

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 24 Apr 2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

6. ISSUED BY CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE
NAVFAC Hawaii Construction Acquisition Division (OPHA2) 400 Marshall Road JBPHH, Hawaii 96860-3139	See Item 6

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State, and Zip Code)	X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N62478-13-R-4010
	X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 7 Apr 2015
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

CODE	FACILITY CODE
------	---------------

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended. Offers 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 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 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) NA

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(x)	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: FAR CLAUSE 52.243-4, CHANGES
	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.)

N62478-13-R-4010, DESIGN BUILD/DESIGN BID-BUILD HUBZONE MULTIPLE AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (HUBZONE MACC) , VARIOUS LOCATIONS, STATE OF HAWAII

(See page 2)

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	

SF30, BLOCK 14 CONTINUED

1. Attached hereto are new and revised pages to the solicitation. Revised pages replace like numbered pages. The revision mark "Amendment 0002" is shown on each new and revised page.

a. REVISED SECTIONS/CLAUSES/PROVISIONS/PAGES/PARAGRAPHS. The following is a revised item to the solicitation. Changes are indicated in **bold** print.

Document 00110 Evaluation Factors for Award
Document 00900 Appendix A - Responses to Questions Submitted by Planholders
Section 01 45 00.05 20 – Design and Construction Quality Control, Paragraph 1.4.2
DQC Manager, Page 8. Delete the following: "**NOTE: Include the following for large, complex projects above \$15 million.**"

2. The date for receipt of proposals remains on May 7, 2015, 2:00 P.M., HST.

DOCUMENT 00110
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

DOCUMENT 00110

EVALUATION FACTORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I. GENERAL

- 1.1 CONTRACT SCOPE
- 1.2 PREFERENCE FOR MAKING MULTIPLE AWARDS
- 1.3 MAGNITUDE OF THE ACQUISITION
- 1.4 PROPOSAL EVALUATION
- 1.5 ENFORCEABILITY OF THE PROPOSAL

PART II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 2.1 BASIS OF AWARD
- 2.2 EVALUATION FACTORS

ATTACHMENTS

- (A) – CONSTRUCTION & DESIGN EXPERIENCE PROJECT DATA SHEET
- (B) – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES

EVALUATION FACTORS

PART I – GENERAL

1.1 CONTRACT SCOPE

The work includes, but is not limited to labor, supervision, tools, materials and equipment necessary to perform new construction, repair, alteration and related demolition of existing infrastructure based on Design-Build or Design-Bid-Build (Full Plans and Specifications) for infrastructure within the State of Hawaii. Infrastructure is defined as: 1) residential building construction for single family and/or multi-family housing; 2) construction for industrial buildings and warehouses; 3) nonresidential buildings, other than industrial buildings and warehouses; or 4) improvements such as utilities, landscaping, airfields and roadways. The areas of consideration will include, but not be limited to, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and miscellaneous Federal and other facilities. Task orders will be issued for the work that may require design and construction services. In support of the Design-Build work, the Contractor shall employ the services of an architect/engineering professional experienced in the coordination of multi-disciplined architectural/engineering design efforts in all aspects of general building and new and renovation projects.

1.2 PREFERENCE FOR MAKING MULTIPLE AWARDS

This acquisition is being advertised as a competitive HUBZone set-aside and is a source selection procurement requiring non-cost/price, past performance and price proposals. This procurement consists of one solicitation with the intent to award multiple Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts. The Government intends to award a minimum of two IDIQ contracts.

1.3 MAGNITUDE OF THE ACQUISITION

The total maximum dollar value of this acquisition is \$245,000,000 for all contracts over the life of the contracts or 60 months, whichever occurs first. The minimum guarantee for the base period only will be \$10,000. The minimum guarantee may be met by the issuance of a task order during the base period or option period(s). The task order minimum and maximum will be stated as \$150,000 to \$10,000,000, respectively.

1.4 PROPOSAL EVALUATION

a. This is a two-phase procurement. In Phase 1 of the two-phase design-build selection procedure, the Offerors will submit and the Government will evaluate Factors 1 through 4 (see paragraph 2.2). The Government will then short list a maximum of 8 of the most qualified Phase 1 Offerors to compete for the design-build Multiple Award Construction Contracts in Phase 2. Factor 1 will only be rated Acceptable or Unacceptable. If an Offeror is rated Unacceptable in Factor 1, they will not be considered for Phase 2.

b. In Phase 2 of the two-phase design-build selection procedure, the short-listed offerors will submit Factor 5 (see paragraph 2.2). In making the best value award decision after Phase 2, the government will consider the evaluated ratings for Factors 2 through 5 and price.

c. The Government intends to evaluate all proposals received and award multiple contracts without conducting discussions; therefore, your initial proposal shall conform to the solicitation requirements and should contain the best offer. However, the Government reserves the right to clarify certain aspects of the proposals, or may conduct discussions if it is deemed necessary to obtain the best value for the Government.

d. If discussions are deemed necessary to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value, discussions will be held with those Offerors within the competitive range. The Government 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, considering price and technical merit.

e. 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. Significant weakness or multiple weaknesses may impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal. Any proposal with a rating that is less than acceptable for a factor will require correction before being considered for award of a contract.

f. The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contracts.

g. The distinction between corporate experience and past performance is corporate experience pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work covered by this requirement, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past performance pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well a contractor has performed on the contracts.

1.5 ENFORCEABILITY OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposals must set forth full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of the contracts. By submission of the offer, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., key personnel, designers, subcontractors, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract and any substitutions will be equal or better than as proposed and accepted for contract award and shall require prior Contracting Officer's approval.

PART II – EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.1 BASIS OF AWARD

The Government intends to award multiple Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) type contracts to those responsible Offerors whose offers, conforming to the solicitation, are determined to be the most advantageous to the Government considering non-cost/price factors, past performance and price. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is that technical factors are equal to each other and when combined are equal importance to the performance confidence assessment (past performance). The combined non-cost/price factors are approximately equal to price. The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-cost/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-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award may be made to other than the lowest priced Offerors or other than the highest technically rated Offerors. Business judgments and tradeoffs may be used to determine the proposals offering the best value to the Government. In determining the best value to the Government, the Government need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the best value decision. The Government also reserves the right to cancel the solicitation if only one proposal is determined to represent the most advantageous proposal.

2.2 EVALUATION FACTORS

Non-Cost/Price Evaluation Factors:

Phase I:

- Factor 1 – Technical Approach
- Factor 2 – Experience
- Factor 3 – Past Performance
- Factor 4 – Safety

Phase II:
Factor 5 – Energy and Sustainable Design

Price (for the seed project which may or may not be awarded.) Project Title: Seed project will be identified in Phase 2.

Price proposal will consist of lump sum pricing for the seed project. The total price proposed will be evaluated to ensure fair and reasonable pricing.

a. NON-COST/PRICE EVALUATION FACTORS

Factor 1 – Technical Approach:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The composition and management of the firms proposed as the design-build (DB) team for this contract will be evaluated in this factor.

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

(1) Provide a narrative describing the proposed primary construction firms and primary design firms for this contract and the rationale for proposing this arrangement. Provide the role, responsibilities, and contractual relationships between the various firms (see FAR Subpart 9.6). The narrative shall also include a simple organizational chart that clearly identifies the lines of authority between the entities. If the experience of a significant subcontractor is being claimed in Factor 2, the firm must be named in the above narrative and organizational chart.

The technical approach narrative shall be Arial 11 font (minimum) and limited to one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages) including the organizational chart. The information requested in item #2 below is not included in this page limitation.

(2) In addition to the narrative, the Offeror shall submit a signed copy of their applicable joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, mentor-protégé agreement, Limited Liability Company, Limited Partnership, letter of commitment for each member of the Offeror's team identified above (e.g., joint venture partner, partner, team member, subcontractor, parent company, subsidiary, or other affiliated company, etc.), etc.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The assessment of the Offeror's technical approach will be used as a means to evaluate the organizational structure and teaming relationships proposed by the Offeror. This factor will be rated on an Acceptable or Unacceptable basis.

Factor 2 – Experience:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

(1) Construction Experience:

Submit a maximum of five (5) construction projects in which the Offeror was the Prime Contractor that best demonstrates the Offeror's experience on recent relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. Out of the maximum of five (5) construction projects, at least 2 projects shall be new construction and 1 project shall be repair/alteration or related demolition of existing infrastructure. For purposes of this evaluation, a recent relevant project is defined as new construction and/or repair, alteration and related demolition of existing infrastructure completed within the past five years of the proposal issue date for this RFP. Infrastructure is defined as: 1) residential building construction; 2) construction for industrial buildings and warehouses; 3) nonresidential buildings, other than industrial buildings and warehouses; or 4) improvements such as utilities, landscaping, airfields and roadways. "New Construction" is defined as construction that provides for new or expanded facilities or infrastructure. New construction does not include repair and/or modernization of an existing facility nor does it include replacement or upgrade to an existing infrastructure. Also, the Offeror must have been a Prime Contractor for the projects and each project shall be **\$6M** or more in dollar value and be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

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 shall not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors shall submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. If the same project is being used to demonstrate construction and design experience, submit separate Project Data Sheets for construction and design. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Do not alter the Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) with the exception of expanding the individual blocks on this form; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages) and shall be Arial 11 font (minimum).

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 (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods). In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. Provide applicable documentation on projects that were validated and/or certified through U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) or the equivalent organization or process. The validation or certification documentation will not be included in the page limitation of the Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A).

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV) or a participant of Small Business Administration (SBA) Mentor-Protégé Program, recent relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity or SBA Mentor-Protégé. If the JV or SBA Mentor-Protégé does not have shared experience, recent relevant projects shall be submitted for each JV partner or for the Mentor and Protégé. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all JV partners or Mentor and Protégé may be rated lower. 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 the extent of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm involvement in the performance of the contract.

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 Offer must provide a letter of commitment that the subcontractor will have involvement in performance of this contract.

(2) Design Experience

Submit a maximum of five (5) design projects for the designer of record (Lead A-E that coordinates, facilitates and stamps the overall project) that best demonstrates design experience on recent relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. For purposes of this evaluation, a recent relevant project is defined as design of new and/or repair and alteration of existing infrastructure. Infrastructure is defined as: (1) residential building construction; 2) construction for industrial buildings and warehouses; 3) nonresidential buildings, other than industrial buildings and warehouses; or 4) improvements such as utilities, landscaping, airfields and roadways. "New Construction" is defined as construction that provides for new or expanded facilities or infrastructure. New construction does not include repair and/or modernization of an existing facility nor does it include replacement or upgrade to an existing infrastructure. A-E design experience is on construction projects valued at **\$6M** or more. All recent relevant project designs shall be completed within the past five (5) years of the issuance of this RFP.

For design-build projects, the design portion of the contract shall have been completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

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

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) is **MANDATORY** and **SHALL** be used to submit project information. If the same project is being used to demonstrate construction and design experience, submit separate Project Data Sheets for construction and design. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Do not alter the Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) with the exception of expanding the individual blocks on this form; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages) and shall be Arial 11 font (minimum).

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 (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods). In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. Provide applicable documentation on projects that were validated and/or certified through U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) or the equivalent organization or process. The validation or certification documentation will not be included in the page limitation of the Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A). Also, the description should address features detailing how the work was completed in accordance with the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

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 the extent of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm involvement in the performance of the contract.

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 Offer must provide a letter of commitment that the subcontractor will have involvement in performance of this contract.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing recent relevant construction and design projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror's recent 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 the first five (5) recent relevant projects from the prime contractor and the first five (5) recent relevant projects from the designer of record. Any projects submitted in excess of the first five (5) for Construction Experience and five (5) for Design Experience will not be considered.

Recent relevant projects where the Offeror and the proposed design firm(s) have previously worked together may be considered more favorably than those that have not worked together.

Recent relevant projects that demonstrate design-build experience may be considered more favorably than those that do not have design-build experience.

Recent relevant projects that demonstrate experience with sustainable features may be considered more favorably than those that do not demonstrate experience with sustainable features.

Recent relevant projects where the Offeror performed major or critical aspects of the project may be considered more favorably than major or critical aspects of the project performed by a subcontractor or design subcontractor.

Recent relevant projects that the JV entity completed may be considered more favorably than those projects that were completed by only one JV partner.

Factor 3 – Past Performance:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

If a completed Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS)/Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in factor 2 for construction experience. If a completed AE Contractor Appraisal Support System (ACASS)/CPAR evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in factor 2 for design experience. If there is not a completed CCASS, ACASS, or CPAR evaluation then submit Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment B) for each project included in Factor 2 for both Construction Experience and Design Experience. Evidence of customer satisfaction shall be from the owner and/or their representative responsible for the construction contract administration of construction projects or design administration of design projects. For construction contractors, it shall not be from the designer on a design build project nor shall it be from a prime construction contractor for a subcontractor. For design firms, it shall not be from the construction contractor on a design build project nor shall it be from prime consultant to a subconsultant or from a subconsultant to a prime consultant. 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, previously completed PPQs in full text submitted for other RFPs will be accepted. All previously completed PPQs shall include all information requested in Attachment B , NAVFAC/USACE Past Performance Questionnaire (Form PPQ-0) located the end of

Document 00110. This does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 2 – Experience. Offerors may also address any adverse past performance issues. Explanations shall be Arial 11 font (minimum) and 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.

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 recent relevant projects submitted under Factor 2 – Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. 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 (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror.

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. The assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the Offeror's probability to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP.

Offerors lacking recent relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance and will receive an Unknown Confidence rating.

Factor 4 – 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. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

For the three (3) 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 (3) 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 shall 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 (3) 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 shall 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 Arial 11 font (minimum) and limited to two (2) pages.

(b) 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, and any innovative safety methods that the Offeror plans to implement for this procurement. The Government's sources of information for evaluating safety may include, but are not limited to, OSHA, NAVFAC's Enterprise Safety Applications Management System (ESAMS), and other related databases. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete safety information regarding these submittal requirements rests with the Offeror. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

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

The Government will evaluate the OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety:

The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project.

The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation.

Factor 5 – Energy and Sustainable Design

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Provide the following information, which describes how the seed project will meet or exceed the following sustainable design contract requirements.

(1) EPAAct 2005 Energy Efficiency Narrative:

Using the guidance outlined in Part 3 of this RFP, provide a detailed narrative to describe whether the proposed solution will meet or exceed the goal of a 30% energy reduction using the ASHRAE Std 90.1-2007, Appendix G, Building Performance Rating Method, excluding receptacle and process loads. Provide both a Baseline Building Performance and Proposed Building Performance conforming to the modeling requirements given in Table G3.1 but, excluding receptacle and process loads. Provide the proposed percent energy reduction from the Baseline Building Performance to the Proposed Building Performance. Provide the assumptions the Offeror will use to obtain a high-performance building, which will comply with these energy reduction goals. Describe the Offeror's proposed building with regards to, if applicable, building orientation; shape; fenestration; solar heat gain coefficients (SHGC); wall and roof insulation values (U-values); HVAC systems; water heating systems; lighting systems; and control systems. Organize/divide the assumptions into four areas; building orientation and configuration, building envelope, mechanical systems, and electrical systems. If the Offeror cannot achieve the 30% reduction within the budget identified, the Offeror shall state what percent energy reduction is proposed within their proposal. Do not exceed two (2) double-sided pages (or four (4) single-sided pages) with Arial 11 font (minimum). *Note: Building performance rating and percent energy reduction are calculated in terms of energy rather than energy cost.*

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's response to the Energy and Sustainable Design Factor considering the proposed energy savings.

EPAAct 2005 Energy Efficiency Narrative: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed energy budget reduction relative to EPAAct 2005 energy efficiency goals, including evaluation of assumptions.

b. PRICE EVALUATION

PRICE PROPOSAL FOR THE SEED PROJECT (which may or may not be awarded) - Project Title: Seed project will be identified in Phase 2.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

With regards to price, Offerors shall complete the Proposal Schedule line item for the seed project (which may or may not be awarded).

BASIS OF EVALUATION

The price proposal for the seed project (which may or may not be awarded) will be evaluated to determine the reasonableness of the Offeror's proposal. One or more of the following techniques will be used to ensure a fair and reasonable price:

- Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation.
- Comparison of proposed prices with the independent Government estimate.
- Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.
- Obtain information reports from Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) or other outside agencies as required.

A price that is found to be either unreasonably high or unrealistically low in relation to the proposed work may be indicative of an inherent lack of understanding of the solicitation requirements and may result in the overall proposal not being considered for award.

The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-cost/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-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered.

Any inconsistency whether real or apparent, between proposed performance and price must be clearly explained in the price proposal. For example, if unique and innovative approaches are the basis for an apparently unbalanced/inconsistently price proposal, the nature of these approaches and their impact on price must be completely documented. The burden of proof of price realism rests solely with the Offeror.

DOCUMENT 00900
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS
SUBMITTED BY PLANHOLDERS
FOR
RFP NO. N62478-13-R-4010

Q1. Our question is in reference to Factor 2 - Experience; (1) Construction Experience:

Our firm has the financial, bonding and management capability to execute projects (task orders) in excess of \$15M dollar each with an annual aggregate capacity of \$50M that adequately supports the \$8M or more in dollar value threshold required by this solicitation even though we do not have projects at this time in excess of \$8M each. Will you consider this in the evaluation of our proposal? And if not, will you consider a teaming partner's experience that will comply with the requirement along with ours that may not?

A1. Yes

Q2. Given the task order minimum and maximum range for this contract is \$150,000 to \$10,000,000 respectively, requiring five projects with a contract value of \$8M including two new construction projects for a relevant project is very restrictive for a HUBZone pool. Would the Government please consider relaxing the Factor 2 Construction and Design Experience criteria to require just two of the five projects to be \$8M or more in dollar value?

A2. See Document 00110 paragraph 2.2 a. Factor 2- Experience (a) (1) Construction Experience

Q3. Regarding the subject solicitation, as stated on page 6 of 12 of Document 00110, Factor 2 – Experience requires Offerors to submit a maximum of five (5) recent relevant construction projects, that meet the following criteria:

- at least 2 projects shall be new construction and 1 project shall be repair/alteration or related demolition of existing infrastructure;
- they were the Prime Contractor for the projects;
- each project shall be \$8M or more in dollar value; and
- each project shall be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

However, Para 1.3 of the aforementioned document states that the task order minimum and maximum will be stated as \$150,000 to \$10,000,000, respectively. As the minimum dollar value for a recent relevant project is \$8M, the RFP is requiring Offerors to submit projects with dollar values at the top of the anticipated task order range for evaluation. We feel that the submission requirements are very stringent and unreasonable considering the anticipated task order range and – from our prior experience working under previous indefinite-quantity contracts – the reality of how many projects will actually be issued at the top of the task order range. Moreover, the solicitation is already restricted to HUBZone certified small business contractors, but this requirement further limits competition to selective contractors.

Therefore, to allow local HUBZone contractors like ourselves the opportunity to demonstrate our relevant experience through the submittal of the maximum number of projects, we request your consideration to limit the submittal of a project with a dollar value of \$8M or more to just one (1) project, of which the remainder of projects can have a dollar value of \$150K or more.

A3. See Response to RFI #2

Q4. Pursuant to the reference RFP, Document 00110, Page 6, (1) Construction Experience. Please consider allowing projects to be completed within the past 10 years in lieu of the past 5 years.

Given the size standard of \$8 Million in construction value, it is difficult for HUZONE Small Business Concerns to have multiple projects over that threshold in the past 5 years.

If the management within the organization has not changed over the course of ten years, the experience gained on projects 10 years ago would still be very valuable to task orders completed under this contract.

A4. The criteria will remain the same.