefinite quantity (IQ) contract is submitted as a "project", the term "substantially complete" pertains only to the individual task orders under the IQ contract that are included in the narrative.

UNACCEPTABLE (Past Performance Evaluation): Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

UNACCEPTABLE (Technical Rating): Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

WEAKNESS: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

M.4 JOINT VENTURE (JV)/TEAMING AGREEMENTS

(a) Contractors that propose as joint venture teams shall submit their joint venture agreements and letters of commitment shall be submitted with a list of the joint venture parties and/or teaming/partnering parties to include the following information: Company Name, DUNS and CAGE Code Numbers, Address, Point of Contact, Email Address, Phone Number, and Fax Number.

(b) All such agreements shall be signed by the parties and shall demonstrate the relationship between firms and identify contractual relationships and authorities to bind the firm/joint venture/team/partnership.

(c) Offerors shall ensure that joint venture agreements and teaming/partnering agreements comply with the Small Business Administration requirements set forth in 13 CFR 124, 8(A) Business Development/Small Disadvantaged Business Status Determinations, paragraph 124.513. The Proposer is not required to participate in a joint venture or teaming agreement. However, if you propose to enter into any agreements, failure to comply with applicable requirements may eliminate your proposal from consideration for award.

(d) This information will not be evaluated by the Source Selection Evaluation Board, but will be reviewed by the Contracting Officer.

M.5 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVALUATION FACTORS

(a) In accordance with FAR 15.304, the evaluation factors that apply to this acquisition are listed below:

Factor 1 – Corporate Experience
Factor 2 – Safety
Factor 3 – Past Performance
Factor 4 – Price

(b) Factors 1, 2, and 3 will be evaluated as Acceptable or Unacceptable. If Factors 1, 2, or 3 are rated Unacceptable, you will not be considered eligible for award.

(c) Offeror's are advised that if your proposal contains any technical deficiency under any factor, you will not be considered eligible for award.

(d) If your proposal contains a combination of significant weaknesses which creates and unacceptably high risk in contract performance, you will not be considered eligible for award.

FACTOR 1 – CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit three (3) temporary labor support services contracts for the Offeror that best demonstrates experience that meets the minimum dollar value, recency, relevancy, as special experience and type (discipline and performance location) listed below.

For purposes of this evaluation, the minimum recency requirement is as follows:

1. The contracts submitted shall be awarded within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP, and be complete or partially performed. "Partially perfomed" is defined as 60% or more of the total value of the contract has been performed.

For purposes of this evaluation, the minimum relevancy requirements are as follows:

1. The contract must have been awarded to the offeror as the prime contractor.
2. The total contract value for each contract submitted as experience shall have a potential (base plus options) minimum total value of $3.5M.

For purposes of this evaluation, the special experience type requirements are:

1. At least one (1) contract must be submitted as experience that includes at least one of the following disciplines: program management, environmental, asset management, project management, planning, design, scheduling, cost estimating, and/or construction management support.

2. At least one (1) contract submitted as experience must be for work performed on a federal installation.

The attached Recent Relevant Experience Contract Data Sheet (Section J, attachment J-10) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit contract corporate experience information. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. The content of Section J, attachment J-10, as included in the solicitation, may not be edited. Section J, attachment J-10 is limited to three (3) pages; all additional pages will be removed and will not be evaluated.

For all submitted contracts, the description of the contracts shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the disciplines involved. Clearly state which contract(s) demonstrates the requirement of meeting at least one (1) of the disciplines described in the relevancy requirements section of the solicitation and clearly state which contract(s) demonstrates meeting at least one (1) contract submitted as experience for work performed on a federal installation.

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant contract experience should be submitted for contracts completed by the Joint Venture entity or the Joint Venture partners. Offerors are still limited to a total of three (3) contracts 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 in order for the past performance 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 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 contract. 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. Any contracts submitted in excess of the three (3) will not be considered.

(b) Basis of Evaluation – The basis of evaluation will be the Offeror's demonstrated experience in performing three (3) recent and relevant temporary labor support services contracts as defined in the proposal submission requirements above. 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.

Proposals which submit fewer than three (3) relevant temporary labor support services contracts or fail to demonstrate experience as required above will be rated Unacceptable.

Any contracts submitted as experience which are (1) in excess of the three (3) required contracts, (2) not awarded within the past five (5) years of the date specified and complete or partially performed (see definition), (3) not awarded to the offeror as the prime contractor, (4) under the minimum total value of $3.5M (see definition), or (5) outside the scope of work of this solicitation, will not be evaluated.

FACTOR 2 – SAFETY

(a) 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. TRC and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) OSHA Total Recordable Case (TRC) Rate:

For the five (5) previous complete calendar years, submit your OSHA Total Recordable Case (TRC) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA TRC Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA TRC Rate data should be addressed as part of this element. OSHA TRC rates above 4.0, in any of the previous five years, will be considered UNACCEPTABLE, unless an adequate explanation is provided to address the extenuating circumstances that affected the rate.

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

For the five (5) previous complete calendar years, 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 should be addressed as part of this element. OSHA DART rates above 3.0, in any of the previous five years, will be considered UNACCEPTABLE, unless an adequate explanation is provided to address the extenuating circumstances that affected the rate.

(3) Technical Approach for Safety:

Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to qualify, evaluate, select and oversee its potential subcontractors. The Safety narrative shall be limited to one page. Offerors must submit both (1) a plan to include the safety

performance of subcontractors in the selection process for all levels of subcontractors and (2) a plan to monitor the safety of those subcontractors during contract performance, highlighting what specific management practices will be in place for providing deliberate safety program management and mishap prevention support to those sub-contractors whose EMR is greater than 1.0, whose TRC is greater than 4.0 and whose DART rate is greater than 3.0. Offerors who fail to submit either of these will be rated UNACCEPTABLE.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine whether the Offeror has an acceptable safety record. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall safety record as evidenced by the TRC and DART rates, if the Offeror's plan includes safety in the evaluation and selection of subcontractors, and if the narrative includes a plan to monitor the safety performance of subcontractors during performance. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- OSHA Total Recordable Case (TRC) Rate
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety

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

The Government will evaluate the OSHA TRC Rate to determine if the Offeror's OSHA TRC rate is above 4.0 and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. OSHA TRC rates above 4.0, in any of the previous five years, will be considered UNACCEPTABLE, unless an adequate explanation is provided to address the extenuating circumstances that affected the rate.

(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's OSHA DART rate is above 3.0 and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. OSHA DART rates above 3.0, in any of the previous five years, will be considered UNACCEPTABLE, unless an adequate explanation is provided to address the extenuating circumstances that affected the rate.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety:

The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine if subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the qualification, evaluation, selection, of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project, and both the plan to monitor the safety of those subcontractors during contract performance, highlighting what specific management practices will be in place for providing deliberate safety program management and mishap prevention support to those sub-contractors whose EMR is greater than 1.0, whose TRC is greater than 4.0 and whose DART rate is greater than 3.0. Offerors who fail to address either of these items (i.e. whether the safety performance of subcontractors will be evaluated in the selection process for all levels of subcontractors and whether the safety of those subcontractors will be monitored during contract performance) will be rated UNACCEPTABLE.

FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

(a) Submittal Requirements: If a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 1. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation then submit Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment C) for each project included in Factor 1. The Offeror should provide completed Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) in the proposal. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). The Government may make reasonable attempts to contact the client noted for that project(s) to obtain the PPQ information. However, Offerors should

follow-up with clients/references to help ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Jennifer McGuire Contract Specialist, via e-mail: jennifer.l.mcguire@navy.mil.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 1 – Corporate Experience. Offerors may also address any adverse past performance issues. Explanations shall not exceed two (2) double-sided pages (or four (4) single-sided pages) in total.

The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the references unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor. In addition to the above, the Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any and all sources including sources outside of the Government. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of Contractors who are part of a partnership or joint venture 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.

Performance award or additional information submitted will not be considered.

(b) Basis of Evaluation - This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the relevant projects submitted under Factor 1 – Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. Based on the Offeror's performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the Offeror's performance record is unknown.

The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, the source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the Contractor's performance. This evaluation is separate and distinct from the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination.

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, "unknown" shall be considered "acceptable."

FACTOR 4: PRICE

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements: The Offeror shall complete and submit the following in the order shown below:

Tab A - Signed Standard Form (SF) 33 (Solicitation, Offer and Award)
Tab B - Section J, Attachment J-07, IDIQ ELINS Worksheets
Tab C - Section J, Attachment J-08, Breakout of Burdened Rate Costs
Tab D - Section J, Attachment J-12, Financial Questionnaire
Tab E - Section J, Attachment J-14, Professional Employee Compensation Plan
Tab F - Section J, Attachment J-15, Pre-Award Contractor Self-Performance Certification

(b) 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.

2. Amendment 0001 is also issued to:

DELETE Attachment J-12, Financial Questionnaire of Section J - Documents, Exhibits, and Other Attachments in its entirety.

ADD a revised version of Attachment J-12, Financial Questionnaire of Section J - Documents, Exhibits, and Other Attachments (attached to Amendment 0001).

Note: The revision of Attachment J-12, Financial Questionnaire changed the Financial Questionnaire submission due date from 30 April 2016 to 31 May 2016. Financial Questionnaire's that have already been submitted to the contracting office do not need to be re-submitted on the revised form.

3. Amendment 0001 is also issued to add the following text to section:

A.2 TYPE OF CONTRACT

The base year and four, 12 month option period dates listed in the solicitation are estimated and will be adjusted at the time of award. The base period and four option periods will each be 12 months and start at the time of award and follow in sequence.

4. Amendment 0001 is also issued to provide questions and answers:

QUESTION 1: Is any element of the work currently being done on this program covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) or similar arrangement?

ANSWER 1: No. None of the original contractors identified in Attachment J-06, Contract Historical Data have/ had collective bargaining agreements.

QUESTION 2: Attachment J-10, Contract Positions. It appears the box for "Professional Service" is missing, which is quite relevant to this RFP (see title above). Can you please revise this form?

ANSWER 2: No revision is necessary to Attachment J-10, Recent, Relevant Experience Contractor Data Sheet, Item 3, Contract Positions.

QUESTION 3: The Basis for Evaluation section to the RFP is missing. Please provide.

ANSWER 3: See Section M added by Amendment 0001.

QUESTION 4: Can the Government please confirm that proposals will be evaluated on a "Lowest Price Technically Acceptable' basis?

ANSWER 4: See Section M, M.1 EVALUATION PROTOCOL, first paragraph.

QUESTION 5: Can the Government please clarify what the 4 factors are that need to be addressed in the proposal? Only Factors 1 and 4 are clearly defined/ highlighted.

ANSWER 5: See Section M, M.5 Relative Importance of the Evaluation Factors.

QUESTION 6: Can the Government please provide the Attachment J forms as separate word documents?

ANSWER 6: No change to be made to the format provided.

5. Offeror shall state their acknowledgement of this Amendment when submitting proposal.

(End of Summary of Changes)