

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 11
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0005	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 06-Mar-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC SOUTHEAST IPT GULFCOAST BLDG 903, PO BOX 30 NAS JACKSONVILLE JACKSONVILLE FL 32212-0030	CODE N69450	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. N69450-15-R-0604	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06-Feb-2015	
			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 <u>1</u> 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.) N69450-15-R-0604 REPAIRS TO RUNWAYS 5/23 AND 14/32 AT NAS WHITING FIELD, FL SEE PAGE 2 CONTINUATION				
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 06-Mar-2015

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION 00800 - SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0005

1. The purpose of this amendment is to respond to Pre-Proposal Information requests, revise Factor 1, revise Factor 3 and revise Exhibit 4..

- a. A copy of the Pre-Proposal Information log dated 2015-03-06 is being provided as an attachment to this amendment.

The Pre-Proposal Information log with attachment name 2015-03-06_PPI_Log can be located at <https://www.neco.navy.mil/> under this solicitation number under Additional Documents.

- b. Factor 1 – Experience - relevant project definition has been revised and is in response to Pre-Proposal Information request number 29. A relevant project for Factor 1 – Experience has been revised to:

For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as construction of a project to repair or construct approximately 5,000 linear feet or greater of full-width asphalt runway(s) with a construction value of approximately \$8M or greater.

The answer to Pre-Proposal Information number 29 has been revised and can be found within the Pre-Proposal Information log with attachment name 2015-03-06_PPI_Log and can be located at <https://www.neco.navy.mil/> under this solicitation number under Additional Documents.

- c. Factor 3 – Small Business Utilization has been revised, specifically paragraph 4 and the Basis of Evaluation, and can be found within this Amendment.
- d. Exhibit 4 – Small Business Subcontracting Plan, page 11 of 11 has been revised and is being provided as an attachment to this amendment.

Revised Exhibit 4 – Small Business Subcontracting Plan with attachment name 2015-03-06_Exhibit_4_SB_Subcontract_Plan can be located at <https://www.neco.navy.mil/> under this solicitation number under Additional Documents.

2. The proposal due date remains Tuesday March 10, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time.
3. All other terms and conditions of this RFP remain unchanged.
4. Offeror's must acknowledge this amendment in writing with their proposal submission.

The following have been modified:

EVALUATION

BASIS FOR AWARD

1. 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 lowest priced technically acceptable offer.

2. 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.

3. The LPTA process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition because the best value is expected to result from selection of the technically acceptable proposal with the lowest evaluated price.

4. An overall non-cost/price factors rating must be at least "ACCEPTABLE" in order to be eligible for award. An "UNACCEPTABLE" rating in any factor results in the overall non-cost/price factors proposal being rated "UNACCEPTABLE" unless corrected through discussions. An overall non-cost/price factors rating of "UNACCEPTABLE" makes a proposal ineligible for award.

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. The solicitation requires the evaluation of price and the following non-cost/price factors:

Non-Cost/Price Evaluation Factors:

In making the best value award decision, the LPTA process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition because the best value is expected to result from selection of the technically acceptable proposal with the lowest evaluated price. An overall non-price factors rating must be at least "ACCEPTABLE" in order to be eligible for award. An "UNACCEPTABLE" rating in any factor results in the overall non-price factors proposal being rated "UNACCEPTABLE" unless corrected through discussions. An overall non-price factors rating of "UNACCEPTABLE" makes a proposal ineligible for award.

In accordance with NFAS 15.101-2, the number of proposals to be evaluated for technical acceptability may be limited to the three lowest priced offers at the discretion of the contracting officer. If no proposals are found to be technically acceptable within the first group of proposals, then the process described will be conducted again as many times as necessary, until such time as the Government identifies a technically acceptable proposal. If the contracting officer later determines that discussions are necessary, the procedures in FAR 15.306 shall be followed.

Since the LPTA methodology prohibits trade-offs, all evaluation factors are equally important. Proposals are evaluated for acceptability but not ranked using the non-cost and/or price factors.

The non-cost and/or price factors that will be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable shall be as follows:

- Factor 1 – Experience
- Factor 2 – Safety
- Factor 3 – Small Business Utilization
- Factor 4 – Past Performance

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.

2. Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.

(a) Price:

Provide one (1) original, one (1) copy, and one (1) electronic copy (CD) of the solicitation submittal requirements for pricing identified below.

Price shall be considered available for award for 90 calendar days from the price proposal due date.

The Offeror shall submit the following as part of their **Volume I, Price Proposal** in a separate binder(s) from their Non-Cost/Price Factor (technical) proposal. _

(1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

i. Cover letter with the following information:

- Authorized negotiator's (POC) name
- POC telephone number
- POC email address
- CAGE code
- DUNS number
- TIN (taxpayer ID number)

ii. SF1442 (Solicitation, Offer, and Award) with blocks 14 through 20c completed.

iii. The Offeror shall submit their prices using Section 00010 CLIN Pricing.

iv. Bid Bond (see clause 5252.228-9302 Bid Guarantee in RFP for Bid Bond amount) in the amount of 20% of total project bid price or \$3M, whichever amount is less.

v. Proof of the Offeror's filled out Representations and Certifications and Active and Inactive Exclusions from the System for Award Management (SAM).

Note: The bid bond, SAM registrations must be in the name/CAGE/DUNS of the offeror identified on the SF1442.

(2) 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.

(b) Non-cost/price (Technical) Factors:

Provide one (1) original, four (4) copies, and one (1) electronic copy (CD) of the solicitation submittal requirements.

The Offeror shall submit the following as part of their **Volume II, Non-Cost/Price (Technical) Proposal** in a separate binder(s) from their Price Proposal.

Factor 1 – Experience

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information under **Tab 1** of the Technical Proposal Volume II.

(1) Construction Experience:

Submit a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of five (5) construction projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as construction of a project to repair or construct approximately 5,000 linear feet or greater of full-width asphalt runway(s) with a construction value of approximately \$8M or greater. Projects must have been completed within approximately the last seven (7) years.

Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be completed within the past seven (7) 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 Experience Project Data Sheet (Exhibit 2) 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 RFP (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 or at least one of the Joint Venture partners. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract 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 project. The proposal shall also describe specific roles of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies in terms of the work it will either self-perform or manage on behalf of the Offeror in performance of the contract. Any projects submitted in excess of the five (5) will not be considered.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The requirement for acceptability will be based upon the projects submitted by the Offeror in its proposal, the Offeror must have at least two (2) and a maximum of five (5) construction projects that demonstrate ability to construct a project to repair or construct approximately 5,000 linear feet or greater of full-width asphalt runway(s) with a construction value of approximately \$8M or greater. Projects must have been completed within approximately the last seven (7) years.

Factor 2 – Safety

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information on the Safety Data Sheet (Exhibit 3): (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 [2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014], 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 [2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 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 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 between 1.0 and 1.1, whose TRC is greater than 4.0 and/or whose DART rate is between 2.0 and 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 between 1.0 and 1.1, whose TRC is greater than 4.0 and/or whose DART rate is between 2.0 and 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 – Small Business Utilization

Definitions: "SB" as used herein, is intended to include Small Business concerns, Small Disadvantaged Business concerns (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business concerns (WOSB), Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business concerns (HUBZone), Veteran-Owned Small Business concerns (VOSB), and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business concerns (SDVOSB). All small business programs are self-certifying programs with the exception of HUBZone certifications, see HUBZone SB Certifications below. Small Business Program requirements and definitions may be found in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), Part 19.

HUBZone SB Certifications: Offerors are reminded that HUBZone SB concerns must obtain formal certification from the Small Business Administration (SBA) if they expect to receive the evaluation benefits associated with the HUBZone SB programs either as a prime or subcontractor(s). For more information on the HUBZone SB certification requirements and available benefits, contact your local SBA representative. Certified HUBZone SB firms are listed on the U.S. Small Business Administration's Dynamic Small Business Search (DSBS) website at http://web.sba.gov/pro-net/search/dsp_dsbs.cfm. It is the responsibility of the prime contractor to periodically check the DSBS as certifications are subject to change.

SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total acquisition, the extent of work you will perform as the prime contractor. If submitting an offer as a Joint-Venture, identify the percentage of work each member will be responsible for and indicate the size status of each member, e.g., LB, SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, etc.

If you are a Large Business, submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan for this project in the format provided in Exhibit 4 for this factor, to include all information required in the attachment. If you are a Small Business, submit a subcontracting participation breakdown in the format provided in

Exhibit 5 for this factor. All proposers: To demonstrate commitment in using small business concerns, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan or subcontracting participation breakdown may list all subcontractors by name. If the proposed Small Business Subcontracting goals do not meet the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, include a detailed explanation describing the actions taken to arrive at that determination, along with an explanation for the goals that actually were proposed.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The following will be evaluated on all proposals:

- a. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates maximum practicable participation of SBs in terms of the total value of the acquisition, including options.
- b. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a commitment to use SB concerns that are specifically identified in the proposal, including but not limited to use of mentor protégé programs.
- c. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates SB participation in a variety of industries expected during the performance of work.
- d. The realism of the proposal to meet the proposed goals.

The following will be evaluated on proposals submitted by Large Business firms:

- a. The extent to which the proposal provides Small Business Subcontracting goals that meet or exceed the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, and utilization of AbilityOne CRP organizations. The proposed goals and NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are expressed as a percentage of total subcontracted values.

The minimum NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are as follows:

	FY 2015
SB	66.80%
SDB	17.27%
WOSB	15.30%
HUBZone	8.94%
SDVOSB	3.03%

b. The extent to which the proposer's Small Business Subcontracting Plan establishes reasonable efforts demonstrating the subcontracting targets can be met during the performance of the contract:

A copy of the blank forms to be used for offeror submission of Small Business Utilization are included as follows:

Exhibit 4 – Small Business Subcontracting Plan. To be submitted by Large Businesses

Exhibit 5 – Small Business Offeror Small Business Participation Breakdown. To be submitted by Small Businesses.

Factor 4 – Past Performance

(i) 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 1. If there is not a completed CCASS evaluation then submit Past Performance Questionnaires (Exhibit 1) 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, Adam Bradescu, adam.bradescu@navy.mil.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 1 – 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 (FAPIS), 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.

(ii) 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.”

(End of Summary of Changes)