

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE PAGE OF PAGES

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CODE		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER
	<input type="checkbox"/>	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER
	<input type="checkbox"/>	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 _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication 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 letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication 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 NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.)

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)
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	(Signature of Contracting Officer)

Previous edition unusable

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The Purpose of This Amendment Is:

- A. Extend the date of the Pre-Award Site visit to 18 July 2019; Update Clause 52.236.27/Alternate 1 Site Visit (Construction) to reflect this date.
 - B. Extend the due date for contract proposals to 1 August 2019.
 - C. Update Section M, para 3.1.1 Subfactor 1, Item C: change the aggregated days from 365 to 295 Calendar Days.
 - D. Update SF 1442 Section 13a: copies of proposals changes to 1.
 - E. Update Section L, para. 2.3.4.1: Change "Attachment G" to "Attachment 6."
 - F. Delete delivery information from CLIN 002 in its entirety; to be updated at a later date.
- All other Terms and Conditions remain the same.

Section F - Deliveries or Performance

The delivery information for the following CLIN(s) / SLIN(s) were deleted:

0002 - FTFA 17-1100 Install HVAC.

Period of Performance (POP) is 295 days after Notice to Proceed (NTP).

Place of Performance - F1T2BR - 796 CES CEOC

Section L - Instructions, Conditions, & Notices to Offerors or Quoters

Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:

PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

1.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS.

1.1 General Information

1.1.1 The offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested by these Instructions to Offerors and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the Specifications and Solicitation. Non-conformance with the instructions provided in these Instructions to Offerors may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation or rejection of an offer.

1.1.2 The proposal acceptance period is specified in Block 13, SF 1442, of this solicitation. By signing block 20B of the SF 1442, the offeror certifies that the proposal is valid from the due date and time listed in block 13A through the entire period specified in block 13D.

1.1.3 All referenced documents for this solicitation are available on the Federal Business Opportunities website at <http://www.fedbizopps.gov>. Potential offerors are encouraged to subscribe for real-time e-mail notifications when information has been posted to the website for this solicitation.

1.1.4 The Government reserves the right to revise or amend the specifications, drawings, or the solicitation prior to the proposal closing time. Such revisions or amendments will be communicated by amendments to the Request for Proposal (RFP) and posted in Federal Business Opportunities website (www.FBO.gov). If such amendments require material changes in quantities or prices, the proposal closing date may be postponed by enough days to enable offerors to revise their proposals.

In such cases, the amendment will include an announcement of the new closing date and time. Offerors MUST acknowledge all amendments in their proposal, either by completing SF 1442 Block

18, providing signed copies of the amendments with their proposal (Section III), or by separate letter which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers.

1.1.5 The Contracting Officer listed below is the Government's sole point of contact authority for this acquisition. Address any questions or concerns you may have to the Contracting Officer. Written requests for clarification may be sent to the Contracting Officer and Contracting Specialist at the following email addresses:

MSgt Duran Chapman, duran.chapman@us.af.mil

Brianna Miller, brianna.miller.3@us.af.mil

1.1.6 In accordance with FAR Subpart 4.8 (Government Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals. Unless the offeror requests otherwise, the Government will destroy extra copies of such unsuccessful proposals.

1.1.7 Debriefings. The Contracting Officer will promptly notify offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive range; whereupon, they may request and receive a debriefing in accordance with FAR 15.505. Offerors excluded from the competitive range may request a pre-award debriefing or they may choose to wait until after the source selection decision to request a post award debriefing. However, offerors excluded from the competitive range are entitled to no more than one debriefing for each proposal. The Contracting Officer will notify unsuccessful offerors in the competitive range of the source selection decision in accordance with FAR 15.506. Upon such notification, unsuccessful offerors may request and receive a debriefing. Offerors desiring a debriefing must make their request in accordance with the requirements of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

1.1.8 Discrepancies. If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the Contracting Officer in writing with supporting rationale as well as the remedies the offeror is asking the Contracting Officer to consider as related to the omission or error. The offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.

1.1.9. The Contracting Officer has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the Contracting Officer will review this determination and if, in the contracting officer's opinion, adequate price competition exists no additional cost information will be requested and certification under FAR 15.406-2 will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the contracting officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists; offerors may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the contracting officer to determine the reasonableness and affordability of the price.

1.1.10 Who Can Participate. Proposals may only be submitted by Small Business firms with an Industrial Classification System Code (NAICS) of 236220. At the time of initial contract offer and at time of award, each business must be a small business. In order to submit an offer on a contract, each business concern in a teaming agreement must be a small business under the designated NAICS size standard, and must also be small when combined in the aggregate of all teaming affiliates.

2.0 SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

2.1 The following instructions are to aid in the evaluation process.

Offerors are responsible for submitting proposals, and any revisions, and modifications, so as to reach the Government office designated in this solicitation by the time specified in this solicitation. Contractors shall submit proposals electronically to the Government as described in the following paragraphs.

Proposal Format: Offerors shall submit their proposals in electronic format via email or via the Army SAFE site to the points of contact (POC) listed below. The electronic copies of the proposal shall be submitted in a format readable and usable by Microsoft Office 2013 (MS Word, MS Excel, and PowerPoint) or PDF format viewable with standard Adobe Acrobat Reader X. Hidden fields, comments, macros, etc. shall be omitted, and read passwords on files shall not be used. The files shall be consistent and uniformly named to allow for easy distinction between required proposal submissions. Inclusion of company name or abbreviation is acceptable. No picture shots of MS Excel

spreadsheets shall be included. All MS Excel spreadsheets and formulas shall be accessible for review if submitted.

Email submission:

a) The subject line of all emails that comprise the proposal shall be formatted as follows:

Subject: FA282319RA012/Company Name/Email X of X (insert number of the email and total number of emails)

b) File Size: Individual emails shall not exceed 4MB in size. Offeror shall submit multiple emails as necessary to stay under the 4MB limit. Failure to stay under this limit may cause a rejection of the email.

Submission via Army SAFE:

Contractors may submit proposals electronically to the Government via the Army SAFE site (<https://safe.arl.army.mil/>). All documents other than MS Excel Worksheets must be submitted must be saved in .pdf format, and shall follow the instructions in 2.1.4 below. Title of the documents should include the offerors CAGE code (i.e., "Vol 1 Tech Proposal CAGE#").

Points of Contact for Proposal Submissions:

duan.chapman@us.af.mil

brianna.miller.3@us.af.mil

Submission of Bid Guarantee:

An electronic copy of the bid guarantee shall be submitted with the electronic proposal. Offerors shall submit a hard copy of the bid guarantee via mail or hand delivery. Offerors shall deliver or mail the bid guarantee no later than 3-business days after the date established for receipt of proposals. Mail or deliver to the address listed in Block 7 of the SF1442. Failure to submit a hard copy original of the bid guarantee may render the offer ineligible for award.

2.1.1 Any proposal, modification, or revision, that is received at the designated Government office after the exact time specified for receipt of proposals is "late" and will not be considered unless the Contracting Officer determines the criteria set forth in FAR 15.208 exists.

2.1.2 Proposals shall be complete, clearly presented, and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation as detailed in section M of this solicitation and for substantiating validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements but rather provide convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of the offeror's facilities and/or experience and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the offeror's proposal. Proposals shall be neat, indexed (cross-indexed as appropriate) and assembled in an orderly manner. Elaborate artwork, expensive paper/binding, and expensive visual and other presentation aids are neither necessary nor desired. Include only information that is relevant to this source selection.

2.1.3 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits.

2.1.3.1 A complete proposal shall consist of three (3) volumes:

Volume I: Technical Proposal;

Volume II (a), Past Performance; Volume II (b), Signed Teaming Agreement (if applicable); and Volume III, Price Proposal (Executed RFP Documents/Contractor Responsibility).

Specific guidance regarding the content of each volume will be discussed further below. Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal. When Evaluation Notices (ENs) are necessary, the Government will issue them by electronic means to prospective offerors. Page limitations may be placed on responses to these ENs and such limitations will be provided at the time the EN is issued.

2.1.4 Page Size, Format and Limit

2.1.4.1 A page is defined as each face of an 8 1/2" X 11" sheet of paper containing information.

Pages in excess of the maximum page limits defined below will be removed from the proposal and will not be evaluated. For the purposes of formatting, typing shall not be less than 10 pitch. Double-sided pages are acceptable and counted as 2 pages. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume.

Volume I - Technical Proposal: See paragraphs 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 for Page Limit/Format Criteria

Volume II (a) - Past Performance: See paragraph 2.3 for Page Limit/Format Criteria

Volume II (b) - Signed Teaming Agreement (required if proposing a teaming agreement): No Page limit

Volume III - Price Proposal (Executed RFP Documents/Contractor Responsibility): No Page Limit

2.1.4.2 All pages of each part shall be appropriately numbered and identified with the Request for Proposal (RFP) number. Pages in excess of the maximum will be removed from the proposal and will not be evaluated.

2.1.4.3 Cost of Pricing Related Data. All cost or pricing data shall be addressed ONLY in the Cost/ Price Proposal Volume.

2.1.4.4 Indexing. Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections. Indexing is not included in the page limitations.

2.1.4.5 Proposal Acceptance Period. The proposal acceptance period is specified in Block 13d of the Standard Form 1442 of the Solicitation.

2.2 Volume I - Technical Proposal.

Subfactor 1: Construction Progress Schedule: Prepare and submit a hard copy practicable construction progress schedule showing all necessary work elements to complete the project identified under this solicitation. The Contract Progress schedule must include all Options. At a minimum, the Contract Progress Schedule must include mobilization, submittals, demolition, major work elements by specification division (A major work element is defined as those elements identified in the specifications as a Division, e.g. Division 26 - Electrical.), final inspection, demobilization, and close-out documents. The schedule must be in the form of a progress chart of suitable scale to indicate appropriately the percentage of work scheduled for completion by any given date during the performance period. The submitted schedule must be developed using project scheduling software such as MS Project, Primavera, or any other comparable form. The AF Form 3064 (Contract Progress Schedule) may also be used for submission of this item. Offerors should only include the work elements necessary to complete the required work. This list is provided as a guide and is not all inclusive or exclusive. It is the offeror's responsibility to identify all necessary work elements.

Each offeror's progress schedule must address the following:

- Identification of separate work elements
- Order of work elements to include project phasing
- Number of days for each work element
- Identification of Long Lead Time Materials (Long lead items such as major HVAC equipment, electrical equipment, pre-engineered buildings, etc. must be specifically identified in the technical proposal. If there are no Long Lead Time Materials, the proposal must state that there are no Long Lead Time Materials).
- Identification of work elements in the critical path

The proposed schedule must include the activities which are consistent with those described within the project specifications and drawings and must not exceed the Government's maximum allowable performance period including Options (if any), as noted in FAR Clause 52.211-10. Typing shall not be less than 10 pitch. No Page Limit.

Offerors are encouraged to provide, as necessary, additional information to clarify their technical proposal. Additional information is limited to five (5) page, as defined at paragraph 2.1.4.2.1, and will be considered as part of their technical proposal. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal.

Failure to submit a Construction Progress Schedule will render the offer ineligible for award.

Subfactor 2: 50 Division Cost Estimate Worksheet - Offerors shall submit the 50 Division Cost Estimate Worksheet in accordance with the instructions listed below in paragraph 2.5.6 of Volume III, Price Proposal. Offer will be complete, accurate, and sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a clear technical understanding of the requirement. Evaluation of this area will be addressed under the Price Factor and the Technical Factor.

2.3 Volume II (a) --Past Performance Information. Offerors shall provide a maximum of five (5) total references on completed or current contracts (including Federal, State, local government and private) to demonstrate their ability to perform the proposed work as identified within the Specifications.

The Government's evaluation of past performance information will take into account only past performance information regarding the prime contractor's relevant experience, or subcontractors that

will perform major or critical aspects (See Teaming Agreements, para 2.4, when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition).

2.3.1 Provide a summary of the previous contracts described above, not to exceed 1 (one) page of past performance information per reference. The summary should explain what aspects of each contract are deemed recent and relevant as related to the requirements of this solicitation and in accordance with Section M. Failure to provide required relevancy description may impact the confidence rating, (i.e. aspects of previous projects should match work elements identified in the solicitation/specification). The summary should not exceed 1 (one) page per reference (maximum total of five (5) pages) and include:

- a) Name of project (Contract number, if applicable)
- b) Name and address of customer or Government agency
- c) Name, telephone, fax number and/or email of customer contact or contracting officer
- d) Dollar value
- e) Period of performance/Completion date
- f) Brief description of work performed, and why the effort is relevant
- g) Comments regarding any known performance deemed unacceptable to the customer, or not in accordance with the contract terms and conditions

2.3.2 RECENCY is defined as projects performed within the last six (6) years of the issue month of the solicitation. All references for work not performed within six (6) years of the issue month of the solicitation will not be evaluated.

2.3.3 RELEVANCY is defined as contracts involving:

- a) Projects involving the type of construction and work elements described in the attached Specifications. Renovate BLDG. 886, FTFA 17-1100.
- b) Cost within or exceeding project magnitude, as specified in Block 10 of the SF 1442 (RFP).

2.3.4 Past/Present Performance Questionnaires.

2.3.4.1 Offerors shall complete Attachment 6, Past Performance Questionnaire and mail, fax, or email the attached Past Performance Questionnaire to all past performance references and instruct them to return the completed questionnaire directly to the individual indicated in paragraph 2.3.4.1.1 below by email. Evaluators are only allowed to use the Attachment 6, Past Performance Questionnaire.

Past Performance Questionnaire submissions do not count against the page limits specified at para 2.1.4.2.1, Volume II (a). Altered or substituted questionnaires will not be evaluated. Also, Past Performance Questionnaires will only be accepted from Project Owners or their authorized representatives. Past Performance Questionnaires will not be accepted from Prime Contractors, Subcontractors, or Manufacturers. Offerors are responsible to ensure questionnaires are transmitted to their references, and to indicate which references the questionnaire was sent to (see paragraph 2.3.4.1.1 below).

2.3.4.1.1 Inform your references that they shall forward questionnaires directly to the Contracting Officer at the address below. Questionnaires must be received in the AFTC/PZIOC office not later than the closing date of the solicitation. Offerors are responsible for ensuring their references transmit the questionnaire to the Contracting Office to the below emails addresses:

brianna.miller.3@us.af.mil

duran.chapman@us.af.mil

2.3.4.2 In lieu of a Past/Present Performance Questionnaire, if a project is currently available in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), the contractor shall attach the evaluation to the questionnaire with the relevant solicitation number and submit hardcopy, along with the rest of the proposal package, to the Contracting Office (AFTC/PZIOC) no later than the official closing date and time of the solicitation.

2.3.5 Lack of any past performance will not automatically disqualify an offeror. See Section M for how lack of past performance will be evaluated.

2.3.6 If the offeror claims there is no past performance, then that status must be identified to the Contracting Officer not later than the date and time proposals are due from all offerors.

2.3.7 The Government shall consider past performance information on contracts obtained from any other sources when evaluating the offeror's past performance.

2.3.8 If Teaming Agreements are contemplated, the teaming members must provide complete information as to relevant and recent past performance information on previous teaming agreements.

If this is a first time teaming effort, each party to the teaming agreement must provide information on all relevant contracts as specified in paragraph 2.3.1. The maximum number of past performance references for the entire team shall not exceed a total of 10. See additional documentation requirements for Teaming Agreements in Volume II (b) paragraph 2.4 below.

2.4 Volume II (b) - Teaming Agreements (include only if applicable). Submit original and one (1) copy of signed Teaming Agreement.

2.4.1 If Teaming Agreements are contemplated they must comply with the appropriate Federal Regulations (13 C.F.R. Part 121 (Size Regulations), Part 124 (8(a) & SDB), Part 125 (Government Contracting Programs), and/or Part 126 (HUBZone). The Government will recognize the integrity and validity of contractor teaming agreements; provided, the agreements are identified and company relationships are fully disclosed in an offer. Teaming agreements will be incorporated into the contract. Failure to clearly define roles and/or provide a teaming agreement with a proposal shall make teaming agreements and related subcontractor past performance ineligible for evaluation and consideration of award. Teaming Agreements must provide the following information as part of their proposal, Volume II (b), not later than the date/time proposals are due:

2.4.1.1 Clearly establish roles of each party (who is prime and who is subcontractor, who is responsible for what tasks, contract administration, proposals, work management, etc.)

2.4.1.2 Provide for protection of competition-sensitive proprietary information (subcontractor past performance cannot be disclosed to the prime offeror without the subcontractor's consent). Provide a letter from all subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, consenting to the release of their past performance information to the prime contractor, only if it is being used as part of the past performance evaluation.

2.4.1.3 Identify each member's share of the prospective contract, 50/50, 51/49, etc.

2.4.1.4 Exclusivity. Assurance that the team member will not be replaced for the duration of the contract, any exceptions should be identified. Assurance that the team members are not teaming with another firm for the same procurement.

2.4.1.5 Statement of acknowledgement that the Prime Contractor is responsible for adhering to contract terms and conditions and daily management. The Prime Contractor is obligated to negotiate in good faith and responsible for conveying mandatory government terms and conditions to subcontractors.

2.4.1.6 The prime contractor shall remain fully responsible for contract performance, regardless of any teaming agreement between the prime contractor and its subcontractors.

2.4.1.7 At the time of initial contract offer and at time of award, each business must be a small business. In order to submit an offer on a contract, each business concern in a teaming agreement must be a small business under the designated NAICS size standard, and must also be small when combined in the aggregate of all teaming affiliates. Exception: Small businesses who are part of an SBA approved mentor and protege program in accordance with 13 CFR (S) 124.520 may submit an offer pursuant to 13 CFR (S) 121.103(h)(2)(iii).

2.5 Volume III - Price Proposal and Proposal Documents:

2.5.1 Submit the Standard Form 1442 and all pages originally included in the RFP.

2.5.2 Complete blocks 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 20a-c of the SF 1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award. An authorized official of the firm submitting the offer must sign and date the SF 1442 in block 20a-c. (In doing so, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP, Sections A through K).

2.5.3 Insert proposed prices in Section B for each Contract Line Item.

2.5.4 Complete representations and certifications in Section K or the System for Award Management (SAM). Ensure that both the FAR and DFARS representations and certifications are completed.

2.5.5 Submit the Financial Reference Worksheet with the top portion only completed.

2.5.6 Price Proposal - Offerors shall provide a price breakdown for the project utilizing the 50 Division Cost Estimate Worksheet. Use the 50 Divisions Cost Estimate CSI* Format tool to build your proposal. Offerors shall input the major work elements by specification division and provide pricing for those major work elements within each division sheet. The information from the division sheets

may not be all inclusive. Offerors are allowed to include any missing items from each division and are allowed to fill in other divisions that are not listed in the prefilled division sheets. Offer will be complete, accurate, and sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirement.

Offeror's are cautioned not to utilize Lump Sum or Total Pricing when pricing each specification division. Failure to breakout major work elements within a specification division may result in an unfavorable evaluation. The burden of proof for credibility of proposed pricing rests with the offeror. Evaluation of this area will be addressed under the Price Factor and the Technical Factor.

2.6 Relationship between Instructions and Evaluation. Your attention is directed to the functional relationship between Sections L and M of this solicitation. Section L provides information for the purpose of organizing the proposal and is not intended to be all inclusive. Section M describes evaluation factors for award. The Government evaluation of proposals will cover areas identified in Section M, proposals should address all such areas of evaluation.

2.7 Amendment of Solicitation Prior to Closing. The Government reserves the right to revise or amend the specifications, drawings, or the solicitation prior to the proposal closing time. Such reservations or amendments will be communicated by amendments to the Request for Proposal (RFP) and posted on the Federal Business Opportunities website (www.fbo.gov). If such amendments require material changes in quantities or prices, the proposal closing date may be postponed by enough days to enable offerors to revise their proposals. In such cases, the amendment will include an announcement of the new closing date and time. Offerors MUST acknowledge all amendments in their proposal, either by completing SF 1442 Block 18, providing signed copies of the amendments with their proposal (Section III), or by separate letter which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers.

2.8 Questions. All questions regarding this solicitation must be submitted in writing. Any questions and subsequent answers will be posted to the Federal Business Opportunities website (www.fbo.gov). It is the responsibility of the contractor to continuously monitor the site for updates.

To mitigate the risks associated with the cancellation of this solicitation due to untimely submission of questions, all questions must be submitted to the individual(s) listed below no later than close of business 5 calendar days after the site visit. Any questions submitted after this period may not be answered.

Contract Specialist: Brianna Miller, brianna.miller.3@us.af.mil

The following clauses were modified:

52.236-27 Alternate I - Site Visit (Construction). - (Alternate I) Feb 1995 hereby reads as follows: As prescribed in 36.523 , insert a provision substantially the same as the following: Site Visit (Construction) (Feb 1995) (a)The clauses at 52.236-2, Differing Site Conditions, and 52.236-3, Site Investigations and Conditions Affecting the Work, will be included in any contract awarded as a result of this solicitation. Accordingly, offerors or quoters are urged and expected to inspect the site where the work will be performed. An organized site visit has been scheduled for- __18 July 2019; 0900__ (c) Participants will meet at- __Building 886, Eglin AFB FL 32542__ For base access requests please contact Brianna Miller at brianna.miller.3@us.af.mil.

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

SECTION M

SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

1.0 BASIS FOR AWARD

1.1 General Information.

1.1.0 This is a competitive best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3, Source Selection, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Supplement (DFARS), and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Supplement (AFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>. By submission of its offer, the offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable.

1.1.1 This acquisition will utilize a Best Value approach. The Best Value technique chosen for this particular acquisition will be Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA).

1.1.1.1 Award will be made to a single offeror who is deemed responsible, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements, and whose proposal, judged by an overall assessment of the evaluation criteria and other considerations specified in this solicitation, is rated as technically acceptable, has an acceptable past performance, and represents the lowest price among those rated as technically acceptable with acceptable past performance. Trade-offs between cost/price and non-cost/price factors are not permitted. Unreasonably high, unbalanced, inaccurate or incomplete price proposals may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition.

1.1.1.2 Offerors are cautioned to follow the detailed instructions fully and carefully, as the Government reserves the right to make an award based on initial offers received, without discussion of such offers.

1.1.1.3 If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to establish a competitive range and hold discussions or negotiations with all offerors in the competitive range, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award. Offerors may be required to participate in telephone discussions or face-to-face oral discussions at the Contracting Office, AFTC/PZIOC, 308 W. D Ave, Ste 130 (Bldg 260) Eglin AFB, FL, 32542.

1.1.1.4 Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system.

2.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 Initially all offers shall be ranked in order of total price (to include any option pricing) from lowest to highest. In the event that the Government determines that it will not exercise any of the specified options the Government shall rank only the offers for the basic requirement(s) in order of price from lowest to highest. The lowest priced offer that conforms to the solicitation requirements will be evaluated. If the lowest priced offer has been determined technically acceptable and is judged to have an Acceptable Past Performance Confidence rating that offer represents the best value for the government and the Government then assesses Contractor Responsibility.

2.2 Contractor Responsibility. Once the apparent successful offeror is selected the Government will evaluate the offeror's financial capabilities and the specified criteria at FAR 9.104. In the case of a Teaming Agreement, the financial capabilities of both teaming partners will be evaluated, with the Prime Contractor's financial capability carrying significantly more weight than the subcontractor's.

A financial reference worksheet will be forwarded to the financial institution and a determination will be made regarding the apparent successful offerors financial capabilities and overall contractor responsibility using the specified criteria at FAR 9.104.

2.3 If the lowest priced offer has been determined technically acceptable, is judged to have an Acceptable Past Performance Confidence rating, and is determined responsible, that offer represents the best value for the Government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers. If the lowest priced offeror, is determined technically unacceptable, or judged to have an Unacceptable Past Performance

Confidence rating, or is non-responsible, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue in order by price until an offeror is determined technically acceptable, judged to have an Acceptable Past Performance Confidence rating and is responsible.

3.0 PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Evaluation Factors. The below evaluation factors will be used to evaluate proposals.

3.1 Technical Evaluation

3.1.1. Subfactor 1: Proposed Construction Progress Schedule - The offerors proposed contract progress schedule will be evaluated relative to overall coordination of the construction phase, to include ability to identify all necessary work elements of the specific project, the offerors ability to schedule the activities in a logical sequence, is within the time required in this solicitation, and covers the minimum requirements listed in below. The proposed schedule must include the activities which are consistent with those described within project specifications and drawings, and must not exceed the Government's maximum allowable performance period, as noted in SF 1442 (RFP), Block 11 and Section F, FAR Clause 52.211-10.

In accordance with Section L, Subfactor 1 will be evaluated against the following minimum requirements:

- a) The Construction Progress Schedule includes the following work elements: mobilization, submittals, demolition, major work elements identified in each specification division, final inspection, demobilization and close-out documents.
- b) The order of the work elements in the Construction Progress Schedule, to include project phasing, is logically sequenced.
- c) The number of days for each work element, when aggregated together, does not exceed 295 calendar days.
- d) Long Lead Time Materials (e.g. major HVAC equipment, electrical equipment, pre-engineered buildings, etc.) are identified in the proposal, or the proposal states that there are no Long Lead Time Materials.
- e) Proposal identifies those work elements within the critical path.

Failure to submit a Construction Progress Schedule will render the offer ineligible for award.

3.1.2. Subfactor 2: 50 Division Cost Estimate Worksheet: The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding of the contracts technical requirement through an analysis of the major work elements proposed by each offeror in each specification Division. In accordance with Section L, this Sub Factor will be evaluated against the following minimum requirements:

- a) The offeror submitted the 50 Division Cost Estimate Worksheet;
- b) The offeror has proposed the appropriate Divisions in relation to the specifications;
- c) Major work elements are identified within each Division and are sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirement; and
- d) Quantities for materials, labor and other services are not significantly understated or overstated.

Failure to submit a price for all CLINs in the price schedule or failure to submit and complete the 50 Division Cost Estimate Worksheet will render the offer ineligible for award.

Offeror's who fail to provide a breakdown of the major work elements within each Division and only provide a lump sum or other aggregate type of unit pricing consisting of a quantity of 1 for an entire Division will be evaluated as Unacceptable.

Technical Evaluators shall assign a rating of "ACCEPTABLE" or "UNACCEPTABLE" for each subfactor based on the minimum requirements established above. Ratings are defined as follows:

Adjectival Rating Description

ACCEPTABLE Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.

UNACCEPTABLE Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

If any subfactor is evaluated as unacceptable then the whole factor is considered unacceptable.

If all offerors are deemed technically unacceptable, the Government may establish a competitive range and enter into discussions.

3.2 FACTOR 2: Past Performance Evaluation.

3.2.1 Past/Present Performance Questionnaires and Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) Submissions-Volume II (a). Offerors shall provide information regarding past or current contracts (including Federal, State, local government, and private) for efforts similar to the

Government requirement as stated in this solicitation through either questionnaires or evaluations from PPIRS as identified in Section L, paragraph 2.3.

3.2.1.1 The Government evaluation of past performance information will take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects (See Teaming Agreement, Section L, paragraph 2.4 and Section M, paragraph 2.3.2, when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition. Each teaming offeror's past performance will be evaluated separately using the same evaluation methods described in paragraph 2.3.1 above. The Prime Contractor's past performance will be weighted significantly more than equal based on their overall responsibility for contract management. The separate ratings of each party in the Teaming Agreement will be combined to determine an aggregate PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE RATING as defined in paragraph 2.3.3 below.

3.2.1.2 The Government may evaluate information on problems identified and encountered on previous contracts and corrective actions taken by the offeror. The Government may use information previously obtained from past performance questionnaires or data independently obtained from other Government and commercial sources in the evaluation process.

3.2.1.3 In the event an Offeror submits a Past Performance Questionnaire and it is subsequently determined that the referenced project has been formally evaluated in PPIRS, the ratings in PPIRS shall take precedence.

3.2.1.4 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."

3.2.1.5 Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Offerors may be asked to clarify or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond.

3.2.1.6 The Government will evaluate the offerors ability to successfully complete projects based on demonstrated past and present experience that meet the requirements of Recent and Relevant.

3.2.1.6.1 RECENCY is defined as contracts performed within six (6) years of the issue month of the solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

3.2.1.7 RELEVANCY is defined as contracts involving:

- a) Projects involving the type of construction and work elements described in the attached Specifications and Drawings for project FTFA 17-1100 Renovate Building 886
- b) Cost within or exceeding project magnitude, as specified in Block 10 of the SF 1442 (RFP).

3.2.1.8 The following RELEVANCY ratings, apply:

PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS

Rating Definition

RELEVANT Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

NOT RELEVANT Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

3.2.1.9 **PERFORMANCE QUALITY ASSESSMENT:** The Government will consider the performance quality of recent, relevant efforts (how well the contractor performed on the contracts). For each recent past performance citation reviewed, the performance quality of the work performed will be assessed. The quality assessment consists of an in-depth evaluation of all past performance information available, regardless of its source. The Government will use the following quality levels when assessing recent, relevant efforts:

QUALITY ASSESSMENT DESCRIPTION

SATISFACTORY (S) During the contract period, contractor performance is substantially meeting (or substantially met) contract requirements. For any problems encountered, contractor took effective corrective action.

UNSATISFACTORY (U) During the contract period, contractor performance is not meeting (or did not meet) some contract requirements. For problems encountered, corrective action appeared only marginally effective, not effective, or not fully implemented. Customer involvement was required.

NOT AVAILABLE (N)* Quality and/or performance information is not available.

*In the event that performance quality information on a particular reference cannot be obtained by the Government, the past performance reference will not be used to determine the overall past performance rating.

3.2.2 Teaming Agreements. (Only if an offeror proposed a Teaming Agreement).

3.2.2.1 Each teaming offeror's past performance will be evaluated separately using the same evaluation methods described in paragraph 2.3.1 above. The Prime Contractor's past performance will be weighted slightly more than equal based on their overall responsibility for contract management. The separate ratings of each party in the Teaming Agreement will be combined to determine an aggregate PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE RATING as defined in paragraph 2.3.3 below.

3.2.3 PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE RATINGS. Based on the evaluation of all recent and relevant past performance for an offeror an overall Performance Confidence rating is assigned in accordance with FAR 15.305(a) (2). The Performance Confidence assessment represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offerors demonstrated past and present performance.

The ratings are defined as follows:

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATINGS

Rating Description

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. (See note below.)

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

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."

3.3. FACTOR 3: Price Evaluation and Proposal Documents

3.3.1 Offerors Proposal Documents will be evaluated for compliance with the solicitation instructions. Failure to comply with all instructions listed in the solicitation may be grounds for elimination from the competition. The contracting officer reserves the right to waive minor informalities.

3.3.2 Price. Price will be evaluated for reasonableness. Price will not be assigned an adjectival rating; however, proposed prices evaluated as unreasonably high may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from a competitive range. Price will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's proposed price is reasonable utilizing price analysis techniques in accordance with the guidelines in FAR 15.404-1(b).

3.3.2.1 Failure to submit a price for all CLINs in the price schedule will render the offer ineligible for award.

3.3.2.2 The Government reserves the right to obtain additional information concerning the price (cost) as necessary to obtain a better understanding of the price proposed. No proposal revisions will be allowed under these conditions. Request for such information is for clarification purposes only. This does not constitute and shall not be construed as discussions. If a minor clerical error has occurred, in which case the offeror may be given an opportunity to correct the minor error within the constraints of the "clarifications" process or the Contracting Officer in his/her sole discretion later determines discussions to be necessary or appropriate.

3.3.2.3 The Contracting Officer has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. However, if at any time during this competition the contracting officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists or only one offer is received; offerors

may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the contracting officer to determine the reasonableness and affordability of the price. Additionally, offerors may be required to provide additional cost information in accordance with FAR 15.403-4 and provide the certification under FAR 15.406-2.

4.0 Clarifications, Discussions, and Negotiations. The Government intends to evaluate offers and award a contract without discussions with offerors. Therefore, the offerors initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. In accordance with FAR 15.306, Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, relevance of past performance information). Communications (Clarifications) conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if later determined by the Contracting Officer to be necessary. Discussions or negotiations may be conducted with all offerors in the competitive range. Offerors may be required to participate in telephone discussions or in face-to-face oral discussions at the Contracting Office, AFTC/PZIOC, 308 W. D Ave, Ste 130 (Bldg 260) Eglin AFB, FL, 32542.