

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 21
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0009	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 01 Jun 2026	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FORT WORTH 819 TAYLOR ST. ROOM 3A28 FORT WORTH TX 76102	CODE W9126G	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. W9126G24R0124	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 25-Apr-2024	
			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 CONTRACT 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.) Project: Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build Vertical Construction for Fort Johnson by means of Indefinite Delivery-Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ), Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (MATOC) 8(a) Set-Aside to support facilities construction and repair: The purpose of this amendment is to: See SF30 Continuation Sheet(s) NOTE: Phase 2 Proposal Receipt date is 22 June 2026, 1:00 p.m., CT.				
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)		

**SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE
SUMMARY OF CHANGES
CHANGES TO SOLICITATION W9126G24R0124**

CHANGES TO BASE MATOC SPECIFICATIONS

1. Replacement Sections: The following sections are being replaced in their entirety in the BASE MATOC with amendment markings, bearing the notation W9126G24R0124-0009:

00 22 16 PHASE 1 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

PHASE II – SEED TASK ORDER

2. Replacement Sections: The following section is being updated and replaced, bearing the notation W9126G24R0124-0009:

00 21 30 SITE VISITS

End of Summary of Changes

SECTION 00 22 16 - SUPPLEMENTARY INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS SECTION 00 22 16 SECTION 00 22 16

SECTION 00 22 16 - Phase One Evaluation Criteria and Submission Instructions:

The following have been modified: 1. Overview

1.1. The Fort Worth District intends to award a target of (5) five 8(a) Business Vertical Construction Firm Fixed Price (FFP) Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (MATOC) primarily for use Fort Polk which will predominately support Fort Polk however, the MATOCs may be used to support other USACE Civil and Military programs and/or in support of Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and other Southwestern Division (SWD) Interagency & International Support (IIS) customers within SWD geographic boundaries. The maximum task order limitation is \$30,000,000 with a minimum task order limitation of \$2,500 and an overall capacity of \$95,000,000 for all task orders.

1.2. This 8(a) MATOC is one of a suite of Small Business Firm Fixed Price/Fixed Price Incentive Vertical Construction MATOC's envisioned by Fort Worth District, to include additional Small Business MATOC solicitations for Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), Small Business (SB) and HUBZone.

1.3. This solicitation will be evaluated under the Two-Phase Design Build Process. In Phase One, interested firms or joint venture entities (referred to as "Offerors") may submit certain specified performance capability proposals, demonstrating their capability to successfully execute the design-build/design-bid-build construction MATOC resulting from this solicitation. The Government will evaluate responsive proposals based on the Phase One evaluation criteria contained in Section 00 22 16.

1.4. After evaluation of the Phase One proposals, the Government, IAW FAR 36.306(b) will select a target of ten (10) of the most highly qualified offerors to be invited to submit proposals for Phase Two of the solicitation.

1.5. It is not intended for the Offerors to complete and provide price information in Phase One.

1.6. In Phase Two, the selected Offerors will submit a technical and price proposal for a seed or sample project task order. The Government will evaluate the Phase Two proposals in accordance with the criteria described in the Section 00 22 16.

1.7. Firms formally organized as design-build entities and design firms/construction contractors that have associated specifically for this acquisition may submit proposals. Associations may be as joint ventures or as key team subcontractors. Small Business Joint Ventures must be in compliance with 13 CFR 125.8.

1.8. All designs under this contract must be developed under the direct supervision of appropriately licensed professionals for each discipline involved.

1.9. Supplemental Price Breakdown. The Government ~~may~~ ~~intends~~ to request a Phase 2 price breakdown of the Contract Line items in excel format submitted through the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE). This information will be other than certified cost or pricing data". This information will not be needed sooner than three (3) working days after the proposal submission due date. This information may be required for the initial Phase 2 proposal and, if requested, for any revised proposals. This information is not an opportunity for an Offeror to revise its non-price or price proposal.

2. Basis of Award

2.1. Awards will be made based on the best overall (i.e., best value) proposals determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, will appropriate consideration given to the evaluation factors contained in Phase One, Section 00 22 16 and Phase Two, Section 00 22 16. To receive consideration for award, offerors must be evaluated and selected in Phase One to proceed in Phase Two. ~~Phase One factors will not carry forward into Phase Two for inclusion in the best value trade-off analysis.~~ Upon completion of Phase Two, offerors whose proposal(s) represent the best value to the Government will be selected for award. The evaluation of Phase Two proposals will be determined using the Trade-off Process in accordance with FAR. This process permits

trade-offs among cost or price and non-cost factors and allows the Government to accept other than the lowest priced proposal.

Offerors are cautioned that MATOC awards and seed (if applicable) project task order award may not necessarily be made to the lowest price offered. The source selection authority (SSA) will give due consideration to all the factors and their relative order of importance but reserves the right to make an award to other than the lowest priced offeror, or to other than the offeror with the highest technical rating or to reject all offers--if the SSA determines that to do so would result in the best value to the government. If there is a lower priced, conforming offer(s), the SSA must determine that the added value of a more expensive proposal for the initial task order would justify award to that Offeror. The Offeror receiving the first award will receive either the task order for the seed project, if funds are available, or a minimum guaranteed task order with the award of the basic IDIQ. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

- 2.2. The source selection process will be conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15 and FAR Subpart 36.3. Offers will be evaluated using the criteria listed below to include Phase One and Phase Two, Section 00 22 16. Non-compliance with the solicitation requirements may raise serious questions regarding an Offeror's technical ability or past performance and may be groups to eliminate the proposal from consideration for contract award. Failure to include all information requested may adversely affect the evaluation. A proposal that merely reiterates or promises to accomplish the requirements of the solicitation will be considered unacceptable. A proposal that is orderly and sufficiently documented will be easy for the Government to understand and will enable the Government to perform a thorough and fair evaluation.

3. EVALUATION APPROACH:

- 3.1. All proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the factors stated in the solicitation for each respective phase. By submitting a proposal in response to this solicitation, offerors agree to comply with all terms and conditions contained in the solicitation. In this solicitation, the words "offer", and "proposal" are used interchangeably. (See definition of "offer" at FAR 2.101). Except for any portions of the offeror's proposal incorporated into the resulting contract by reference, the terms and conditions included in the solicitation, including any amendments, shall take precedence over the offeror's proposal.

- 3.2. Proposal Evaluation: The Government intends to make award after completion of Phase Two evaluations without holding discussions with offerors. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Source Selection Authority or the Contracting Officer determines them to be necessary. Therefore, offers are encouraged to include their best technical terms and complete past performance information in the initial offer(s).

- 3.3. Source Selection Decision: The Source Selection Authority (SSA), independently exercising prudent business judgment, will make the source selection decision based on the proposals that meet the requirements of the Government as described herein.

- 3.4. APPLICABILITY: This section is applicable to offerors submitting proposals in response to the solicitation for Phase One.

- 3.5. NOTICE: Offerors must be selected to proceed with Phase Two of the solicitation to be considered for award. Offerors who are not selected to participate in Phase Two are ineligible for a MATOC award.

3.6. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

- 3.6.1. For submissions with page limitations, the pages furnished for organizational purposes only, such as a "Table of Contents" or divider tabs, are not included in the page limitation.

- 3.6.2. Failure to include all required information may cause the proposal to be considered nonresponsive and not considered further for award.

3.6.3. Phase One proposals shall be organized by sections indicated in the table below:

Base MATOC- Phase One Proposal Evaluation Factors			
FACTORS	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
Not an Evaluated Factor	Vol. 1, Tab A	Cover Letter, SF 1442, Proposal Data/Acknowledgement Sheet, Representations and Certifications	Not Rated
FACTOR 1	Vol. 1, TAB B	<u>Factor 2</u> - Past Performance	Most Important Factor
FACTOR 2	Vol. 1, TAB C	<u>Factor 2</u> - Organizational & Technical Approach	Factor 2 is less important than Factor 1 but more important than Factor 3
FACTOR 3	Vol. 1, TAB D	<u>Factor 3</u> - IDIQ Capability	Factor 3 is the least important Factor

4. PHASE ONE EVALUTION PROCEDURES/RATING SYSTEM

4.1. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

- 4.1.1. A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will evaluate responsive proposals and identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies for each evaluation factor. The evaluation will be based on the content of the proposal, proposal corrections and in the case of past performance, any information obtained from other sources, e.g., past performance information. The SSEB will not consider any proposal incorporated by reference, except as expressly allowed by this solicitation.
- 4.1.2. Offerors are cautioned to put forth their best efforts for the submission and to furnish all information clearly to allow the Government to determine their performance capability. Offerors should not assume that they would have an opportunity to clarify or correct anything in their proposal after submitting.
- 4.1.3. The Government reserves the right to allow proposal revisions in accordance with FAR 15.306, Exchanges with Offerors after Receipt of Proposals, if deemed necessary to determine the most highly qualified Offerors to proceed into Phase Two.
- 4.1.4. After evaluation, the SSEB will assign an adjectival rating to each factor. The ratings will reflect the Government's confidence in each Offeror's ability to perform the requirements. Based upon the ratings, the Government will select the most highly rated offerors to participate in Phase Two of the solicitation.

4.2. EVALUATION AND RATING SYSTEM

- 4.2.1. General: The Government will review the proposals and rate the quality of each evaluation factor. The SSEB will rate each proposal against the specified evaluation criteria in the Solicitation requirements.
- 4.2.2. Review Write-up: The Government will support each rating with a narrative, separately listing all strengths or advantages, weaknesses or disadvantages, deficiencies, and required clarifications.

4.2.3. Rating System: After listing proposal strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies, the SSEB will assign an adjectival rating of "Outstanding", "Good", "Acceptable", "Marginal", or "Unacceptable" to each factor except Past Performance. The rating will reflect the Government's assessment of each Offeror's technical ability, as demonstrated in its proposal, to perform the requirements stated in the RFP.

4.3. TECHNICAL RATINGS DEFINITIONS:

4.3.1. Findings Definitions:

Deficiency. A deficiency is a material failure of a proposal to meet a government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Significant Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001

Strength. An aspect of a proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Significant Strength. An aspect of a proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Uncertainty. An aspect of a proposal for which the intent of the Offeror is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission, or mistake).

4.3.2 COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS DEFINITIONS:

Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is not awardable.

Adjectival Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

4.4. PAST PERFORMANCE RATINGS DEFINITIONS.

4.4.1. PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS:

Adjectival Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the 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.

4.4.2. CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT DEFINITIONS:

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

- 5. VOLUME 1, TAB A
- 5.1. Cover Letter. The proposal cover letter shall include the following:
 - 5.1.1. Solicitation number;
 - 5.1.2. Offeror name, address, telephone number and email address;
 - 5.1.3. Names, titles, telephone numbers and email addresses of persons authorized to negotiate on the Offeror's behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation;
 - 5.1.4. Names, titles, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal;
 - 5.1.5. Statement indicating whether the firm is a 8(a) small business under the size standard for NAICS 236220. The size standard is \$45,000,000.00 in average annual receipts.
- 5.2. Standard Form (SF) 1442, Solicitation, Offer and Award. Complete, in its entirety, the "Offeror" portion of the SF 1442 and SF 30 (as applicable). An official having the authority to contractually bind your company must sign the SF 1442 (and SF 30 as applicable) in accordance with the instructions at FAR 4.102.
- 5.3. Submit the completed Proposal Data/Acknowledgement Sheet (Attachment 1) and the following documents (if applicable):
 - 5.3.1. Joint Venture Requirement. Parties wishing to propose as a joint venture shall submit a fully executed copy of the joint venture agreement with the proposal. The joint venture agreement shall be executed in accordance with FAR 4.102.
 - 5.3.2. Each joint venture partner shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Contracting Officer that its Board of Directors has approved its participation in the joint venture and by an instrument of similarly binding character in the case of an unincorporated entity. For joint ventures seeking to qualify for the award under the Mentor Protégé Program as the 8(a) small business category applicable to this solicitation, ensure that your joint venture agreement complies with applicable Small Business Administration regulations. The written agreement by the joint venture shall be furnished with the proposal designating one firm with the authority to bind the other member(s) of the joint venture. All members of the joint venture shall sign the required bid bond (if invited to submit a proposal during Phase Two). In addition, the joint venture must be registered in SAM as a joint venture in order for an award to be made. Failure to comply with the foregoing requirements may eliminate the proposal from further consideration.

- 5.3.3. If the Offeror is a Limited Liability Company, a copy of the Articles of Organization and Operating Agreement shall be included in the proposal submission.
- 5.3.4. If the Offeror has teaming agreements, a copy shall be submitted in the proposal submission.
- 5.3.5. Designer Commitment: The Designer of Record (DOR) teaming with the Offeror shall provide a fully executed signed teaming agreement and/or fully executed signed letter of commitment in order to be considered as part of this evaluation.
- 5.3.6. Representations and Certifications: Offerors shall verify by submission the representations and certifications have been completed in <https://www.sam.gov> in accordance with FAR 52.204-8 <AM#0006>(DEVIATION 2025O0003/ DEVIATION 2025-O0004)</AM#0006> and DFARS 252.204-7007 ALT I. Submit the representations and certifications not covered in <https://www.sam.gov> that are included in Section 00 45 00 of this solicitation, under this tab.
- 5.4. Offerors failing to submit the required (or applicable) documents in 5.3 will be deemed deficient and their proposals will not be further evaluated or considered for award.

6. Volume 1, TAB B □ FACTOR 1 □ PAST PERFORMANCE

6.1. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

6.1.1. Attachments 2-4: General Instructions. The Offeror and their designer shall each demonstrate past performance through the submission of similar projects, using Attachment 2 Past Performance Projects Table, Attachment 3 Construction - Past Performance Assessment Worksheet, and Attachment 4 Designer - Past Performance Assessment Worksheet. If any firm has multiple functions or divisions, limit the project examples to those performed by the division or unit submitting the offer. Design firms may list prime contractors they have worked for or Government, private or commercial customers. If projects were design-build, identify them as such.

6.1.1.1 Attachment 2: Past Performance Projects Table. Both the prime contractor and the design firm(s) shall each submit up to ten (10) projects on the Past Performance Projects Table (Attachment 2). Attachment 2 may be formatted to an 8.5"x11" or 11"x17" page size. The Construction Projects Table and Design Projects Table within Attachment 2 may be provided on separate pages, with each table sized to fit on a single page. There is no page limitation for Attachment 2.

6.1.1.2 Attachments 3 and 4: Past Performance Assessment Worksheets (Design and Construction). Both the prime contractor and design firm shall submit a Past Performance Assessment Worksheet (Attachment 3 or 4) for each project submitted on the Past Performance Projects Table (Attachment 2). Limit Attachments 3 and 4 to two (2) pages for each project.

6.1.1.3 Attachment 5: Construction IDIQ Experience Table. An Offeror with past performance on Construction Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contracts, such as a Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC), Multiple Award Construction Contract (MACC), etc., shall demonstrate the experience using the Construction IDIQ Experience Table (Attachment 5). Attachment 5 may be formatted to an 8.5" x 11" or 11x17 page size. The prime contractor shall provide experience on Construction IDIQ contracts with task orders <AM#0003> completed </AM#0003> <AM#0003> awarded </AM#0003> within six (6) years from the issue date of this solicitation; for Construction IDIQ contracts awarded more than six (6) years prior, limit the task order information to task orders awarded within the six (6) years window. The submitted contracts for Attachment 5 are in addition to the projects submitted under paragraph 6.1.1.1. In order for the experience to be considered relevant for the prime contractor, the offeror must be the IDIQ prime contract holder, not a subcontractor performing on the contract. The Construction IDIQ Experience Table is applicable only to the entity(ies) identified as the "Offeror".

6.1.2. Attachment 6: Past Performance Questionnaires. The Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation (Attachment 6) is provided for the Offeror to submit to the client for each design project and each construction project the Offeror included for Factor 1, Past Performance that does not have an interim or final Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation or is a non-Federal Government

project. Correct phone numbers and email addresses for the client point of contact must be included on each PPQ. Completed PPQs shall be submitted with the proposal, however, if the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror shall complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If any negative past performance information is received to which the Offeror has not an opportunity to respond, the contractor will be given an opportunity to provide rebuttal. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Mr. Demetrius Brooks via e-mail at Demetrius.D.Brooks@usace.army.mil prior to the proposal closing date.

- 6.1.2.1 Re-use of PPQs. Offerors are permitted to include completed PPQs previously submitted for other solicitations in lieu of requesting new PPQs from clients. In these cases, the Offeror shall submit each PPQ in its entirety to be considered for evaluation. Only referencing the solicitation and PPQ previously submitted for other solicitations without including the completed PPQ in the proposal submission shall not be evaluated or considered. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.
- 6.1.2.2 PPQs used only in absence of CPARS. Offerors should not request PPQ on projects that have interim or final CPARS evaluations. If an interim or final CPARS evaluation exists, and a PPQ is provided for the same project, the CPARS evaluation will supersede the PPQ for evaluation as the official past performance record. If a CPARS record and PPQ exist for a particular project and the ratings conflict; the CPARS record shall govern.
- 6.1.3. Other Sources of Past Performance Information for Submission. Offerors may submit, but are not required to submit, additional past performance information. There is no page limitation for additional sources of past performance information.
- 6.1.3.1 Corrective Actions. Offerors may submit information on past performance issues and corrective actions taken to prevent these issues from reoccurring. Submittals should discuss whether these corrective actions have been implemented on contracts awarded subsequent to the performance issues, the effectiveness of the corrective actions, and contact information for the subsequent contracts.
- 6.1.3.2 Awards. Offerors may submit performance recognition documents received within the last six (6) years from the date of this solicitation such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of recommendation or commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition relevant to the submitted projects to demonstrate the Offeror's performance capabilities and customer satisfaction.
- 6.1.4. Burden Rests with Offeror. The Government may elect to consider data from other sources. However, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

6.2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 6.2.1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's record of past performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the solicitation projects to be procured. The aspects of the past performance evaluation consist of recency, relevancy, and the overall confidence rating. Each recent project submitted will be evaluated to determine its relevancy based on similarity of size, scope, and complexity to the solicited requirement. The Government will then review Offerors' performance on recent, relevant projects to determine an overall confidence rating at the factor level.
- 6.2.2. RECENCY DETERMINATION: The recency determination will assess how recent each submitted project is. The Government will consider contract or task order has been completed within six (6) years of the solicitation issuance date to be recent. If a project is not recent, the Government will not evaluate it further.

<AM#0003>NOTE: For design, the Government only accepts completed designs. For design-bid-build design contracts, the Government will allow design contracts completed within six years of the solicitation date. For design-build projects, the Government will consider for design: (1) the design has been completed within 6 years of the solicitation date (status of construction is not important if this project is only being considered for

design), or (2) the design is completed, and the DB construction contract was completed within 6 years of the solicitation issue date.<AM#0003>

6.2.3. RELEVANCY DETERMINATION:

- 6.2.3.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance on recent projects to determine relevance of the projects to this solicitation. Offerors are not required to demonstrate experience in all aspects of relevancy. It is not intended for a single project to meet all aspects of relevancy. Projects will be considered relevant to this procurement if they are similar in type, scope, complexity, and magnitude to the projects to be completed under the anticipated MATOC that is the subject of this solicitation. Projects anticipated under this procurement will consist of both new construction and renovation with the majority anticipated to be renovation.
- 6.2.3.2 The portfolio of projects identified on the Past Performance Projects Table (Attachment 2) and described in the Past Performance Assessment Worksheets (Attachments 3 and 4) will be utilized to evaluate relevancy for design and relevancy for construction, respectively.
- 6.2.3.3 Types of Relevant Projects. New construction or renovation of the following facility types within a range of \$1 million to \$30 million in project value will be considered relevant:
- 6.2.3.3.1 Aircraft Maintenance Hangars,
 - 6.2.3.3.2 Headquarter Building/Office Buildings,
 - 6.2.3.3.3 Child/Youth Development Centers,
 - 6.2.3.3.4 Physical Fitness Centers,
 - 6.2.3.3.5 Operations Centers,
 - 6.2.3.3.6 General Purpose Maintenance Shops,
 - 6.2.3.3.7 Barracks,
 - 6.2.3.3.8 Vehicle Maintenance Shops,
 - 6.2.3.3.9 Vehicle Access Control Point/Checkpoints,
 - 6.2.3.3.10 Wash Racks, or
 - 6.2.3.3.11 Other.
- 6.2.3.4 Additional Consideration. The following benchmarks will be used to assist in determining whether a contractor has established a wide variety of experience:
- 6.2.3.4.1 Multi-discipline project experience with at least four (4) different facility types,
 - 6.2.3.4.2 Experience with projects in each of the three (3) Project Value ranges (\$1 million to \$7.5 million, \$7.5 million to \$20 million, and \$20 million to \$30 million), or
 - 6.2.3.4.3 Multi-discipline new construction or renovation projects with at least three (3) of the project attributes: new HVAC/HVAC renovation, new roof/roof replacement, new interior buildout/interior renovation, or new life safety/fire protection renovations.
 - 6.2.3.4.4 Projects performed as a prime contractor rather than as a subcontractor,

6.2.3.4.5 Design Build projects,

6.2.3.4.6 Construction IDIQ contract experience as the prime contractor,

6.2.4. CONFIDENCE EVALUATION:

6.2.4.1 The confidence rating assesses the risks associated with each Offeror's proposal, likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the solicitation based on the Offeror's demonstrated performance on recent contracts. SSEB members and the SSA may use personal knowledge or information from other sources in its evaluation of an Offeror's past performance, provided such information is consistent with the established evaluation criteria of the RFP.

Offerors that have no relevant performance record will be given a neutral confidence rating.

6.2.4.2 More relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance. Contracts with lower degrees of relevance will not be as strong of predictors of likely future contract performance success and will typically have less influence on the final past performance confidence rating. Projects that have little or no relevance typically do not influence the performance confidence rating; however, any contracts with adverse past performance could reflect larger company-wide concerns and may have impact upon the past performance confidence rating.

6.2.4.3 Because this solicitation is for a MATOC, a wide variety of positive past performance experience may result in a greater confidence rating. The following benchmarks will be used to assist in determining whether a contractor has established a wide variety of experience:

6.2.4.3.1 Multi-discipline project experience with at least four (4) different facility types,

6.2.4.3.2 Experience with projects in each of the three (3) Project Value ranges (\$1 million to \$7.5 million, \$7.5 million to \$20 million, and \$20 million to \$30 million).

6.2.4.4 The SSEB will review the past performance information available, to include CPARS and other past performance information deemed relevant, to determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment. If any firm has multiple functions or divisions, the Government will only evaluate past performance of the division or unit submitting the offer. If the Government cannot establish the Offerors relevant past performance, it reserves the right to utilize the PPQs to conduct telephone interviews on any source it deems relevant to the evaluation. Owners/references may be asked to comment on items such as quality of construction, timeliness, management of the work, subcontractor management, including timely payment to subs or suppliers, safety, level of support for such things as as-built documentation, O&M manuals, training, correcting construction errors, warranty work, etc. The Government's evaluation is not limited to past performance information on the cited example projects.

6.2.4.5 In determining the performance confidence rating for Past Performance, the degree of relevancy of all the considered efforts; the overall performance record of the Offeror on each contract assessed; number and severity of problems, the demonstrated effectiveness of corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised); and trend data will be considered. Contracts which are comparatively more recent may be better predictors of likely future success than older contracts. The resulting relevant/recent assessment conclusions will then be combined, along with the assessed quality of performance on prior contracts, to arrive at a single performance confidence rating for the Past Performance Factor.

6.2.4.6 The confidence rating will be established based on the past performance of the firms or that of its predecessor, if applicable. An entity may not establish past performance based on the past performance of its key personnel apart from that of the entity.

6.2.4.7 In the case of firms for which there is no information on past contract performance, or where past contract

performance information is not available, or has been determined not to be recent or relevant, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past contract performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). In this case, the firm's past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence rating of "neutral." Although the Government may not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the Government may determine that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" past performance rating. Failure to meet submission requirements may also result in a neutral confidence assessment rating for the past performance submission.

- 6.2.4.8 If negative information is received, the Offeror will be given an opportunity to provide input as required by FAR 15.306(b)(1)(i). CPARS that are part of the official record will be utilized as if the Offeror has already had an opportunity to respond.
- 6.2.4.9 The Government shall utilize CPARS, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), and any other contractor performance information deemed relevant, and within six (6) years of completion for construction and architect-engineer contracts to assess confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform in accordance with FAR 42.150
- 6.2.4.10 Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through CPARS, using all CAGE/UEI number of team members (Partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary/ affiliate) identified in the offeror's proposal, inquires of owner representative(s), FAPIS, Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

7. VOLUME 1, TAB C - FACTOR 2 - ORGANIZATIONAL & TECHNICAL APPROACH

7.1. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

This Factor addresses the Offeror's organization and intended technical approach to executing the contract. Limit to fifteen (15) pages or less for this factor. The organizational chart(s) may be formatted to an 8.5" x 11" or 11x17 page size. Clearly but concisely describe the organizational and technical approach as required below.

- 7.1.1. Organization
 - 7.1.1.1 Organizational Chart and Narrative: Submit an organizational chart and corresponding narrative describing team members, their resources, how their resources will be utilized, and their roles and responsibilities between the prime and all key subcontractors and within the joint venture if applicable. Provide a separate organizational chart of the proposed design-build team. The chart shall show both the construction and design team members by position, not by name. If the Offeror elects to use multiple design teams, include an organization chart for each separate team. Do not submit resumes as they will not be evaluated or considered.
 - 7.1.1.2 Teaming Experience: Submit a narrative to describe any previous teaming experience between current team members.
- 7.1.2. Collaborative Approach for Design-Build: Describe interactions within the team and with the Corps of Engineers during the design and construction.
 - 7.1.2.1 Submit a narrative on how the design-build team will manage collaboration and coordination between design and construction team members, manage Government comments, and how subcontractors will be integrated into design. Reference Section 01 33 16.00 10.
 - 7.1.2.2 Submit a narrative to discuss how the configuration management system (refer to 01 33 16.00 10) will track and control design evolution and changes during design for quality control and to facilitate quicker Government reviews. The narrative shall discuss how the Offeror will maintain configuration management of the design during construction, including control and approval of revisions to the accepted design.

- 7.1.2.3 Submit a narrative to describe the role and interaction of the design team with the construction team during construction, addressing, at a minimum, requests for information; shop drawing and submittal reviews and approvals; progress meetings; site visits, if any; contract completion, closeout, as-built and completion documentation.
- 7.1.3. Planning and Scheduling: Submit a narrative detailing the team's project scheduling capabilities for design and construction. Identify the system the offeror(s) will utilize and how the team will implement the schedule to manage design and construction. The Government is looking for ways the design-builder will streamline design and construction, manage labor and other resource constraints. In Phase Two, the Offeror will develop a summary schedule. In Phase One, the Government is interested in the Offeror's planning and scheduling capabilities. Reference Section 01 32 01.00 10.
- 7.1.4. Quality Control: Submit a narrative describing the team's capabilities to assure quality control. Describe the quality control approach, corporate systems, and capabilities to maintain quality control of the design and construction. Provide information on how the Offeror's Quality Control Organization will handle internal and external requests for information, shop drawings, submittal reviews, progress meetings, site visits, contract completion, closeout, as-builts, and completion documentation. Describe experience with the Resident Management System (RMS Contractor Mode and/or RMS Quality Control System, QCS). After task order award, the selected design- builder will submit a Quality Control Plan for Government Approval. Do not submit a Quality Control Plan as part of this Factor. Reference Sections 01 45 00 and 01 45 00.15 10.
- 7.2. EVALUATION CRITERIA:
- 7.2.1. Organization: The Government will evaluate the clarity and strength of the overall organization, the structure and staffing to execute the entire scope of work. Joint venture participants' contribution to the project should be commensurate with their skills and background. Failure to submit the identified narrative(s) and organizational chart(s) for items in 7.1.1 will be evaluated as a deficiency. Previous teaming by the construction contractor and design firm(s) will be considered a strength.
- 7.2.2. Collaborative Approach for Design-Build: The Government will evaluate the integration of the design and construction firms and the staff during design and construction. The constructor must be actively involved in the design process (see "Design-Build Construction Contracts, UAI Clause 5152.236- 9011" in Section 00 72 00). The Offeror must have an effective configuration management system to control and track revisions to the design (See Section 01 33 16.00 10). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's understanding of the design process and the roles of the designers of record and the Government reviewers. The Government will evaluate the role of the designer in maintaining design integrity throughout the process, including its key roles during construction. Failure to submit any of the identified narratives in 7.1.2 will be evaluated as a deficiency.
- 7.2.3. Planning and Scheduling: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's scheduling capabilities to develop and implement an integrated design- build schedule and the systems that will be utilized to implement the schedule. The Government places a higher value on an offer that provides methods to streamline construction and manage labor and other resource constraints to control costs and supports an achievable and flexible schedule. Failure to submit any of the identified narratives in 7.1.3 will be evaluated as a deficiency.
- 7.2.4. Quality Control: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's capabilities and understanding of the contractually required quality control processes for both design and construction. The Government places value upon continued participation by the designers of record during the construction quality control process. The Government may provide additional consideration for experience with Resident Management System (RMS Contractor Mode and/or RMS Quality Control System, QCS). Failure to submit any of the identified narratives in 7.1.4 will be evaluated as a deficiency.

8.1. VOLUME 1, TAB D - FACTOR 3 - IDIQ CAPABILITY

8.1. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

Limit this Factor to ten (10) pages. The letter from the surety is excluded from this page limitation.

8.1.1. Task Order Procedures and Task Order Management. Submit a narrative to describe the offeror's understanding of task order procedures and plan and capabilities to respond to the Government's notification of a proposed Task Order requirement. Include a detailed plan and capabilities to estimate, prepare, and submit Task Order proposals within the range anticipated under the awarded contract.

8.1.2. Managing Subcontractors. Submit a narrative to describe your plan for managing subcontract performance, acquisition, execution, and administration. Discuss planning for acquiring and engaging local subcontractors and workforce. Explain any experience in developing relationships with subcontractors where you do not have previous working experience.

8.1.3. Self-Performance. Submit a narrative providing a general description of the work the Offeror will self perform to be compliant with the requirements of set-aside subcontracting limitations per 52.219-14(e) under set-aside award conditions, small businesses are required to perform minimum levels of work when they receive a federal contract.

8.1.4. Bonding Capability. Contractors are expected to be able to bond concurrent task orders with an aggregate total of \$30 million at any given time, to include bonding a single task order up to \$30 million; describe your resources available and your capabilities to support concurrent task orders with an aggregate total of \$30 million, including a single \$30 million task order. Evidence of Bonding Capacity: Submit a current letter of commitment from a surety, signed by an officer or agent authorized to bond that identifies the offeror's current and available bonding capacity for a single project and the aggregate capacity.

8.2. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

8.2.1. Task Order Procedures and Task Order Management: The Government will evaluate the clarity, adequacy, capabilities, and strengths of the Offeror's understanding of task order procedures, plans for responding to task order requirements.

8.2.2. Managing Subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability managing subcontractors to include performance, acquisition, execution, and administration.

8.2.3. Self-Performance. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's capability and intent to comply with the applicable requirements for self-performance of work by the prime contractor. Failure to submit the required narrative(s) in 8.1.1, 8.1.2, and 8.1.3 will be evaluated as a deficiency.

8.2.4. Bonding Capability. Single Contract and Aggregate Bonding Capacity: In order for the Offeror to have a satisfactory bonding capacity, they must show evidence of current and available bonding capacity of \$30 million for a single project and at least \$30 million aggregate capacity. Failure to submit evidence of bonding capacity will be evaluated as a deficiency. Proposals with letters of commitment that lack a showing of current and available bonding capacity for the single and aggregate amount identified in 8.1.4 will be deemed unacceptable. D. 00 22 16 - Phase Two Evaluation Criteria and Submission Instructions:

VOLUME 2 - PHASE TWO EVALUATION FACTORS

Base MATOC- Phase Two Proposal Evaluation Factors			
FACTORS	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
FACTOR 4	Vol. 2, TAB A	Design & Construction Technical	Most Important Factor
FACTOR 5	Vol. 2, TAB B	Summary Schedule	Factor 5 is less important than Factor 4
FACTOR 6	Vol. 3	Price (Standard Form 1442 and Proposal Bid Schedules)	The evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price

<AM#0006> ~~**Detailed Phase 2 evaluation factors will be provided in Phase 2**~~ </AM#0006>

<AM#0006> 9. VOLUME 2, TAB B, FACTOR 4, DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION TECHNICAL

9.1. Submission Requirements: The offeror shall submit a narrative that demonstrates its technical approach to the design of the project. The narrative shall demonstrate your understanding of issues that may affect the design effort and your plan to address each issue during the design phase of the task order.

Refer to Sections 01 00 00.00 44, 01 30 00, 01 33 16.0010, 01 57 20.00 10, and appendices. Factor 4 shall be limited to 20 pages. The narrative shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

i) ~~<AM#0009> Discuss, by discipline, the design and construction of the Animal Building, to include the following items. For each item, address base proposal requirements and option requirements, as applicable. Discussions shall also address maintenance considerations, operability, durability, sustainability, and energy consumption, as applicable. </AM#0009>~~

<AM#0009> Discuss, by discipline, the design and construction of the Animal Building, to include the following items:

Offerors shall describe, by discipline, their design and construction approach for the Animal Building. The narrative shall address both base and option requirements, as applicable. At a minimum, the proposal shall discuss the following elements:

- 1) Dog Kennel Enclosure — Approach to enclosing the existing kennels, including treatment of the roof structure, integration with existing conditions, and modifications associated with the existing trench drain.
- 2) HVAC Improvements — Design and installation of HVAC systems serving the dog kennel area, including load considerations, system selection, distribution, controls, and coordination with existing building systems.
- 3) Fire Protection System — Additions and modifications to the existing fire protection system, including code compliance, system capacity, tie ins, and sequencing of work.
- 4) Isolation Room Construction — Design and construction of the isolation room, including finishes, mechanical and electrical requirements, pressurization strategy, and infection control considerations.

- 5) ADA Compliant Restroom — Design and construction of the ADA compliant restroom, including fixture layout, accessibility requirements, and utility connections.

For each item listed above, offerors shall address:

- 1) Technical approach to meeting the base and option requirements
 - 2) Maintenance considerations
 - 3) Operability and functionality
 - 4) Durability and material selection
 - 5) Sustainability and energy consumption, where applicable </AM#0009>
- ii) Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems: Include discussion regarding the Design and commissioning plan for the systems (Power Distribution, Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning (HVAC), Service Water Heating, Plumbing, meters, fire suppression, etc.).
- iii) <AM#0009> ~~Discuss the design, and construction for all remaining work, to include but not limited to the Exam/Isolation Room, Isolation kennels, enclosure of the kennel area, K-9 Break Areas~~ </AM#0009>

9.2. Evaluation Criteria

9.2.1. Design Approach Evaluation: The Government will evaluate the offer's technical approach to the design of the project, their understanding of the issues that affect the design, and the feasibility and effectiveness of their plan to address these issues after award of the task order. A design approach that demonstrates a proactive approach to mitigating the risk to the overall cost and schedule of the project that offers advantages to the Government will receive additional consideration over a design approach that merely indicates an adequate understanding of the issues. A more specific, detailed plan will receive more consideration than a more general plan. an

9.2.2. Construction Approach Evaluation: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's selected systems and components proposed in terms of maintenance considerations (frequency, estimated cost, access, equipment locations), operability (ease of use, placement of control features, simplicity), durability (withstand troop and K-9 usage, ease of cleaning), sustainability, and energy consumption (lighting, power). The Government will evaluate the proposed commissioning for the systems. The minimum acceptable level of quality for exterior finish materials for this facility are those materials suitable for the expected population and usage.

Residential or similar exterior grade finishes and materials are not acceptable for inclusion in this facility.

9.2.3. All requirements identified as mandatory in Section 01 10 00 or elsewhere in the solicitation must be included.

10. VOLUME 2, TAB C FACTOR 5, SUMMARY SCHEDULE

10.1. Submission Requirements: Proposed Contract Duration: The Offeror shall propose the overall contract duration, to include base and all options, in the appropriate Contract Line-Item Number in the CLIN Schedule, not to exceed the maximum contract duration specified in Section 01 00 00.00 44. For proposal purposes, assume that all options will be executed on the last day of the option acceptance period. Refer to Section 00 72 00, Clause 52.217-7 Option for Increased Quantity Separately Priced Line Item for the option acceptance period.

Submit a summary level schedule for integrated design and construction, to include the base proposal and all options. This summary schedule will, after contract award, be replaced with a project schedule as required by Section 01 32 01.00 10: Project Schedule. The summary schedule shall be task oriented, indicating the number of calendar days, after notice to proceed, by which milestones are to be achieved. Offeror may use a critical path or other method of his choice; however, schedules shall be graphically represented and shall include, as a minimum, Activity ID, Activity Description, Original Duration, early start and early finish dates, and total float for each

activity. The proposed schedule shall include an activity that shows the proposed overall contract duration in calendar days. Offerors shall submit the following:

- 10.1.1. Show the design phase, including design submissions and Government reviews associated with each design submission (See section 01 33 16.00 10: Design Data (Design After Award)).
 - 10.1.2. Show the overall construction phase for the features of work in this project. It isn't necessary to show detailed breakdown construction (e.g., by trades) for each feature of work. Show activities for each feature of work in sufficient detail to demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work and to substantiate the reasonableness and realism of the proposed duration.
 - 10.1.3. Show submittal preparation and review/approval activities for long lead items. If long lead item equipment must be ordered prior to completion of a design phase, show the required ordering date and delivery duration in the schedule.
 - 10.1.4. Show turnover of the project. The time to complete the project and turnover to the Government must consider the requirements for the Contractor's CQC completion inspection, the subsequent joint Contractor Government prefinal and final inspections, and the correction of punch list items between inspections.
 - 10.1.5. Indicate the anticipated overall critical path on the schedule in calendar days.
 - 10.1.6. Show activities and/or milestones for coordination with other entities during construction, to demonstrate your understanding of the coordination requirements for the contract. (See section 01 35 12.00 44).
 - 10.1.7. Constraints: Offeror must demonstrate the capability and flexibility to schedule the complete project to meet the proposed contract completion period. Describe any constraints considered in the schedule logic (e.g., labor or material availability, permits, weather, etc.).
 - 10.1.8. Provide a narrative, for the requirement for the design packaging plan for separate design packages. "Fast tracking" is not allowed (See section 01 33 16.00 10: Design Data; (Design After Award)). If long lead item equipment must be ordered prior to completion of a design phase, describe the requirement in the narrative and show the required ordering date and anticipated delivery durations in the schedule.
 - 10.1.9. Recent projects have experienced challenges with material and labor availability. Discuss how the proposed schedule accounts for labor and material challenges. Describe your plan to manage material and labor challenges to reduce schedule risk and complete construction within the proposed duration. Offeror must demonstrate the capability and flexibility to plan and schedule the complete project to meet the proposed contract completion period.
- 10.2. Evaluation Criteria:
- 10.2.1. Proposed Contract Duration: The proposed duration will become the contractually binding duration. The Government will evaluate the contract duration, as proposed by the Offeror herein, and also on the Price Proposal Schedule, not to exceed the maximum allowed duration listed in Section 01 00 00.00 44. This duration shall also include all bid options. In assessing the reasonableness of the proposed contract duration, the Government may take into account how well the proposed summary schedule supports the proposed duration, as well as use other information, such as but not limited to independent judgment concerning logic, constraints and typical construction durations. A proposed contract order duration shorter than the duration will receive additional rating consideration, provided the schedule is realistic and deemed to be achievable. The Government will consider an unreasonably condensed contract duration, which places additional cost or schedule risk on the Government, or which may create a risk of contract or performance failure, as a significant weakness or a deficiency, depending upon the evaluators' judgment.
 - 10.2.2. Summary Schedule: The Government will evaluate the design packaging plan for logic, reasonableness, how it facilitates meeting the proposed contract duration and how it facilitates the Government's ability to

W9126G24R0124-0009
W9126G24R0124-0006
W9126G24R0124-0003

W9126G24R0124

timely perform its design reviews. The packaging plan should minimize risk to the Contractor and to the Government for tear-out and coordination for reviews.</AM#0006>

SECTION 00 21 30

SITE VISITS

<AMENDMENT 0007>

<AMENDMENT 0009>

PART 1 GENERAL

1.1 SITE VISITS

(a) Pursuant to Contract Clause "FAR 52.236-3, Site Investigation and Conditions Affecting the Work," and the Site Visit Clause in Section 00 21 00 INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS prospective offerors will be permitted to inspect the site where services are to be performed and to satisfy themselves as to all general and local conditions that may affect the cost of performance of the Contract to the extent such information is reasonably obtainable. Offerors are urged and expected to inspect the site where the work will be performed. Site visits will be arranged during normal duty hours.

(b) Site visit information: See Section 00 21 00 INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS for site visit dates, time, location, and point of contact information. The site visit will be:

Date: <AM#0009>June 9, 2026<AM#0007>May 20, 2026 May 12, 2026</AM#0007>
</AM#0009>

Time: 1:00 PM

Location: Fort Polk USACE Resident Office
2315 Service Command Loop, Bldg. 4740
Fort Polk, LA 7145

POC: Penelope Smith

EMAIL: penelope.z.smith@usace.army.mil

Office Phone: 726-780-1173

Offerors and subcontractors wishing to participate must submit a complete listing of all personnel to attend the preproposal site visit, via encrypted email, to the referenced Base Access POC, a minimum of two (2) business days prior to the preproposal site visit. The Government will conduct a project briefing at the specified location prior to visiting the project site. Offerors may be limited to three (3) attendees for the briefing due to conference room limitations. There is no limit to the number of attendees for the site visit following the briefing. Include the following information for all attendees and subcontractors. The first name on the list will indicate: TEAM CHIEF (POC), and this individual will be responsible for all other personnel:

Offeror's and offeror's subcontractor personnel full names
Driver's License, including the State Issued
Firm

NOTE: The U.S. Government will conduct a check of every individual submitted; this will include checking all law enforcement databases. Persons with questionable criminal records or outstanding warrants will be denied access to the installation.

(c) In no event will a failure to inspect the site constitute grounds for withdrawal of a proposal after receipt of proposal or for a claim after award of the contract.

PART 2 PRODUCTS (NOT USED)

PART 3 EXECUTION (NOT USED)

-- End of Section --