AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
J	1		35

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0002	09 JUN 2026		PBXP 222050

6. ISSUED BY CODE W50S8R

W7NU USPFO ACTIVITY OHANG 179
KO FOR OHANG DO NOT DELETE, 1947 HARRINGTON MEMORIAL RD
MANSFIELD, OH 44903-8049
UNITED STATES
GORDON STROM, EMAIL: GORDON.STROM.1@US.AF.MIL TELEPHONE: 696-6390

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

SCD: PAS:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X)

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER
W50S8R26RA005

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
15 MAY 2026

☐ 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

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 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

SEE SECTION G - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
☐	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
☐	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
☐	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 purpose of this amendment is to incorporate responses to RFI's, corrections to erroneous verbiage in section 00 22 16, and update wage determination.

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)*	
		GORDON STROM	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	09 JUN 2026

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Section 00 22 16 - Supplementary Instructions to Proposers

Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. This solicitation is for a Firm Fixed Price Contract. The Government intends to award a single contract to a

qualified Offeror deemed responsible in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR),

whose proposal conforms to all the RFP's requirements and is judged to represent the Best Value to the Government

in accordance with the evaluation scheme set out in this solicitation. The award will be made based on the best overall

(i.e. best value) proposal that is determined to be the most be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate

consideration given to three (3) evaluation factors: Technical, Price, and Past Performance, for all proposals received.

A Subcontracting Plan (*for Large businesses only*), will need to be submitted as a subfactor under Technical factor. To

arrive at a Best Value decision, the Source Selection Authority will integrate the evaluation of Past /Present

Performance, Technical and Price as set out in the solicitation. In terms of the relative importance of the factors, the

Technical factor is approximately equal to the Present/ Past Performance and *when combined*, the non-cost factors

are significantly more important, when compared to the Price Factor. Evaluation of Subcontracting Plan (*for Large*

businesses only) is a subfactor under Technical, and will be evaluated on a "Acceptable /Unacceptable" basis. The firm

that represents the best value to the Government will be selected for award in accordance with RFO FAR 15.103

Developing a Competitive Source Selection Approach.

1.2. To arrive at a Best Value decision, this acquisition will utilize the RFO FAR 15.103-1 Tradeoff Approach unless

the lowest priced offeror (with a price deemed reasonable and realistic) is also deemed to be the highest rated in

terms of non-price evaluation criteria. If the lowest priced offeror is also the highest rated in terms of non-Price

Factors, no tradeoff is necessary. Further, there is no tradeoff necessary between any offer that is lower priced and

higher rated in terms of non-Price Factors with respect to any other offers that are higher priced and lower rated for the

non-Price Factors. While the Government and the Source Selection Authority will strive for maximum objectivity, the

evaluation process, by its nature, is subjective, and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire

evaluation process.

1.3. The source selection process will be conducted in accordance with RFO FAR 15.2, Evaluation and Award. Offers

will be evaluated using the criteria listed in "Evaluation Factors for Award." Noncompliance with the RFP requirements

may raise serious questions regarding an offeror's technical ability, past performance and/or pricing, and may be

grounds 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 RFP 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.

1.4. The Contracting Officer will begin the evaluation process by conducting a proposal compliance review for all

timely-received proposals for determination of basic proposal adequacy prior to providing the proposals to the

evaluators. Failure to provide a complete proposal may result in the proposal being removed from further

consideration for award. Failure to address any factor Technical, Past Performance and Price or any technical

subfactor shall be grounds for elimination from evaluation and consideration for award. Failure to submit a

Subcontracting Plan (*for Large businesses only*) shall be grounds for elimination from evaluation and consideration for

award.

NOTE for Small Businesses: While small businesses do not submit Subcontracting Plans as a part of their proposal,

they should confirm their understanding of the requirements set forth in FAR clause 52.219-14, Limitations on

Subcontracting (DEVIATION 2021-O0008) and provide a statement that they will make a good-faith effort to support

the Dept. of War's (DoW's) goals for subcontracting.

1.5. Offerors must ensure that no pricing information is displayed in Volume 2, Technical and Past Performance

Proposal.

1.6. Although the assessment of Past Performance as a specific evaluation factor is separate and distinct from the

Determination of Responsibility required by FAR Part 9, Past Performance information obtained herein will be used

during the Government's responsibility determination. The Government also reserves the right to obtain additional

information solely for the purpose of making a responsibility determination from all offerors after receipt of proposals.

Requests for responsibility information do not constitute discussions.

1.7 The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except

clarifications as described in RFO FAR 15.202(a)(2). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the

Contracting Officer, in his/her sole discretion, later determines them to be necessary or appropriate. Further, the

Government reserves the right to create or not to create a competitive range.

1.8. ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL: The proposal must set forth full, accurate and complete information as

required by this solicitation. By submission of the offer, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (if applicable e.g.,

key personnel, subcontractors, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract and any substitutions shall require

prior Contracting Officer's approval.

2. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

2.1. The evaluation factors are (1) Technical, (2) Past/Present Performance and (3) Price. To arrive at a Best Value

decision, the Source Selection Authority will integrate the evaluation of Past/Present Performance, Technical and

Price as set out in the solicitation. In terms of the relative importance of the factors, the Technical factor is

approximately equal to the Present/ Past Performance and when combined, the non-cost factors are significantly more

important, when compared to the Price Factor. The firm that represents the best value to the Government will be

selected for award in accordance with RFO FAR 15.103 Developing a Competitive Source Selection Approach.

2.1.1. Factor 1: The Technical factor is further divided into the following subfactors:

1. Experience and Capability

2. Subcontracting Plan (*for Large businesses only*)

3. Quality Control

4. Construction Schedule

The subfactors are all *of equal importance*. Evaluation of the offeror's proposal shall address subfactor's 1, 3 and 4, as

it applies to the Plans and Specifications. Subfactor 2 will be evaluated in accordance with AFARS Appendix DD. A

detailed explanation of the criteria for the evaluation for each subfactor is set forth in the "Evaluation Approach",

Paragraph 2.2 of this section. During evaluations of each proposal, the Government will assign each subfactor an

adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings; however, the overall evaluation will

be at the factor level. An offer which fails to provide information in any of the specified areas may be deemed

incomplete and be eliminated from the competition and ineligible for further consideration.

2.1.2. Factor 2. Past Performance: Each offeror's past performance will be reviewed to determine relevancy and

confidence assessment.

2.1.3. Factor 3. Cost/Price. The resulting award will be a firm fixed price contract type. Price Reasonableness will

be utilized in the evaluation of the Firm-Fixed price effort.

2.1.4. The overarching evaluation approach for all factors and subfactors is as follows:

a. Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the offeror's methods

and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified

in the RFP. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which each requirement has been

addressed in the proposal in accordance with the proposal submission section of the RFP.

b. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which proposed

approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which

successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The proposal will be evaluated to

determine the extent to which the offeror is expected to be able to successfully complete the proposed task and

technical requirements within the required schedule.

2.2. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL: TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTOR RATINGS:

2.2.1. The technical rating reflects the degree to which the proposed approach meets or does not meet the

minimum performance or capability requirements through an assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies,

and risks of a proposal. This is a combined rating that includes risk associated with the technical approach in a single

rating. Ratings will be assigned at the subfactor level as well as an overall factor level rating. Based on evaluation

results, the Government will assign a technical rating for each of the four (4) subfactors as well as the overall technical

proposal. All subfactors are of equal importance. An offer which fails to provide information in any of the specified

areas may be deemed incomplete, eliminated from the competition and be ineligible for further consideration for award.

2.2.2. The technical ratings are as follows:

Color Rating	**Adjectival Rating**	**Description**
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Purple	Good	Proposal demonstrates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and demonstrates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.

Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and /or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

2.2.3. Subfactor 1: Experience and Capability. The elements in subfactor 1 are of equal importance.

2.2.3.1. Using the information in Technical Proposal, and the projects/contracts discussed and listed in the Exhibit As,

the Government will evaluate the extent of related experience and determine to what degree the offeror has the

experience and capability to manage a complex multi-disciplined construction project comparable to the work

requirements of this solicitation. Accordingly, higher ratings can be achieved by offerors whose projects more closely

resemble the scope, size, and complexity of this solicitation's requirements.

2.2.3.2. The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding of the contract requirements and determine to what

degree their technical and administrative capabilities, proposed organization and management plan are adequate to

meet contract requirements. To be considered adequate the Experience and Capability proposal will address the full

spectrum of activities involved in the management of a resulting contract in a manner that gives the Government

confidence that the offeror understands all the requirements. An adequate proposal will include the information

necessary to give the Government confidence of the offeror's ability to successfully perform complete project

management of the scope requirements.

2.2.3.3. Proposal must demonstrate, as a minimum, that the following key personnel: Project Manager, Site

Superintendent(s), and Quality Control Manager (on site), have experience in managing projects /contracts of the same

/similar dollar magnitude, size, complexity and scope, in the capacity in which they are proposed for this project. See

Division 01 Section 30 00, Part 1.7.1 (Program Manager), Division 01 Section 30 00, Part 1.7.2 (Site Superintendent),

and Division 01 Section 45 00, Part 1.6.1.2. (Quality Control Manager) of the specification, for additional minimum

qualification requirements for key personnel.

2.2.3.4. Proposal shall also include any contractor experience in projects that were required to meet ICD-705

standards and requirements.

2.2.4. Subfactor 2: Subcontracting Plan. Offeror shall submit a subcontracting plan with your planned commitment

to small business goals and supporting explanation. The following goals are the Department of War (DoW) goals for

subcontracting:

a. 30% Small Business (all types of small businesses combined)

b. 5% Small Disadvantaged Business

c. 5% Woman-Owned Small Business

d. 3% HUBZone Small Business

e. 3% Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business

Subcontracting plans will be evaluated on an "Acceptable/Unacceptable" basis, and in accordance with AFARS

Appendix DD. Offeror's subcontracting plan must commit to meeting the minimum DoW goals, with sufficient

explanation that supports their plan. If you fail to provide a subcontracting plan your proposal will be found

unacceptable. If you fail to provide sufficient explanation of how the goals were developed, to include the inability to

meet a certain goal, your proposal will be found unacceptable. Subcontracting Plan will be rated based on the

following:

Color Rating	**Adjectival Rating**	**Description**
Green	Acceptable	Subcontracting Plan indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives
Red	Unacceptable	Subcontracting Plan does not meet the small business objectives

2.2.5. Subfactor 3: Quality Control. The proposal narrative demonstrates that the quality control staff, with lines of

authority, is at least adequate to meet the contract's requirements. The proposed Quality Control process should

provide a detailed explanation of how quality issues are dealt with on the project and at a minimum, a description of

the conduct of meetings, inspections, submittal reviews, correction of non-compliant work. The Quality Control

program ensures non-reoccurrence of quality issues and timely reporting of quality problems to Government officials.

2.2.6. Subfactor 4: Construction Schedule. The Government will evaluate the proposed schedule for compliance

based on the estimated period of performance. The schedule should demonstrate an offeror's understanding of the

requirements. The Construction Schedule is an integrated and networked multi-layered schedule of program/project

tasks. It identifies project events, accomplishment, and criteria and the expected dates of each. These dates are

based on the calendar dates provided as the starting point and the logical flow of dates provided by calculating the

addition of duration of all tasks using typical schedule networking tools. Each major task will be directly traceable to

the requirements of the project. The schedule should demonstrate logical task sequencing, accurate activity durations,

identification of critical paths, proper resource allocation, risk assessment, alignment with project scope, stakeholder

feedback, and the ability to monitor progress against the baseline schedule. The NTP date for the schedule is for the

purpose of evaluation only.

2.3. PAST/PRESENT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

2.3.1. The Government will evaluate the offeror's record of past and current performance to ascertain the

probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the Plans and Specifications. The Past /Present

Performance evaluation will consist of a "relevancy" rating and a "confidence" rating. Although there are subfactors

listed below, the "confidence" ratings will be at the factor level only. Stated differently, the subfactors will be

considered, but they will not receive individual confidence ratings. The Past/Present Performance evaluation will

consider such things as an offeror's business practices, customer relationship, ability to successfully perform as

proposed, and other considerations as described in Past/Present Performance Sub-factors, elements and other

considerations. Past/Present Performance includes current/on-going (present) performance complete to 70% percent.

Projects currently in progress for the National Guard will also be considered regardless of percentage complete. In

assessing performance confidence, the evaluator may: (1) evaluate present and past performance information through

the use of questionnaires completed by the offeror's references; (2) use data independently obtained from other

Government or commercial sources; from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to,

the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting

System (eSRS), or other databases; (3) interview Program/Project Managers, Contracting Officers or rely upon

personal business experience with the offeror; (4) use the information provided in the Offeror's Past Performance

Relevancy Questionnaire; and (5) consider any information the offeror submits which explains any problems

encountered on the identified contract and the offeror's corrective actions. The Government reserves the rights to

obtain and evaluate past performance information from any source it deems appropriate.

2.3.2. The evaluation may consider Past/Present Performance information regarding predecessor companies, key

personnel who have relevant experience or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the

requirement when such information is relevant to this acquisition. The evaluation will also consider information

provided relative to corrective actions taken to resolve problems on past or existing, contracts.

2.3.3. An offeror with no relevant Past/Present Performance may receive a rating based on the evaluation of its

predecessor companies, key personnel, and/or subcontractors provided the offeror clearly states in the proposal that

the information provided about predecessor companies, key personnel, and/or subcontractors is for the purposes of

enhancing the offerors past performance proposal. These ratings may not have the same weight as the ratings of the

proposing company. The weight that will be afforded for this type of past performance is within the sole discretion of

the Government. If such information is not applicable (i.e., the offeror does not have a predecessor company, key

personnel or subcontractors with relevant experience), the offeror shall be evaluated as "Unknown Confidence"

(Neutral).

2.3.4. In accordance with RFO FAR 15.203, if award will be made without conducting discussions, offerors may be

given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposals, e.g., the relevance of an offeror's past/present

performance information and adverse past/present performance information to which the offeror has not previously

had an opportunity to respond or to resolve minor clerical errors.

2.3.5. Current, Trends and Relevancy: Evaluators will consider the performance information for currency, relevancy

as well as trends in the performance as explained further below.

2.3.5.1. "Current" means performance occurring within the last five (5) years for the period beginning five years prior

to the solicitation release date. Within this period, performance occurring later in the period may have greater

significance than work occurring earlier in the period.

2.3.5.2. "Trends" in performance will be considered and may include but may not limited to: more current

performance having greater weight than older performance; patterns or trends in performance issues as relating to,

but not limited to, types of projects, work, personnel and similar elements; and whether performance shows a pattern

of improvement or decline over time.

2.3.5.3. The Government will also consider similarity of the client type (e.g. federal government) and/or projects that

were required to meet ICD-705 standards.

2.3.5.4. In assessing "relevancy" of an offeror's previous contracts the Government may evaluate an offeror's past

performance for similarity of the construction methods, size, project scope, cost magnitude and complexity of work

performed to those required for the proposed effort. The Government will also consider similarity of the client type (e.g.

federal government) and/or projects required to meet ICD-705 standards.

Relevancy weight will affect offeror's overall Past Performance Confidence rating. The more relevant the project

is weighted the greater confidence there will be in the past performance assessment as a predictor of future

performance.

2.3.5.5. The following apply to weighting relevancy considering all the elements listed above:

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Ratings	**Definition**
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.

2.3.5.6. Offerors who otherwise have satisfactory performance on previous construction projects may be rated

Neutral if those projects are not considered relevant to the proposed acquisition and relevancy cannot be obtained

through the evaluation of key personnel and/or subcontractors. Projects that are not current will not be considered in

the evaluation.

2.3.6. Past Performance Sub-factors. There are four (4) sub-factors. The four sub-factors are of equal importance.

An overall evaluation for Past Performance will be at the factor level.

1. Quality Control

2. Management Effectiveness

3. Timely Performance

4. Compliance with utilization of small business concerns requirements (applicable to all offerors); including

small business concerns. Reference RFO FAR 19.101.

2.3.7. The elements that may be considered under each subfactor are described below:

2.3.7.1. **Quality Control (QC): Evaluators may consider such things as:** Quality of Workmanship; Adequacy of

the Contractor QC; Identification/correction of deficient work in a timely manner; Suggested solutions and displayed

initiative to implement solutions; Adequacy of Materials; Use of specified materials; Adequacy of Submittals and

Adequacy of "As-Builts".

2.3.7.2. **Management Effectiveness: Evaluators may consider such things as:**

2.3.7.2.1. **General Business Practices, including, but not limited to:** Contractor provided experienced managers,

and supervisors with the ability needed to meet contract requirements; Hired experienced subcontractors; Paid

subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner; The contractor cooperated to resolve problems, attending meetings (as

applicable) and maintained communication to assure satisfactory resolution; Overall customer satisfaction and

willingness to foster a spirit of partnership with owner. This is a critical element in this subfactor.

2.3.7.2.2. **Pricing, including, but not limited to:** The contractor submitted proposals that accurately represented the

work required; The contractor's supporting price/cost information for modifications were accurate, complete and

reasonable (not over inflated or under estimated); Provided well-substantiated pricing data for change orders;

2.3.7.2.3. **Site Management/Superintendent, including, but not limited to:** Site manager ensured compliance to

contract requirements & safety regulations; Site manager acted promptly to resolve problems and ensure work quality;

Site manager had sufficient authority to make decisions or take actions during project performance; Site manager

consistently present on site when work was performed.

2.3.7.3. **Timely Performance: Evaluators may consider such things as:** Met established progress schedule;

Timely submission of updated and revised progress schedules; Resolved delays in an expeditious manner;

Identification/correction of deficient work in a timely manner; Provided submittals in a timely manner; Completed all

contract work prior to requesting final inspection; Timely completion of punch-list items; Left no major discrepancies;

Timely submission of close out documents, i.e., "as-builts", "red lines"; Contractor provided timely and satisfactory

response to warranty issues after project completion.

2.3.7.4. **Compliance with utilization of small business concerns requirements** (applicable to all offerors); including

small business concerns. Evaluators will consider if the firm was in compliance with FAR 52.219-8 Utilization of Small

Business Concerns.

2.3.8. The following ratings and related definitions will be used to define the performance confidence assessment.

Based on the evaluation results, the evaluators will assign the Past Performance factor one of the ratings as defined

below:

Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	**Definition**
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	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 be able to 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.

4. PRICE EVALUATION

4.1. This contract is a firm fixed price contract. Price is not rated. The purpose of the price/cost evaluation is to

determine whether an offeror's proposed prices/costs for the project are determined to be fair and reasonable in

comparison to the competition, the current market conditions and/or recent prices for the same or similar

requirements. Reasonableness of an offeror's proposal is evaluated through cost or price analysis techniques as

described in RFO FAR 15.202(d) and 15.4.

4.2. The RFP requires firm-fixed prices for the individual contract line items. A price reasonableness approach will

be utilized by the Government to determine that the proposed prices offered are fair and reasonable and that a "buy-in"

or unbalanced pricing between CLINS or Options is not occurring.

4.3 The Government will examine price proposals for artificially low unit prices. Offers found to be unreasonably

high, unrealistically low (an indication of a "buy-in"), or unbalanced, may be considered unacceptable and may be

rejected on that basis.

4.4. The Government reserves the right to obtain additional information concerning the price (cost) as necessary

to obtain a better understanding of the price proposed. No proposal revisions will be allowed under these conditions.

Request for such information is for clarification purposes only. This does not constitute and shall not be construed as

discussions. If a minor clerical error has occurred, in which case the offeror may be given an opportunity to correct the

minor error within the constraints of the "clarifications" process or the Contracting Officer in his/her sole discretion later

determines discussions to be necessary or appropriate.

4.5. In the event the Government does not award a contract pursuant to this solicitation within 90 calendar days

after receipt of proposals and award will be made without discussions, the following will apply:

4.5.1 The Government reserves the right to allow offerors to make an adjustment in their price proposals to

accommodate cost changes caused by fluctuating construction material market conditions. The Contracting Officer will

notify Offerors, normally by electronic mail (email) of a common closing date for receipt of the adjusted price proposals.

No additional proposal revisions will be allowed under these conditions. This does not constitute and shall not be

construed as discussions. If a minor clerical error has occurred, in which case the offeror may be given an opportunity

to correct the minor error within the constraints of the "clarifications" process or the Contracting Officer in his/her sole

discretion later determines discussions to be necessary or appropriate.

4.6. In the event the current prevailing Wage Determination is changed by the Department of Labor after the

closing date of this solicitation, the updated Wage Determination will be incorporated by amendment and issued to all

offerors that have not been eliminated from the competition. If applicable, these offerors /contractors will be given a

reasonable opportunity to provide revised proposals solely to amend proposals due to Wage Determination changes.

This does not constitute and shall not be construed as discussions.

5. AWARD and DEBRIEFINGS

5.1. Award: A written award or acceptance of offer emailed, or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within the

time for acceptance specified in the offer shall be deemed to result in a binding contract without further action by either

party.

5.2. Debriefings

5.2.1. Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from the competition before award may

submit a written request for a debriefing to the Contracting Officer in accordance with RFO FAR 15.206.

5.2.2. After award, unsuccessful offerors may submit a written request for a debriefing to the Contracting Officer in

accordance with RFO FAR 15.301.

End of Section 00 22 16

Section 00 73 00 - Supplementary Conditions

Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:

"General Decision Number: OH20260099 05/18/2026

State: Ohio

Construction Types: Building

Counties: Ohio Counties of

Richland

Modification Number Publication Date

0 01/02/2026

1 05/18/2026

ASBE0008-010 03/01/2025

Rates Fringes

ASBESTOS WORKER/HEAT & FROST INSULATOR.....$ 35.23 23.04

BROH0040-002 06/01/2024

Rates Fringes

BRICKLAYER.....$ 35.67 24.75

BROH0040-006 06/01/2023

Rates Fringes

TILE FINISHER.....$ 30.25 23.93

TILE SETTER.....$ 35.67 24.75

BROH0040-006 06/01/2024

Rates Fringes

TILE FINISHER.....$ 30.25 23.93

TILE SETTER.....$ 35.67 24.75

CARP0200-003 05/01/2025

Rates Fringes

CARPENTER (SOFT FLOOR LAYER AND FLOOR LAYING -

HARDWOOD FLOORS ONLY).....$ 35.94 23.59

ELEC0038-004 04/28/2025

Rates Fringes

ELECTRICIAN (HVAC/TEMPERATURE CONTROLS INSTALLATION

ONLY) FOOTNOTES; A. 6 PAID HOLIDAYS: NEW

YEAR'S DAY; MEMORIAL DAY; JULY 4TH; LABOR DAY;

THANKSGIVING DAY; & CHRISTMAS DAY B. 1 WEEK'S

PAID VACATION FOR 1 YEAR'S SERVICE; 2 WEEKS' PAID

VACATION FOR 2 OR MORE YEARS' SERVICE.....$ 46.63 24.92

ELEC0683-004 06/02/2025

Rates Fringes

ELECTRICIAN (LOW VOLTAGE WIRING ONLY).....$ 43.00 26.37

ELEC0688-005 05/30/2022

Rates Fringes

ELECTRICIAN (EXCLUDES LOW VOLTAGE WIRING AND

INSTALLATION OF HVAC/TEMPERATURE CONTROLS).....$ 32.30 21.83

ELEV0037-003 01/01/2025

Rates Fringes

ELEVATOR MECHANIC PAID HOLIDAYS: A. NEW YEAR'S DAY, MEMORIAL DAY, INDEPENDENCE DAY, LABOR DAY, VETERN'S DAY, THANKSGIVING DAY, THE FRIDAY AFTER THANKSGIVING, AND CHRISTMAS DAY. B. EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTES 8% OF REGULAR HOURLY RATE TO VACATION PAY CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE WHO HAS WORKED IN BUSINESS MORE THAN 5 YEARS; 6% FOR LESS THAN 5 YEARS' SERVICE.....$ 57.33 38.44

ENGI0018-041 05/01/2024

Rates Fringes

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATOR: BULLDOZER.....$ 44.02 16.41

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATOR (OILER).....$ 36.34 16.41

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATOR (BOBCAT/SKID STEER/SKID LOADER; CONCRETE PUMP; CRANE).....$ 44.14 16.41

ENGI0066-048 06/01/2017

Rates Fringes

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATOR: GRADER/BLADE.....$ 32.42 19.66

POWER EQUIPMENT OPERATOR (MECHANIC).....$ 32.92 19.66

IRON0172-005 06/01/2025

Rates Fringes

IRONWORKER, REINFORCING.....$ 40.87 23.15

IRON0550-011 05/01/2025

Rates Fringes

IRONWORKER: ORNAMENTAL AND STRUCTURAL.....$ 36.00 23.57

LABO0423-003 06/01/2024

Rates Fringes

LABORER (MASON TENDER - BRICK & CEMENT/CONCRETE)....$ 32.10 14.20

LABO1216-003 05/01/2024

Rates Fringes

LABORER: COMMON OR GENERAL.....$ 32.62 13.95

PAIN1275-001 05/01/2024

Rates Fringes

PAINTER (SPRAY).....$ 29.70 14.91

PLUM0189-005 06/01/2025

Rates Fringes

PIPEFITTER.....$ 53.00 27.59

SFOH0669-009 04/01/2025

Rates Fringes

SPRINKLER FITTER (FIRE SPRINKLERS).....$ 48.28 28.08

SHEE0024-028 06/01/2022

Rates Fringes

SHEET METAL WORKER (EXCLUDES HVAC DUCT AND UNIT

INSTALLATION).....$ 33.53 26.36

SUOH2012-101 08/29/2014

Rates Fringes

TRUCK DRIVER: DUMP (ALL TYPES).....$ 24.32 11.73

SHEET METAL WORKER (HVAC DUCT AND HVAC UNIT

INSTALLATION ONLY).....$ 26.26 15.77

ROOFER.....$ 25.24 11.38

PLUMBER.....$ 25.28 6.87

PAINTER (BRUSH AND ROLLER).....$ 23.87 9.42

OPERATOR: ROLLER.....$ 28.83 12.72

OPERATOR: PAVER (ASPHALT, AGGREGATE, AND

CONCRETE).....$ 30.28 13.29

OPERATOR: LOADER.....$ 29.66 12.61

OPERATOR: FORKLIFT.....$ 22.79 12.76

OPERATOR: BACKHOE/EXCAVATOR/TRACKHOE.....$ 27.26 9.80

LABORER: PIPELAYER.....$ 23.98 8.58

LABORER: LANDSCAPE & IRRIGATION.....$ 13.74 0.00

GLAZIER.....$ 22.60 11.02

DRYWALL HANGER AND METAL STUD INSTALLER.....$ 21.15 3.75

DRYWALL FINISHER/TAPER.....$ 20.44 4.75

CEMENT MASON/CONCRETE FINISHER.....$ 26.07 12.34

CARPENTER (EXCLUDING ACOUSTICAL CEILING

INSTALLATION, FLOOR LAYING - HARDWOOD FLOORS, AND

SOFT FLOOR LAYING).....$ 23.42 11.05

CARPENTER (ACOUSTICAL CEILING INSTALLATION ONLY)....$ 24.17 8.61

ABATEMENT WORKER: ASBESTOS (REMOVAL FROM

CEILINGS, FLOORS, AND WALLS).....$ 22.74 9.25

WELDERS - Receive rate prescribed for craft performing

operation to which welding is incidental.

==========

Note: Executive Order (EO) 13706, Establishing Paid Sick Leave

for Federal Contractors applies to all contracts subject to the

Davis-Bacon Act for which the contract is awarded (and any

solicitation was issued) on or after January 1, 2017. If this

contract is covered by the EO, the contractor must provide

employees with 1 hour of paid sick leave for every 30 hours

they work, up to 56 hours of paid sick leave each year.

Employees must be permitted to use paid sick leave for their own illness, injury or other health-related needs, including preventive care; to assist a family member (or person who is like family to the employee) who is ill, injured, or has other health-related needs, including preventive care; or for reasons resulting from, or to assist a family member (or person who is like family to the employee) who is a victim of, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Additional information on contractor requirements and worker protections under the EO is available at https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/government-contracts.

Note: Executive Order 13658 generally applies to contracts subject to the Davis-Bacon Act that were awarded on or between January 1, 2015 and January 29, 2022, and that have not been renewed or extended on or after January 30, 2022. Executive Order 13658 does not apply to contracts subject only to the Davis-Bacon Related Acts regardless of when they were awarded. If a contract is subject to Executive Order 13658, the contractor must pay all covered workers at least $13.65 per hour (or the applicable wage rate listed on this wage determination, if it is higher) for all hours spent performing on the contract from May 11, 2026, through December 31, 2026. The applicable Executive Order minimum wage rate will be adjusted annually. Additional information on contractor requirements and worker protections under Executive Order 13658 is available at

www.dol.gov/whd/govcontracts.

Unlisted classifications needed for work not included within the scope of the classifications listed may be added after award only as provided in the labor standards contract clauses (29CFR 5.5 (a) (1) (iii)).

The body of each wage determination lists the classifications and wage rates that have been found to be prevailing for the type(s) of construction and geographic area covered by the wage determination. The classifications are listed in alphabetical order under rate identifiers indicating whether the particular rate is a union rate (current union negotiated rate), a survey rate, a weighted union average rate, a state adopted rate, or a supplemental classification rate.

Union Rate Identifiers

A four-letter identifier beginning with characters other than SU , UAVG , SA , or SC denotes that a union rate was prevailing for that classification in the survey. Example: PLUM0198-005 07/01/2024. PLUM is an identifier of the union whose collectively bargained rate prevailed in the survey for this classification, which in this example would be Plumbers. 0198 indicates the local union number or district council number where applicable, i.e., Plumbers Local 0198. The next number, 005 in the example, is an internal number used in

processing the wage determination. The date, 07/01/2024 in the example, is the effective date of the most current negotiated rate.

Union prevailing wage rates are updated to reflect all changes over time that are reported to WHD in the rates in the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) governing the classification.

Union Average Rate Identifiers

The UAVG identifier indicates that no single rate prevailed for those classifications, but that 100% of the data reported for the classifications reflected union rates. EXAMPLE: UAVG-OH-0010 01/01/2024. UAVG indicates that the rate is a weighted union average rate. OH indicates the State of Ohio. The next number, 0010 in the example, is an internal number used in producing the wage determination. The date, 01/01/2024 in the example, indicates the date the wage determination was updated to reflect the most current union average rate.

A UAVG rate will be updated once a year, usually in January, to reflect a weighted average of the current rates in the collective bargaining agreements on which the rate is based.

Survey Rate Identifiers

The SU identifier indicates that either a single non-union rate prevailed (as defined in 29 CFR 1.2) for this

classification in the survey or that the rate was derived by computing a weighted average rate based on all the rates reported in the survey for that classification. As a weighted average rate includes all rates reported in the survey, it may include both union and non-union rates. Example: SUFL2022-007 6/27/2024. SU indicates the rate is a single non-union prevailing rate or a weighted average of survey data for that classification. FL indicates the State of Florida. 2022 is the year of the survey on which these classifications and rates are based. The next number, 007 in the example, is an internal number used in producing the wage determination. The date, 6/27/2024 in the example, indicates the survey completion date for the classifications and rates under that identifier.

SU wage rates typically remain in effect until a new survey is conducted. However, the Wage and Hour Division (WHD) has the discretion to update such rates under 29 CFR 1.6(c)(1).

State Adopted Rate Identifiers

The SA identifier indicates that the classifications and prevailing wage rates set by a state (or local) government were adopted under 29 C.F.R 1.3(g)-(h). Example: SAME2023-007 01/03/2024. SA reflects that the rates are state adopted. ME refers to the State of Maine. 2023 is the year during which the state completed the survey on which the listed classifications and rates are based. The next number, 007 in the example, is an

internal number used in producing the wage determination.

The date, 01/03/2024 in the example, reflects the date on which

the classifications and rates under the SA identifier took

effect under state law in the state from which the rates were

adopted.

WAGE DETERMINATION APPEALS PROCESS

1) Has there been an initial decision in the matter? This can

be:

a) a survey underlying a wage determination

b) an existing published wage determination

c) an initial WHD letter setting forth a position on

a wage determination matter

d) an initial conformance (additional classification

and rate) determination

On survey related matters, initial contact, including requests

for summaries of surveys, should be directed to the WHD Branch

of Wage Surveys. Requests can be submitted via email to

davisbaconinfo@dol.gov or by mail to:

Branch of Wage Surveys

Wage and Hour Division

U.S. Department of Labor

200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20210

Regarding any other wage determination matter such as conformance decisions, requests for initial decisions should be directed to the WHD Branch of Construction Wage Determinations. Requests can be submitted via email to BCWD-Office@dol.gov or by mail to:

Branch of Construction Wage Determinations

Wage and Hour Division

U.S. Department of Labor

200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20210

2) If an initial decision has been issued, then any interested party (those affected by the action) that disagrees with the decision can request review and reconsideration from the Wage and Hour Administrator (See 29 CFR Part 1.8 and 29 CFR Part 7). Requests for review and reconsideration can be submitted via email to dba.reconsideration@dol.gov or by mail to:

Wage and Hour Administrator

U.S. Department of Labor

200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20210

The request should be accompanied by a full statement of the interested party's position and any information (wage payment data, project description, area practice material, etc.) that

the requestor considers relevant to the issue.

3) If the decision of the Administrator is not favorable, an interested party may appeal directly to the Administrative Review Board (formerly the Wage Appeals Board). Write to:

Administrative Review Board

U.S. Department of Labor

200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20210.

==========

END OF GENERAL DECISION