

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08-Jun-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. 06XXXX	5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC PACIFIC A-E/CONSTR CONTRACTS BRANCH (CODE ACQ31) 258 MAKALAPA DR STE 100 JBP HH HI 96860-3134	CODE N62742	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. N62742-16-R-1309	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 31-May-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.) N62742-16-R-1309, FY 16 MCAF PROJECT P-3028/A JY 133028 LOW OBSERVABLE/CORROSION CONTROL/COMPOSITE REPAIR SHOP, JOINT REGION MARIANAS-ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM Amendment 0001 is continued on Page 2.				
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	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		08-Jun-2016

SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS

Replace Document 00202 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD with the attached.

(End of Summary of Changes)

DOCUMENT 00202

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I. GENERAL

- 1.1. INTENT TO AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS
- 1.2. COMPETITIVE RANGE
- 1.3. ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL

PART II. EVALUATION FACTORS / RATING SCHEME

- 2.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS OF AWARD
- 2.2. PRICE EVALUATION
- 2.3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS
- 2.4. RATING SCHEME

ATTACHMENTS

- (A) Construction Experience Project Data Sheet
- (B) Past Performance Questionnaires

PART I. GENERAL

1.1 INTENT TO AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The Government intends to evaluate the three lowest priced proposals for fair and reasonableness and technical acceptability; then select the lowest reasonably priced technically acceptable offer and award a contract (within the funds available) without conducting discussions. Therefore, the initial proposal shall conform to the solicitation requirements and should contain the best offer from a technical and price standpoint. If none of the three lowest priced proposals are found to be technically acceptable, then the Government will evaluate the remaining offers for price reasonableness and technical acceptability.

1.2 COMPETITIVE RANGE

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 most highly rated proposals.

1.3 ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL

The proposal must set forth full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract. By submission of the offer, the offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., subcontractors with teaming agreements) will be enforced for the duration of the contract. Any substitutions after contract award will be equal or better than as proposed and shall require Contracting Officer's approval prior to implementation.

PART II. EVALUATION FACTORS / RATING SCHEME

2.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS OF AWARD

The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to that responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined to be the lowest evaluated price of proposals meeting or exceeding the acceptability standards for technical factors.

2.2 PRICE EVALUATION

a. One or more of the following techniques will be used to evaluate CLIN 0001 to ensure that it is fair and reasonable:

- Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation;
- Comparison of proposed prices with the independent Government Estimate;
- Comparison of previously proposed prices and previous Government and commercial prices with current proposed prices for the same or similar service/items, if both the validity of the comparison and the reasonableness of the previous prices(s) can be established.

b. The price proposals will be ranked from lowest to highest based on the evaluation criteria stated above.

2.3 TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS

The following technical evaluation factors of equal importance shall be used to evaluate the technical proposals.

FACTOR 1: EXPERIENCE

FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE

FACTOR 3: SAFETY

FACTOR 1 – EXPERIENCE:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a maximum of three (3) relevant construction projects for the offeror that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the solicitation. The Government will only review three projects. Any projects submitted in excess of the three (3) for Experience will not be considered. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as:

RELEVANT CONSTRUCTION PROJECT: New construction of large, long span, heavy structural steel framed aircraft hangars or large, long span, heavy structural steel framed buildings/structures with substantial column-free areas, such as, steel framed sports arenas and industrial or manufacturing facilities. Projects must be similar in scope and complexity as the proposed project. “Similar in scope and complexity as the proposed project” means projects with similar spans and column-free areas that are supported by heavy structural steel truss framing systems. Projects must have been completed or substantially completed within the past ten (10) years of the date of issuance of this solicitation and must be approximately \$20M in dollar value or more.

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.

“Substantially completed” is defined as at least 90% physically complete.

Definition: “Offeror” typically refers to a single corporation submitting the proposal as a prime contractor. “Offeror” is also defined as other legal entities such as joint ventures, Limited Partnerships (LTD), and Limited Liability Companies (LLC). In its evaluation of past performance and experience, the Government’s evaluation will generally focus on the entities submitting the proposal (individual joint venture partners, the LTD or the LLC).

The attached Construction Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) 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).

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 solicitation (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods).

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 shared experience, projects must be submitted for the Joint Venture members.

If an offeror is utilizing experience and past performance 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 in order for the experience and 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 will provide to this project.

The offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform relevant aspects of the requirement to demonstrate construction experience under this evaluation factor. The offer must provide a teaming agreement signed by the prime and subcontractor and an explanation of the meaningful involvement that the subcontractor will have in performance of this contract.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the offeror's demonstrated experience in performing a minimum of one (1) relevant construction projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements.

Factor 2 – Offeror's Past Performance:

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

If a completed Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 2 for construction experience. If a completed CCASS evaluation is not available then submit Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) (Attachment B) for each project included in Factor 2 for Construction Experience. It shall not be from a prime contractor to a sub-contractor. The offeror shall provide completed Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) in the proposal. Offerors may submit PPQs previously submitted for other solicitations.

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 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 awards 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 2 – Experience and past performance on other relevant construction 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 (FAPIIS), 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 solicitation.

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 3 – Safety

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each Contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture; however, only one safety narrative is required. 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. If the TRC rate exceeds 4.0, the Offeror shall provide an explanation of the circumstances that caused the TRC rate (s) to exceed 4.0 and actions taken to prevent future occurrences.

(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. If the DART rate(s) exceeds 3.0, the Offeror shall provide an explanation of the circumstances that caused the DART rate (s) to exceed 3.0 and actions taken to prevent future occurrences.

(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 subcontractors whose EMR is greater than 1.0, whose TRC is greater than 4.0 and whose DART rate is greater than 3.0.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The acceptability of the Offeror’s safety record will be based upon (1) OSHA Total Recordable Case (TRC) Rate of 4.0 or less OR if the TRC rate exceeds 4.0, the Offeror’s explanation of the circumstances that caused the TRC rate(s) to exceed 4.0 and actions taken to prevent future occurrences; (2) Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) of 3.0 or less OR if the DART rate exceeds 3.0, the Offeror’s explanation of the circumstances that caused the DART rate(s) to exceed 3.0 and actions taken to prevent future occurrences; and (3) the Offeror’s Technical Approach to Safety for (1) if subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the qualification, evaluation, selection, of all levels of subcontractors on this project and (2) the plan to monitor the safety of those subcontractors during contract performance.

2.4 RATING SCHEME

The following information is pertinent to the rating of the technical proposals:

a. **Deficiency:** A material failure of the proposal to meet a Government requirement.

b. If the proposal contains an **Unacceptable** rating for any of the Factors, the overall rating of the technical proposal will be **Unacceptable**. An overall technical rating of **UNACCEPTABLE** makes a proposal ineligible for award.

FACTOR 1 – EXPERIENCE:

ACCEPTABLE	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE:

ACCEPTABLE	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. Note: 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 (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability “unknown” shall be considered “acceptable.”
UNACCEPTABLE	Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government does not have a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

FACTOR 3 – SAFETY:

Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.