

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08/10/2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY United States Coast Guard SILC Construction 915 2ND AVE., RM 2664 Seattle, WA 98174	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)		CODE
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. HSCG5016RCGRMAC	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
		<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 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 your 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 ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS.  
IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. 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 NO. 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 date, 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.)

Section M. of the solicitation is amended as depicted in the following pages in track changes format.

Responses to Pre-Proposal Inquiries are provided with this amendment.

The cutoff date for Pre-Proposal Inquiries is August 30th 5PM Eastern.

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)	
		Mark W. Snell	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		SNELL.MARK.W.1245182810 <small>Digitally signed by SNELL.MARK.W.1245182810 DN: cn=SNELL.MARK.W.1245182810, ou=PR, ou=USCG, ou=SNELL.MARK.W.1245182810 Date: 2016.08.10 11:39:29 -0700</small>	08/10/2016
		(Signature of Contracting Officer)	

of the first respective task orders to each RMACC.

## M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS

Evaluation Factors Order of Importance:

Phase One factors are approximately equal to each other. Where Subfactors are identified in Phase One and Phase Two, they are approximately equal to each other. The overall rating from Phase One will be carried forward to Phase Two for purposes of the best value determination and selection of awardees. The Phase One overall rating will be approximately equal to the Phase Two overall rating. When combined, the overall ratings of Phase One and Phase Two are approximately equal to price. Price will be evaluated on the basis of a seed project during Phase Two.

Evaluation Factors For Award:

### **Phase One:**

#### **Factor 1 – Corporate Experience**

Submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) relevant construction projects that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that were completed using Design-Build, One-Step Turnkey (Design-Build), and Design/Bid/Build and that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the projects anticipated to be executed on the RMACC. The scope of work will include real property repairs, maintenance, and general construction, marine construction, demolition, historical restoration, and remediation. Facilities include, but are not limited to, operations buildings, hangars, boat houses, firing ranges, residential and light commercial buildings and their mechanical and electrical systems, site utilities, waterfront facilities, electronic surveillance/security construction, dredging, and airports/runways.

Projects submitted shall be valued between \$500,000 and \$10M and shall be substantially completed (65%) within the past six years of the date of issuance of this RFP. Projects completed in the geographical region of the specific RMACC will be rated higher than projects outside the area of the specific RMACC. A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. At least one project must represent experience using a Design-Build method of delivery. For purposes of this requirement, a fixed-price contract or task order that was based on a performance specification and that incorporates both the design and construction of any facility or real property requirement (including repairs) constitutes the Design-Build method of delivery.

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed, the project delivery method utilized, and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP. Offerors shall submit the following completed attachments for projects submitted under Factor 1: Attachment A, Experience Overview

Sheet and Attachment B, Project Information Sheet. Additional lines may be added as necessary not to exceed one additional page total per Project Information Sheet. Offerors are responsible for providing project descriptions in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of project relevancy and may provide additional descriptive information on each form beyond what is required in the attachment. One page of photographs per project may be provided in order to provide clarity to the project description and do not count against the page limit per Project Information Sheet.

If an Offeror is using experience information of an affiliate, subsidiary, or parent that is not the name as exactly stated on the SF1442 or in the limited case of the experience of a key subcontractor, the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate, subsidiary, parent firm, or key subcontractor will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. No more than one project may be submitted to represent the relevant experience of an offeror's proposed key subcontractor.

**Basis of Evaluation:**

The offeror will be evaluated based on the extent of its demonstration of relevant corporate experience including work experience within the geographic area of the contract and projects similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RMACC. The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. A representation of a diverse construction project experience (inclusive of the types of projects outlined) may result in a higher rating. Significant experience working within the geographic area of the contract may result in a higher rating. Demonstration of waterfront/marine construction experience may result in a higher rating. Experience with Design-Build method delivery must be demonstrated. Prime contractor experience will be rated higher than subcontractor experience.

**Factor 2 – Past Performance**

All projects submitted under Factor 1 corporate experience need to have a corresponding past performance submission in the form of a completed CPARS evaluation or Past Performance Questionnaire. If a completed CPARS evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation, a client completed Past Performance questionnaire in the prescribed format or substantially similar shall be submitted. A narrative of no more than one page in length may accompany each past performance submission and may be used as required to provide amplifying information on the submission.

In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance including Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS). While the Government may elect to consider data from other documented sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the offeror.

**Basis of Evaluation:**

The government will assess the quality of the offeror's past performance by determining how well the contractor performed on the submitted relevant contracts and other related past performance information as stated above.

\*Note: The distinction between corporate experience and past performance is corporate experience pertains to the types of work and projects completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work covered by this requirement, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past performance pertains to how well a contractor has performed on relevant projects. Prime contractor past performance will be rated higher than subcontractor past performance.

### **Factor 3 – Regional Management Capabilities, Technical Capabilities, and Capacity**

#### **Regional Management Capabilities (Subfactor)**

In a narrative not to exceed five pages demonstrate familiarity and established resources and relationships with key subcontractors and suppliers to perform task orders throughout the geographic region. Also identify unique challenges to performing projects throughout the region. Demonstrate extent of established bona fide office(s) within the geographic region including duration of existence of the office, number of employees and labor categories, and functions performed out of the office. Also, identify offices that may be outside the region that would be used to support the contract. If the offeror is unable to identify actual expertise/experience within the region or within significant geographic portions of the region, provide a business plan that outlines the proposed organizational approach to developing the capabilities.

**Basis of Evaluation:**

Offerors will be assessed on the extent their ability to demonstrate organizational capabilities and operational expertise working throughout the region. Actual regional capabilities and expertise may will be rated higher than planned approaches. Demonstration of planned or actual prime contractor regional management capabilities should include extent of familiarity and establishment of resources and relationships with key subcontractors and suppliers. Note: For those regions set aside for 8(a), an offeror must have a bona fide place of business within the region. SBA will make a determination on eligibility including bona fide place of business for presumptive 8(a) awardees. This SBA eligibility determination is limited to 8(a).

#### **Technical Capabilities (Subfactor)**

In a narrative not to exceed four pages address the following organizational capabilities as follows:

- Identify your ability to complete design-build projects and turnkey projects. Describe your planned business relationships with designers, your experience working with these and other design firms, and the capabilities and experience of the planned designers in support of this contract.

- Identify your specific abilities with regard to general construction, marine construction, and repair and renovation.

**Basis of Evaluation:**

Offerors will be assessed on the extent their ability to effectively demonstrate design-build capabilities and various areas of construction expertise. Offerors that can demonstrate in all of the above areas of construction expertise may be rated higher. Offerors that can demonstrate experience working with identified designers may be rated higher.

**Capacity to Support DHS (Subfactor)**

Provide a narrative of no more than two pages outlining your capacity and proposed approach to support multiple concurrent requirements throughout the area of the contract. Provide a letter (not included in the page count requirement) from a corporate surety whose name appears on the list contained in the Treasury Department Circular 570. The letter from the surety needs to acknowledge the maximum dollar amount for which the offeror (prime contractor) would receive approval of single project performance and payment bonds. Also, ensure the letter identifies the offeror's aggregate bonding capacity. If an offeror plans to provide security other than bonds in the form of a firm commitment, supported by corporate sureties, the offeror must demonstrate the resources to obtain individual sureties, or by other acceptable security such as postal money order, certified check, cashier's check, irrevocable letter of credit, or, in accordance with Treasury Department regulations, certain bonds or notes of the United States.

**Basis of Evaluation:**

Offerors will be assessed on the extent their ability to demonstrate capacity to support multiple concurrent requirements and sufficient bonding or other security capacity.

**Factor 4 – Safety**

In a narrative not to exceed two pages discuss and present your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate for the three previous complete calendar years [2013, 2014, 2015], as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Discuss any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element.

**Basis of Evaluation:**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's (prime contractor's) OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates.

**RMACC Pre-Proposal Inquires**

Row	Inquiry	Response
3	Will there be additional documents released per region with additional details on submittals and pre-proposal visits?	Section M (page 79) of the solicitation addresses. Site visits and identification of seed projects will occur during Phase Two.
4	<p>1) General – We request a concise introduction (2-page maximum) to the Phase 1 volume be allowed. This will provide USCG with a valuable overview and summary of the remainder of volume 1.</p> <p>2) Section J, Attachment J.3 (pgs. 57-60 – Past Performance Questionnaire –The Solicitation requires Form “PPQ-0” be used for Past Performance Questionnaires where CPARS reports are not available. Will USCG allow use of the very similar but more detailed 9/30/11 version of Form PPQ-0 to avoid clients from having to complete multiple iterations of performance evaluations?</p>	<p>A1: The USCG will not allow submission of an introduction to the Phase I volume.</p> <p>A2: Section M, page 81 of 83, Factor 2 - Past Performance states, "If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation, a client completed Past Performance questionnaire in the prescribed format or substantially similar shall be submitted." The previous PPQ version you reference certainly can be considered "substantially similar".</p>
5	I just want to confirm that Phase I is due according to the chart on Page 78 of 83. This makes Region 8 Phase I Proposal due by 5PM eastern on October 19, 2016.	Consistent with the chart, your assertion is confirmed. The Region 8 Phase I proposal is due by 5PM eastern on 19 October.
6	1. In the Draft Q&A the government’s response to question #1 states that “only one of the three to five projects submitted needs to represent a design-build method of delivery”. However, neither Attachment A – Experience Overview Sheet nor the Evaluation criteria states how many projects must be design/build. Can the government please clarify how many projects required to be submitted in Factor 1 – Corporate experience, should demonstrate design/build experience?	Page 80 of 83 of the solicitation, Factor 1 – Corporate Experience (2nd paragraph) states: “At least one project must represent experience using a Design-Build method of delivery.”
7	<p>1. We are a Large Business and want to know if teaming under a “Prime/Sub Team” is allowed? We would serve as the critical subcontractor.</p> <p>2. If yes, will our past performance be allowed and will it be evaluated?</p>	<p>1. Contractor Team Arrangements as outlined in FAR Subpart 9.6 are allowed; however, please note that we view the situation where a prime contractor agrees to have another company act as a subcontractor to be equal to the traditional prime and subcontractor relationships that are commonplace in the construction industry. Please recognize that we do not maintain privity of contract with subcontractors and we will review proposals from the point of view of ensuring that prime contractors have demonstrated their own qualifications. At the same time, we recognize that our regions are large and that teaming with subcontractors may be an important aspect of offers. As outlined in FAR Subpart 9.6, we will review contractor team arrangements from the standpoint that they enable the companies involved to complement each other’s unique capabilities and offer the Government the best combination of performance, cost, and delivery for the system or product being acquired. Please note that offerors (prime contractors) will need to comply with FAR 52.219-14, Limitation on Subcontracting.</p> <p>2. See Amendment 0001, which amends Section M.</p>
8	Mark, page 80 of the solicitation Factor 1 Corporate Experience states that previous experience projects need to be valued between \$500,000 and \$10M. We request that this limit be lowered to \$200,000, or all the way down to \$2,000.00, as task orders could be this minimum value per page 18, F.8, (e). We also request this variance as we would like to submit as it is our only AK project that meets the “Demonstration of waterfront/marine construction experience may result in a higher rating” on page 81, Basis of Evaluation.	The dollar thresholds for Factor 1 Corporate Experience will remain unchanged.
9	Explain the number of contracts to be awarded for Region 17.	Up to 10 IDIQ contracts may be awarded for the Region 17 RMACC. Awards will be made in a manner where at least two contracts are reserved for 8(a) offerors and two contracts are reserved for HUBZone offerors.
10	<p>1. Please indicate if bid bond is required for phase 1 and/or for phase 2, if so what amounts?</p> <p>2. In reference to the past performance evaluations forms (CPARS) please indicate if these forms shall be sent to USCG directly from our clients or should they be included in our submitted proposal.</p> <p>3. Please confirm if final proposal can be had delivered to USCG Miami Office.</p>	<p>1. Bid bonds are not required for phase 1. Bid bonds will be required for phase 2 and the amount will be determined by the seed project for each respective region.</p> <p>2. See Section M (Page 81 of 83) Factor 2 - Past Performance. "If a completed CPARS evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation, a client completed Past Performance questionnaire...shall be submitted."</p> <p>3. Due to logistical and security constraints, hand delivery of proposals will not be permissible.</p>

11	We are an 8a contractor with a bonifide office in Pensacola FL. We are performing construction projects in FL., GA, and SC. Are we approved to submit a bid in the 7th district with our Pensacola, FL office?	See the updated 8(a) offering letter for Region 7 posted to the pre-solicitation notice in FBO. "It has been determined that competition will be limited to 8(a) firms located in the states of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina..."
12	The address give is a Post Office Box. In order to guarantee delivery by the time requested (5:00 eastern, 1:00 Alaska time) we need to have a physical address. Is it possible to provide a "federal express" address for the Juneau office?	The physical address for CEU Juneau is:  Civil Engineering Unit - Juneau 709 West 9th Street, Room 817 Juneau, AK 99801
13	I have been following the above solicitation and have been reviewing the information. Our design partner has been shortlisted for the national A/E contract with USCG. I would like to see if this is a conflict should we keep the team together and they became one of the firms that received an award under the A/E.	For any A/E requirement that the design team partner worked on there would likely be a conflict of interest with the team performing a follow on or related construction requirement.
14	An 8(a) in FL has a SBA approved JV with a SB that is in Puerto Rico. The 8(a)s main office is in FL but the JV Office location is in Puerto Rico. Does this met the Bonafide Office rule in the RMACC RFP?	Recommend consulting with SBA Business Opportunity Specialist, as SBA will confirm eligibility including bona fide office of the apparent 8(a) awardee.
15	Here are the pertinent details as I see them: 1) This is a competitive 8(a) procurement  2) NAICS code is 236220, Commercial and Institutional Building Construction, with a Small Business Size Standard of \$36.5M  3) The 8(a) company that we would do a joint venture with has 3-yr average of less than \$18M, which is less than one half of the NAICS size standard  Based on this info, it seems like we are correct in considering only the 3-year average of the 8(a) firm, not the combined 3-year average of both companies in the JV. Is this correct?  And lastly, section (b)(1)(ii)(A) says that this procurement also must exceed half of the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code...so must be greater than \$18.25M. For this, do you consider the anticipated aggregate capacity of the Region 14 RMACC (\$75M) or do you have to divide that by 10 since, "up to ten individual contracts are anticipated for each regional contract". (Page 6 of solicitation)	Recommend consulting with SBA Business Opportunity Specialist, as SBA would approve 8(a) Joint Ventures and make determinations on size standards as applicable.
16	1) Section L mentions only Joint Venture Agreements. Will a prime sub relationship or formal teaming arrangement also be recognized for inclusion of a partner's past performance/experience? 2) For the 8a set aside contracts, if an awardee graduates from the 8a program during one of the option years, will the firm still be eligible for the remaining option years?	1) See the row 7 response. 2) It is anticipated that options may be exercised for 8(a) graduates. Recommend confirming with SBA.
17	Could you please provide attachments in Section J of the RFP in Word format?	Section J attachments have been provided in Word format on FBO.
18	Could you please post on FBO.gov the MS Word Files for Attachment A - Experience Overview Sheet and Attachment B - Project Information Sheet.	The MS Word format for Attachment A and Attachment B have been made available on FBO.

19	How will the fair opportunity task order process work for Region 17? Will 8(a) compete against HUBZone?	After award of the Region 17 RMACC, the Contracting Officer will be able to set-aside orders to either the HUBZone program or the 8(a) program, where the rule of two is met. If the rule of two is not able to be achieved orders may be competed amongst the 8(a) and HUBZone programs.
20	<p>1. In the solicitation, on page 75, it is stated that "If proposing as a joint venture, offerors shall provide the DUNS Number and Cage code for the members of the joint venture." Would you like for those submitting as a joint venture to provide all of this information in block 14 of the SF-1442, or would you like the information on its own page?</p> <p>2. What is the cutoff date and time for questions about the IDIQ RMACC solicitation?</p>	<p>1. If proposing as a joint venture, please provide the name and address of the joint venture in block 14 of the SF1442 and provide a supplemental page that identifies joint venture partner's DUNS and CAGE. Also provide the joint venture's DUNS, CAGE, and Federal Tax ID (if completed at time of proposal).</p> <p>2. 5PM Eastern, 8/30/2016 is the Phase One pre-proposal inquiry cutoff date and time.</p>
21	In the solicitation it states a bid bond is required. Is that the case for Phase 1 or will it be required later in the bid stages?	See the response in row 10.
22	Page 80 states to provide experience in "design build, one-step turnkey (design build)..." As project that meet these 2 separate statements may be viewed more favorably, what is the difference between design build and one-step turnkey (design build)?	See RFP, Section C, page 10 for a description of Design-Build Turnkey delivery method. Two-phase design-build selection procedures are defined in FAR 36.102. There is no preference either type of design-build experience.
23	Since Region 17 set-aside designation is split between Hubzone and 8(a), how does the government intend to compete task orders among contract holder after awards are made? Will some requirements be set aside 8(a) and others Hubzone?	After award of the Region 17 RMACC, the Contracting Officer will be able to set-aside orders to either the HUBZone program or the 8(a) program, where the rule of two is met. If the rule of two is not able to be achieved orders may be competed amongst the 8(a) and HUBZone programs.
24	On the Q&A's dated for April 22nd, another contractor had asked (page 2, question 8) "we would like to request a section that allows and references CTA's in CFR 121.103 (9) and FAR subpart 9.6", and it was answered: "we will consider the agreements outlined in FAR 9.301 (s) as a traditional prime-subcontractor arrangement". FAR Acquisition section 9.6 also attached for reference. Since it states the word "consider", can this be interpreted as "yes"? If so, in section L.3 JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENTS, it also discusses "partnerships". It states that a letter of intent must identify the contractor team arrangements and fully disclose the company relationships in the proposed joint venture. Also, each partner in the partnership (or JV) must be registered in SAM.gov at the time of submission and the JV must be registered in SAM.gov prior to contract award. BUT what if we're only joined by a CTA and not a JV. Will the registration in SAM.gov by each entity suffice? Lastly, other than a letter of intent and the CTA documents, what other supporting documents will be required.	See the row 7 response. Registration in SAM.gov of each entity will suffice. LOI and CTA documents are recommended, but not required.
25	I would just like to confirm that the dates on page 78 in the RFP for the IDIQ, RMACC at Various DHS Facilities throughout the United States and Territories are the due dates we need to follow when submitting our response(s)?	Confirmed, the chart on page 78 of the RFP indicates the due dates for the various regional Phase One proposals.
26	Can you please confirm our SBA bona fide office qualifies us to compete on this contract.	Recommend confirming with SBA, as SBA will make a determination on eligibility including bona fide place of business for presumptive 8(a) awardees.



27	<p>1. In the solicitation under K.1 Congressional Information, it asks for (2) Principal place of performance of the work required under the resulting contract (city, county and state) (3) Congressional District of the principal place of performance. Would you like us to use the mailing address given in the RMACC Contract Region table, under the region we are submitting on, to find the information above?</p> <p>2. Attachment B – Experience Information Form states “attach any copies or photographs of industry awards/special recognition, etc. received for this project). This leads us to believe the government wishes to see pictures of awards received for the project example used in Attachment B, however page 81 of 83 of the solicitation states under Factor 1 – Corporate Experience evaluation criteria that we are allowed to provide photographs per project to provide clarity to the project description. Our question is, will the government allow pictures of the project examples or do they just want pictures of industry awards/special</p>	<p>1. Confirmed. Based on the region, use the appropriate mailing address as the basis for K.1.</p> <p>2. For each project submitted under Attachment B - Experience Information Form: Up to one page of copies/photographs of industry awards/special recognition may be submitted. An additional maximum of 1 page of photographs per project may be provided in order to provide clarity to the project description.</p>
28	<p>Region 5 of this contract is being set aside for an SDVOSB firm (region 5 is VA, DC, MD, PA, and NC) Would it be possible if a qualified 8(a) firm could still submit an offer under the solicitation? Would it be possible for a qualified 8(a) to team/JV with a SDVOSB and still qualify for the SDVOSB set-aside?</p>	<p>A joint venture would be possible as long as it is consistent with applicable regulations and statutes. Joint ventures need to retain appropriate small business set-aside designation for the region. If contemplating joint venture formation, recommend coordinating with SBA.</p>
29	<p>1) Regarding RMACC Contract Region 11 / 13, if awarded an RMACC contract, will contractors be obligated to submit proposals on all issued task order RFPs or will they be allowed to opt out of bidding on projects that are significant distances from their home office? Would San Diego firms for instance be required to bid on projects located in Seattle and vice versa? Will there be a penalty for not bidding work and if so, what would that penalty be?</p> <p>2) Up to ten individual contracts are anticipated for each regional contract. Regarding the Regions 11/13 RMACC, does the government anticipate issuing some RMACC contracts to contractors with home offices located in Region/District 11 and then to also issue contracts to some in Region/District 13? We’ve found that contractors based closer to the work locations are generally more competitively priced and successful than those traveling longer distances from their home office to evaluate work pre-bid and then to perform the work making this approach advantageous</p>	<p>1) While not mandatory to submit proposals for every task order, the contracting officer may take into consideration the frequency of proposal submission in determining whether or not to exercise options.</p> <p>2) The government will make award determinations based on the most highly rated offers considering region 11/13 as a whole. Consistent with fair opportunity, all awardees will be provided opportunity to submit task order proposals throughout region 11/13.</p>
30	<p>3) Hubzone and 8(a) SBA status is administered, and certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA) to verify compliance with the certification status requirements. Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) status is not administered or vetted for compliance with the status requirements by the SBA. The Center for Verification and Evaluation (CVE) is a program within the Dept. of Veterans Affairs that evaluates and verifies the ownership and control of SDVOSBs and VOSBs in accordance with 38 CFR Part 74. Are SDVOSB Offerors required to provide any proof of true SDVOSB status via CVE or any other verifying agency or is it a self-certifying honor system for SDVOSB compliance?</p>	<p>3) The CFR states that SDVOSB status is a self-certifying process and it outlines tough penalties for misrepresentation that include suspension, debarment, and a presumption of loss based on the total amount expended. DHS, like many other Departments/Agencies, relies on the SDVOSB community to police itself and report to the contracting officer any awards made to an SDVOSB that has misrepresented its status. When credible evidence is submitted by an interested party, SBA will review the protest and render a decision. The procedures for protesting a firm's status as a service-disabled veteran-owned small business concern are outlined in FAR 19.307. As a result, for this procurement, SDVOSBs are not required to be verified by the CVE for inclusion in the VetBiz database.</p>

31	<p>In the RFP on page 80 under Factor 1 – Corporate Experience: Instructions say to submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) relevant construction projects that best demonstrates experience on relevant projects. If submitting as an 8(a) Joint Venture does this same criteria still apply, and are we to submit a maximum of five (5) relevant projects for the JV team including relevant projects from each of the 2 company's?</p>	<p>Factor 1 - Corporate Experience remains the same for Joint Venture offerors. A maximum of five relevant projects may be submitted by the Joint Venture or its partners.</p>
32	<p>Good afternoon. On page 78 of 85 of the solicitation it states that Proposals for Region 7.5 (Puerto Rico) are due on December 1, 2016. Please confirm that this is the date for submittal or if it is a typo and should be in September or October as is the case for all other regions.</p>	<p>The due date for the Region 7.5, Phase One proposal is confirmed as 1 December 2016. The USCG has phased proposal due dates to manage resources for review and evaluation.</p>
33	<p>In Section M.2, Evaluations Factors under Corporate Experience "Proposals submitted shall be valued between \$500,000 and \$10M and shall be substantially completed (65%) within the past six years of the date of issuance of this RFP." We feel that the \$500,000 amount limits the amount of offerors for this region (CEU Honolulu) and excludes capable 8a contractors from bidding on this solicitation. Please consider lowering the minimum to \$400,000.</p>	<p>The dollar thresholds for Factor 1 Corporate Experience will remain unchanged.</p>
34	<p>If there is not a completed CPARS/CCASS evaluation available, may we substitute a previously completed Past Performance Questionnaire?</p>	<p>If there is not a completed CPARS/CCASS evaluation available, a previously completed PPQ may be submitted.</p>
35	<p>All projects submitted under Factor 1 corporate experience need to have a Corresponding past performance submission in the form of a completed CPARS evaluation or Past Performance Questionnaire. If a completed CPARS evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation, a client completed Past Performance questionnaire in the prescribed format or substantially similar shall be submitted. A narrative of no more than one page in length may accompany each past performance submission and may be used as required to provide amplifying information on the submission. Please confirm that PPQs, are to be submitted with the proposal submission.</p>	<p>PPQ's are to be submitted with the proposal.</p>
36	<p>A Service-Disabled, Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) will be bidding as the prime contractor for the two RMACC SDVOSB – Region 5 and Regions 11/13. Offeror provides design-build, design/bid/build and construction services to governments and organizations throughout the United States and the world. The SDVOSB has added a team partner, selected specifically for their experience and success working in waterfront and marine construction, and for their ability to add capacity to the SVOSB's scope of services. Is it our understanding that we may use our teaming partner's experience and past performance as well as regional management capabilities including offices for this bid?</p>	<p>See Amendment 0001, which amends Section M.</p>
37	<p>I see that we can use the CPAR evaluations in lieu of a past performance questionnaire being filled out. We have a lot of them in CPAR, but some we (the prime contractor) did not sign off on. We agree with them but must have not received them to sign the contractor part of them. Are they still able to be used since the contracting official filled them out and signed off on them? I just didn't want to submit them if they wouldn't be a valid submission (without contractor rep sign off).</p>	<p>Completed CPARS evaluations may be submitted regardless of whether or not they include contractor representative comments.</p>

<p>1. Block 13 of the SF 1442 states that a bid guarantee is required. Is this a requirement for the Phase One Proposal submission? If so, where within our proposal, should this be submitted?</p> <p>2. Page 76 of 83 states that the Offeror shall ensure FAPIIS certification as required by FAR 52.209-7. Is it sufficient to complete and submit FAR 52.209-7 as part of Section K – Representations and Certifications? Page 76 of 83 states that the Offeror shall ensure a current VETS-100 report has been submitted to the Department of Labor website. Do we need to submit a copy of the email confirmation of submission with our proposal? If so, where within our proposal, should this be submitted?</p> <p>4. Page 81 of 83, regarding the Attachment B, states that “Additional lines may be added as necessary not to exceed one additional page total per Project Information Sheet.” It also states that “One page of photographs per project may be provided in order to provide clarity to the project description and do not count against the page limit per Project Information Sheet.” Since the Attachment B in the RFP is currently three (3) pages, please confirm that our Project Information Sheets can be a maximum of five (5) pages.</p>	<p>1. See row 10 response. Bid bonds are not required for Phase One. Bid bonds will be required for Phase Two and the amount will be determined by the seed project for each respective region.</p> <p>2. It is sufficient to complete and submit FAR 52.209-7 as part of Section K - Representations and Certifications.</p> <p>3. See Section L5. (iv) Confirmation of VETS-100 registration can be submitted between the completed SF 1442 and the Section K Completed Representations and Certifications in the Phase One proposal.</p> <p>4. See row 27 response. For each project submitted under Attachment B - Experience Information Form: Up to one page of copies/photographs of industry awards/special recognition may be submitted. An additional maximum of 1 page of photographs per project may be provided in order to provide clarity to the project description. Based on this, a total of 5 pages may be submitted per project.</p>
<p>38</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the SBA Acceptance Letters that were posted on FBO for this procurement prior to the release of the final RFP part of the final solicitation?</li> <li>The SBA Acceptance Letter for Region 7 seems to indicate that all 8(a) firms with bona fide offices in the states of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina are eligible to bid on the Region 7 RMACC. However, the map of the USCG Regions provided in the RFP shows that Region 7 does not include the southwestern corner of Georgia and the western Florida Panhandle. Are 8(a) firms with bona fide places of business located in the southwestern corner of Georgia and western Florida eligible to compete for a Region 7 RMACC?</li> </ul> <p>39</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any restrictions on font size and type?</li> </ul>	<p>The SBA 8(a) Acceptance letters posted to FBO have been approved by SBA. See the updated 8(a) offering letter for Region 7 posted to the pre-solicitation notice in FBO in July. "It has been determined that competition will be limited to 8(a) firms located in the states of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina..." We note that the regional maps that we provided are approximate and that there are portions of FL and GA that fall outside of Region 7; however, in concert with SBA, we coordinated for all FL and GA 8(a) contractors (with bona fide place of business as established by SBA) to be eligible for the Region 7 contract. Our intention is to use the actual district boundaries when issuing task orders on the contract. For instance, portions of FL and GA work on the contract will be issued on the Region 8 contract.</p> <p>Standard font size is not less than 11 for addressing evaluation factors in Phase One proposals. If using standard forms or Factor 1 and Factor 2 templates the font does not need to be adjusted.</p>

40	<p>1. The RFP did not specify type size or style requirements. Would it be permissible to use 10 point Times New Roman for text and 10 point Arial Narrow for graphics/tables?</p> <p>2. The RFP did not specify any margin requirements. Would it be permissible to use 0.75" margins on all sides?</p> <p>3. Section M.2, Phase One, Factor 1, Attachment B (page 81 of RFP) indicates that: "Additional lines may be added as necessary not to exceed one additional page total per Project Information Sheet." The current Attachment B in 2.25 pages (3 pages for the form), so are the project information sheets allowed to be four pages each or five pages each with the additional page allowed for photos?</p> <p>4. Can attachments be modified to present a more readable layout/format as long as all of the information is provided in the same order (i.e., use a two-column format for some of the information required on Attachment B, page 1)?</p> <p>5. Section M.2, Factor 1, are we allowed to provide team members' corporate experience as 1 or 2 of the projects as long as the offeror provides a minimum of three projects? If so, will team members experience be evaluated the same or lower than the prime contractor (offeror)?</p> <p>6. Because of the DB nature of the solicitation, we will be relying on other team members to demonstrate our ability to perform all aspects of the scope of work. Please confirm that we can include team members' experience/capabilities to demonstrate our full capabilities under Factor 3—Regional Management Capabilities, Technical Capabilities, and Capacity.</p> <p>7. Please confirm the letter from our surety is excluded from the page limitation.</p>	<p>1. See the response in row 39.</p> <p>2. Standard margins should not be less than 0.75" on each side.</p> <p>3. See the response in row 38.</p> <p>4. As long as information is provided in the same order.</p> <p>5. See Amendment 0001, which amends Section M.</p> <p>6. See Amendment 0001, which amends Section M.</p> <p>7. The letter from the surety is not included in the page limitation for that subfactor.</p>
41	<p>8. Please consider allowing us to provide one additional page to address DART metrics, extenuating circumstances, and trends in addition to the current 2-page limitation for the safety narrative.</p> <p>9. Please confirm whether any of following are required—title page, table of contents, list of figures, acronym list; if any of these are required, please confirm they are exempt from page limitation.</p> <p>10. Would you consider allowing a one-page introduction to Factor 1 or a two-page executive summary to convey the key messages/highlights of our proposal that is exempt from the page limitation?</p> <p>11. Please indicate the closing date (last day) for asking questions on the RFP.</p>	<p>8. The page limitation will remain unchanged for Factor 4 - Safety.</p> <p>9. A proposal cover/title page and table of contents are recommended but not required. The other information referenced in the question will not be considered as part of the evaluation.</p> <p>10. An introduction to Factor 1 will not be considered.</p> <p>11. See the response in row 20.</p>