AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
	1 / 5

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ.NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
0001	04/06/2026		

6. ISSUED BY CODE AAQ510ATL-AFN

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
AAQ-500 - REGIONAL ACQUISITIONS
1701 COLUMBIA AVENUE
COLLEGE PARK GA 30337

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

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. 697DCK-26-R-00208

X 9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 04/02/2026

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

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 _____ 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 number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted , such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

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

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(x)	
☐	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.
☐	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO THE 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 amendment 697DCK-26-R-00208 0001 is to update the Statement of Work section 4 (Submittal's). This section will now read 1. Project Health & Safety Plan, 2. Product Safety Data Sheets, and 3. List of all employees on site. Also adding a drawing as attachment 5 labeled "wp-d-601-41812-t-a-6". All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9 A 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)*	
		Rodgers L. Cox Jr.	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. CONTRACT AUTHORITY	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	

LIST OF CHANGES:

Section L - Instructions,Conditions, and Notices to Bidders was revised as follows.

Clause List was revised as follows.

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award was revised as follows.

Clause List was revised as follows.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS, DEFINITIONS AND CRITERIA

NOTE REGARDING TECHNICAL EVALUATIONS
The FAA periodically contracts with outside firms to obtain specialized experience to assist the FAA in accomplishing its mission. These "contractor-employees" may assist in evaluating technical proposals and provide input in qualifying firms and their personnel for a particular project. Regarding this project, a contractor-employee may provide assistance in evaluating technical proposals. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this process or would like additional information, contact the Contracting Officer, Susan Newcomb, susan.newcomb@faa.gov

EVALUATIONS DEFINITIONS

All non-price technical factors other than past performance and their corresponding sub-components will be reviewed for strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks in accordance with the following definitions:

Table 1: Evaluation Definitions for Phase I and Phase II

Strength	An aspect of a proposal that would positively impact on the performance of the resulting contract or provide added value beyond the minimum requirements of this Solicitation or otherwise benefit the FAA.
Weakness	An aspect of a proposal that would negatively impact on the performance of the resulting contract or fail to meet the minimum requirements of this Solicitation or otherwise harm the FAA.
Omission	Information requested in the Solicitation that was not provided in the proposal. An omission is not necessarily a deficiency if it is not material in nature and the intent of the Offeror can be readily determined.
Deficiency	A material failure to meet the requirements in this SIR or a combination of weaknesses that increase the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level. If discussions are conducted, deficiencies are fatal errors that can't be corrected without major revisions.
Risk	An aspect of Offeror's proposal that introduces uncertainty in the ability of the Offeror to successfully perform the required effort.

After the Technical Evaluation Team identifies strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks, for all applicable factors, it will assign an adjectival rating in accordance with the definitions in the SIR.

PHASE I EVALUATION FACTORS AND CRITERIA

Offerors proposal will be evaluated for Phase I based on the adjectival ratings, definitions and narratives listed below for each factor.

Volume I - Business Proposal - The Contracting Officer will conduct a responsibility determination in accordance with AMS T3.2.2.7(A)(1). The offeror's business proposal will be determined as responsible or non-responsible. The Contracting Officer will use information provided in Volume I but reserves the right to use other available information or to request additional information to make the determination.

Factor 1 (Past Performance) will be rated individually utilizing the ratings and definitions in Table 2 and 3 below.

Recency and Relevancy - Past Performance will first be reviewed for recency and relevancy. Past Performance not recent or relevant will not be evaluated further. See recent and relevant definitions in Table 2.

Table 2: Recent, Relevant and Highly Relevant Definitions for Phase I, Volume II, Factor 1.

Recent	Contracts completed or substantially completed within the last fifteen (15) years from the date of this Solicitation.
Relevant	Completed or substantially completed contracts that are similar in terms of size and complexity to the subject requirement.
Highly Relevant	Projects with previous teaming experience between the design firm and the general contractor, or Projects with the FAA and other Federal Government agencies, or airports, or Projects with Federal Government or private-use buildings, such as, but not limited to: ATCTs, Base Buildings, Terminal Radar Approach Control Facilities (TRACONs), Air Route Traffic Control Centers (ARTCCs), airport traffic operational buildings, or other related mission-critical facilities.

Recent and relevant Past Performance will be evaluated and the offeror will receive a confidence rating for Factor 1 based on the descriptions/definitions is Table 3 below.

Table 3: Adjectival Rating Definitions for Phase I, Volume II, Factor 1.

Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	The Offeror's recent/relevant past performance record demonstrates above "Satisfactory" ratings, or an equivalent, in a majority of the ratings within the project examples, and those examples are "highly relevant" projects.
More Confidence	The Offeror's recent/relevant past performance record demonstrates **above "Satisfactory"** ratings, or an equivalent, in a **majority** of the ratings within the project examples available to the Technical Evaluation Team. More Confidence may also be assigned if the performance record indicates "Satisfactory" or higher ratings on "Highly Relevant" projects.
Satisfactory Confidence	The Offeror's recent/relevant past performance record demonstrates "**Satisfactory**" ratings, or an equivalent, in a **majority** of the ratings within the project examples available to the Technical Evaluation Team.
No Confidence	The Offeror's past performance record is not recent, or not relevant, or demonstrates a rating below "Satisfactory", or an equivalent, that is sufficient to cause doubt in the successful performance of this Contract. There also may be a finding of no confidence if the Offeror does

	not provide any information to substantiate its past performance record.

Factor 2 (Corporate Experience), Factor 3 (Key Personnel) and Factor 4 (Technical Approach/Understanding) will be rated individually utilizing the ratings in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Adjectival Rating Definitions for Phase I, Volume II, Factors 2, 3 and 4.

Rating	Description
Excellent	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies and addresses all aspects of the criteria with clarity and in detail. Contains multiple impactful strengths, and no weaknesses exist. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated with very low risk.
Good	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies and addresses all aspects of the criteria. Contains at least one strength, which outweighs any weakness. A high quality of contract performance is anticipated with low risk.
Satisfactory	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies and generally addresses all aspects of the criteria. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting. A quality contract performance is anticipated with an acceptable amount of risk.
Marginal	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies but fails to address all the criteria. One or more weaknesses exist which are not offset by strengths. Contract performance is anticipated with risk.
Unsatisfactory	The Offeror's proposal contains deficiencies or multiple weaknesses amounting to a deficiency, creating an unacceptable risk.

PHASE II EVALUATION FACTORS AND CRITERIA

Offerors proposal will be evaluated for Phase II based on the adjectival ratings, definitions and narratives listed below for each factor.

Factor 1 (Proposed Design Solution), Factor 2 (Schedule) and Factor 3 (Management Approach) will be rated individually utilizing the ratings in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Adjectival Rating Definitions for Phase II, Volume I, Factors 1, 2 and 3.

Rating	Description
Excellent	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies and addresses all aspects of the criteria with clarity and in detail. Contains multiple impactful strengths, and no weaknesses exist. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated with very low risk.
Good	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies and addresses all aspects of the criteria. Contains at least one strength, which outweighs any weakness. A high quality of contract performance is anticipated with low risk.
Satisfactory	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies and generally addresses all aspects of the criteria. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting. A quality contract performance is anticipated with an acceptable amount of risk.

Marginal	The Offeror's proposal contains no deficiencies but fails to address all the criteria. One or more weaknesses exist which are not offset by strengths. Contract performance is anticipated with risk.
Unsatisfactory	The Offeror's proposal contains deficiencies or multiple weaknesses amounting to a deficiency, creating an unacceptable risk.

Volume II - Price Proposal

Price will be evaluated for reasonableness. Analysis of price proposals will be performed using one or more of the price/cost analysis techniques defined in the AMS in order to determine price reasonableness. AMS 3.2.3.1 allows the Contracting Officer to require cost or pricing data if adequate information from sources other than the offeror cannot be obtained that is adequate to determine a fair and reasonable price. Reasonableness must represent a price to the Government a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition but may also be determined through price/cost analysis techniques as described in the AMS.

The offerors price proposal will first be evaluated for completeness. Offerors that provide a price proposal that meet criteria in section L for price proposal will be determined complete. Offerors that do not provide a price proposal that meet the criteria in section L will be determined incomplete and the proposal being considered unacceptable for award.

The FAA reserves the right to perform price realism and/or cost realism in accordance with AMS T3.2.3(A)(9).

Offerors are cautioned that unreasonable prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from the competition based upon an apparent lack of understanding of the requirement.

The remainder of this page has been intentionally left blank.