AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
0004	08/30/2016		

6. ISSUED BY CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE
United States Coast Guard SILC Construction 915 2ND AVE., RM 2664 Seattle, WA 98174	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*	(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.
	☐	HSCG5016RCGRMAC
		9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
	☐	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
		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.
☐	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 ☐ 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.)*

The Phase One Proposal due date for Regions 1, 5, and 7 is extended from 7 September to 14 September 2016. All other Phase One Proposal due dates remain unchanged.

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

The cutoff date for Pre-Proposal Inquiries of August 30th 5PM Eastern has passed.

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 Digitally signed by SNELL.MARK.W.1245182810 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USCG, cn=SNELL.MARK.W.1245182810 Date: 2016.08.30 14:08:08 -07'00' *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	08/30/2016

Regional proposals are due as depicted in the below table by 5:00 PM Eastern.

RMACC Contract Region	Regional CEU	Contract Set-Aside	Aggregate Capacity	Proposals Due (Calendar Days After Solicitation Issuance)
Region 1	CEU Providence	8(a)	$150M	~~7~~ 14 September 2016
Region 5	CEU Cleveland	SDVOSB	$150M	~~7~~ 14 September 2016
Region 7	CEU Miami	8(a)	$125M	~~7~~ 14 September 2016
Region 7.5	CEU Miami	8(a)	$50M	1 December 2016
Region 8	CEU Miami	HUBZone	$125M	19 October 2016
Region 9	CEU Cleveland	8(a)	$150M	19 October 2016
Region 11 / 13	CEU Oakland	SDVOSB	$275M	20 September 2016
Region 14	CEU Honolulu	8(a)	$75M	20 September 2016
Region 17	CEU Juneau	HUBZone; 8(a)	$150M	20 September 2016

RMACC Pre-Proposal Inquires		
Row	Inquiry	Response
3	Attachment A, Experience Overview Sheet. Please clarify what information is to be provided in the last column “Offeror’s Share of Responsibility for Total Construction Contract.”	"Offeror's Share of Responsibility for Total Construction Contract" refers the $ amount the offeror was directly responsible for performing.
4	Attachment B, Experience Information Form. Please clarify what information is to be provided for “If Design-Build, what percentage of the total design was provided to you.” Are you looking for the initial percent design the client/government provided the contractor?	Confirmed, this is referring to the initial percent design furnished to the contractor by the client/government.
5	Please advise if separate Volumes/Binders are preferred for the Administrative Requirements versus the Experience & Capability Factors? Also would the government like for Joint Venture Offerors to include a copy of their SBA 8(a) Joint Venture Agreement (if applicable) within the Administrative Requirements?	Separate volumes/binders are not needed for the administrative requirements versus the evaluation factors. Tabs need to clearly identify each section of the binder.
6	By Amendment 002, the RFP proposal instructions for Factor 1 further delineate and stipulate that the Contract Value for Relevant Projects can be within 10% each end of the stated range of $500,000 to $10,000,000 to be considered relevant. This seems very restrictive and not consistent with other Federal procurements (DHS, USACE, NAVFAC, etc.) which normally consider projects with greater contract values as relevant because they demonstrate an Offeror has the ability to perform Task Order projects within the RFP’s stated range. For example, if one of the five projects an Offeror submits is $12M and it was design-build and included the majority of elements of work included in the RFP, it clearly demonstrates the Contractor has the capability, experience, and past performance required to perform a project that is $10 million dollars. If this project was tossed out as not being relevant for consideration solely because it had a larger contract value, it would be an injustice. We request that the government reconsider the stipulation regarding relevancy for projects on the higher end with contract values larger than $10 million.	In establishing the dollar range for Factor 1, including Amendment 0002 the government has established a wide range, representative of the anticipated projects on the RMACC. No changes are made to the $ range.
7	Please confirm whether the proposal may be hand delivered to CEU Providence.	The proposal may be hand delivered to CEU Providence reception. Please ensure you receive a date and time delivery receipt.
8	Factor 3, Page 83 of the RFP requires “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.” Typically our bonding letters are provided by our broker who identifies the surety. Please confirm a letter from our broker which identifies the surety and provides our single/aggregate bonding limits will meet this requirement.	A letter from a surety's agent is acceptable for this requirement.
9	Will consideration of an extension to the Phase One Proposals that are due 7 September (Regions 1, 5, and 7) be given?	The due date for Phase One Proposals for Regions 1, 5, and 7 has been extended from 7 to 14 September. All other Phase One regional proposal due dates remain unchanged.