

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 4
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0005	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 01-Apr-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. ACQR4250190		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC SOUTHWEST CENTRAL IPT CODE ROPCA 1220 PACIFIC HWY SAN DIEGO CA 92132-5190	CODE N62473	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. N62473-16-R-0612	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 01-Mar-2016	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ 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.) N62473-16-R-0612 FIRM FIXED PRICE, DESIGN-BUILD; PROJECT PE1309M REPAIR BEQ 520442, MARINE CORPS BASE (MCB) CAMPPENDLETON, CALIFORNIA. The purpose of this amendment is to Revise the Request for Proposal (RFP) and provide responses to the Request for Information (RFI's):				
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 01-Apr-2016

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0005

AMENDMENT 0005

1. The purpose of this amendment is to Revise the Request for Proposal (RFP) and provide responses to the Request for Information (RFI's):

A. The RFP is hereby revised as follows:

1. Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Page 2 of 27

DELETE:

AMENDMENT 0002

REPLACE WITH:

AMENDMENT 0004

2. Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Response to RFI 78

DELETE:

Response 78: The GOVT will allow similar renovations of other types of facilities as relevant to this project.

REPLACE WITH:

Response 78: The Basis for Award remains unchanged.

3. Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Response to RFI 79

DELETE:

Response 79: The government would allow the experience of a key person within the company to satisfy the requirements of the solicitation as long as the key person is highly involved in the project. Provide a narrative to explain the role the key person would play.

REPLACE WITH:

Response 79: The Basis for Award remains unchanged.

4. Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Response to RFI 80

DELETE:

Response 80: See Response 79 above.

REPLACE WITH:

Response 80: The Basis for Award remains unchanged.

B. Responses to RFI's received:

RFI 119: Section 00100, Instructions to Offerors, Paragraph 14, Factor 2 – Safety, page 14

The above Section states if the TRC or DART Rate “.....is above 4.0 or 3.0 respectively, in any of the previous three years, it will be considered UNACCEPTABLE and result in an UNACCEPTABLE rating...”. Please change the wording from “will” to “may”. The reason being is most SDVOSB firms employ between 5 – 15 full time employees, and if there is one single injury in any one of the previous three years, the company automatically and mathematically cannot meet the requirements of this RFP. In other words, if someone cuts themselves unloading a box and the injury is recordable, then the injury will automatically disqualify the bidder. Our JV team partner had one recordable injury back in 2013 with an employee injuring his thumb. That is the only accident in the past 3 years. Unfortunately, because they have between 5 to 8 full time employees, their TRC is 13.45 (severely above 3.0). This due to the math involved ((1) injury x (200,000) / (14,872) hours = 13.45). We would speculate that any credible construction firm who self performs general construction work may incur an injury which means unless they can accumulate in excess of 66,666 Exposure Hours (which equals approximately 32 full time employees) there is no way to achieve the RFP required rates. While we understand how important safety is on a Federal facility, disqualifying an outstanding firm with tremendous past Military performance and qualifications because of one injury seems a bit excessive. We respectfully request such language be adjusted so we can be included in this RFP vs being rated UNACCEPTABLE. We can then elaborate more about this thumb injury in the Proposal.

Response 119: The Safety Factor remains unchanged. The RFP allows contractors to submit an explanation to address the extenuating circumstances that affected the rate.

RFI 120: Part 3, Chapter 6, D4010

Part 3 chapter 6 D4010 requires a new fire alarm and mass notification system be provided. The current system in the building is new and according to Simplex Grinnell it is up to current standard. Is it the Governments intend for this system to be replaced, or can the contractors use the current system with minor modifications as required by code?

Response 120: Part 3 chapter 6 D4010 requires a new fire alarm and mass notification system be provided.

RFI 121: Part 3, Chapter 5, Page 8

Part 3 chapter 5 page 8 states that all of the existing toilet partitions are existing and are to remain. With the tile floor being replaced, these partitions will need to be removed and reinstalled. Due to the current condition of these partitions does the Government want include bidders to provide new?

Response 121: The existing toilet partitions will be reused. They will need to be removed and reinstalled.

RFI 122: Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Response to RFI 78

Response to RFI 78 “The GOVT will allow similar renovations of other types of facilities as relevant to this project”.

Question/comment: We believe this response is a bit open ended and vague. We request leaving the original language as part of this RFP since it is clear, concise, and defined as to what is acceptable and what isn't. Otherwise, it appears almost any renovation project will become relevant in the eyes of bidders and the Government.

Response 122: See A. 2. above for details.

RFI 123: Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Response to RFI 79

Response to RFI 79 “The government would allow the experience of a key person within the company to satisfy the requirements of the solicitation as long as the key person is highly involved in the project. Provide a narrative to explain the role the key person would play”.

Question/comment: Allowing the experience of a key person within a company (as opposed to the experience of ‘a company’) causes various concerns as it relates to this RFP and all the requirements. For example: does a company without necessary experience submit Past Performance Questionnaires or CCASS reports (as required by the RFP) on projects they never performed based on the experience of a new or current employee? This seems odd to submit such past performance information on behalf of a different company to gain access and compete against firms with legitimate performance history.

Another example is the Safety requirements of this RFP. Would such firms (with lack of past experience) also submit safety records and data on projects they didn’t complete based on the experience of a key person? Would bidders submit such safety information for projects (that do not qualify) the key person’s former company has completed?

This cherry picking process of only submitting information that best suits such construction firms is rather disingenuous and confusing. It seems other options are readily available like joint venturing with firms that have such experience is an acceptable practice.

We request leaving the original language as part of the RFP since it is clear, concise and defined as to what is and what isn’t acceptable.

Response 123: See A. 3. above for details.

RFI 124: Amendment 0004, dated March 24, 2016, Response to RFI 80

Response to RFI 80 “See Response 79 above”

Question/comment: We request leaving the original language as part of the RFP since it is clear, concise and defined as to what is and what isn’t acceptable.

Response 124: See A. 4. above for details.

RFI 125: DD30 HVAC

Is the ventilation system for the Open Bays to be passive or active (mechanical)?

Response 125: The ventilation system for the Open Bays is to be passive.

RFI 126: Part 3 - Room Requirements, Paragraph 5, Page number 142 of 1536

Are the new washer/dryers to be included in the base bid or they part of the FF&E?

Response 126: The new washers/dryers are to be included as part of the FF&E package.

**** NOTE: ALL OTHER PARAGRAPHS, PROVISIONS, AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED. ****

(End of Summary of Changes)