AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES	1 | 13
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0006	11/03/2025	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)

6. ISSUED BY CODE

CONTRACT SPECIALIST
USCG, CIVIL ENGINEERING UNIT JUNEAU
709 WEST 9TH STREET, ROOM 817
JUNEAU, AK 99801

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

CONTRACTING OFFICER
USCG, CIVIL ENGINEERING UNIT JUNEAU
709 WEST 9TH STREET, ROOM 817
JUNEAU, AK 99801

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (NO., STREET, COUNTY, STATE AND ZIP CODE)

POTENTIAL RMACC III Contractors

CODE | FACILITY CODE

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. 70Z08725RRMACCIII

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 09/29/2025

☐ 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 xxx 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 telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. 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.

☐	14. 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 REFERENCED 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 1 copy to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (ORGANIZED BY UCF SECTION HEADINGS, INCLUDING SOLICITATION/CONTRACT SUBJECT MATTER WHERE FEASIBLE.)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS 70Z08725RRMACCIII INDEFINITE DELIVERY/INDEFINITE QUANTITY REGIONAL MULTIPLE AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (RMACC)

A. This amendment is issued to answer Contractor questions received October 15-23, 2025.

B. THE PROPOSAL DUE DATES ARE REVISED. SEE REVISED TABLE OF PROPOSAL DUE DATES ON THE FINAL PAGE OF AMENDMENT.

C. PLEASE RETURN A SIGNED COPY OF THIS AMENDMENT WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or Print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)* CHERYL A. BERRY, CONTRACTING OFFICER, USCG	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR *(Signature of person authorized to sign)*	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	16C. DATE SIGNED

REMINDER: Offerors should use Revised RFP and all amendments when preparing their proposal responses.

This amendment makes the following changes to the RFP:

1. Answers Questions #1 – 69 submitted October 15-23, 2025

Q1: Request confirmation of the applicable Buy American Act. The interpretation of the applicable Buy American provision is FAR 52-225-9 Buy American-Construction Materials (Oct 2022), notwithstanding the threshold amount, noted in FAR 25.1102(c), of $6,708,000, activating incorporation of FAR 52.225-11. Per FAR Part 25.401(a)(1), acquisitions set aside for small business are an exception to the applicability of FAR Part 25.4 Trade Agreements, therefore 52.225-11 Buy American-Construction Materials under Trade Agreements (Nov 2023) would not be applicable to this Solicitation and resulting award(s).
A1: Both clauses and provisions remain in the IDIQ and any resultant contract.

Q2: Regarding Section K, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors, Item K.2 Congressional Information, subitems (2) & (3); how can this be completed at this stage of the solicitation, as this is an RMACC, where these locations are to be determined?
A2: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q3: The current set-aside designation(s) for Region [X] (per the latest Amendment/Attachment A).
A3: No changes, see Revised RFP issued with Amendment 0001. Instruction on use of Attachment A addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q4: Whether a Total Small Business pool exists for any region in the current conformed solicitation.
A4: Only Region 17 is designated Total Small Business.

Q5: Any bona-fide office expectations in Phase-One evaluation for Region [X].
A5: Per the RFP, bona fide language is not included.

Q6: Section L page limitations (by factor) for Phase-One submissions after Amendment 0003.
A6: Page limitations remain unchanged.

Q7: Amendment 0002 Q6/A6 and Q7/A7 both call reference to the “Consolidated QA for RMACC III.pdf”. This document was released 9/25/25, prior to the solicitation’s release on 9/29/25 and includes questions and clarifications based on the Draft Solicitation released July 2025. Given the Government’s references to this “Consolidated QA for RMACC III.pdf” document within Amendment 0002, are Offerors to assume the Government’s responses provided in the “Consolidated QA for RMACC III.pdf” are officially incorporated into the official Solicitation?
A7: Yes, information compiled in the Consolidated Q&A was officially incorporated into the solicitation and resulting awards. **However, USCG reserves the right to revise any answers previously provided via solicitation amendment.**

Q8: L.5.2.2 (Optional 1-page narrative). Please confirm the optional 1 page does not count against page limits for Factor 1 or Factor 2.
A8: As shown in the RFP, L.5.2.2 Factor 2 does not have page limitations.

Q9: L.5.1. Factor 1 – Corporate Experience: Demonstrated Project Experience h. – Attachment A - indicates that Attachment A should be provided in an Excel file. Please confirm if Offerors are to provide Attachment A in Excel format and therefore, Offerors would be providing in their email submissions PDF(s) *and* an Excel file.
A9: Addressed in Amendment 0005, revised Section L.5.1.

Q10: L.5.3.b. Organizational Technical Capabilities 1. Design-Build and Turnkey Project Capability asks for Offerors to describe "Planned business relationships with specific designers." Please confirm if it is the Government's intent for Offerors to evidence this by a description within this narrative, or if Offerors are to provide Letters of Commitment by one, or possibly even multiple, DoRs? If Offerors are expected to provide Letters of Commitment to support the requirements outlined in L.5.3.b. Organizational Technical Capabilities – please confirm these Letters of Commitment ***do not*** count against the established (4) page limitation.
A10: The RFP asks for narrative not letters of commitment.

Q11: M.3.2. Factor 2 – Past Performance - Basis of Evaluation | The Government has indicated in PPIs that CPARS evaluations are preferred however, PPQs may be accepted.
A11: Addressed in Amendment 0005, revised Section L.5.2.1.

Q12: The Government's has established a minimum contract value of $500,000 for projects to be considered relevant experience. The dollar threshold for CPARS associated with Construction is $750,000+.
A12: If a CPARs evaluation was not registered and completed due to being below the threshold, USCG will accept PPQ.

Q13: Please confirm that though the Government may prefer CPARS evaluations, Offerors providing PPQs will not be rated lower than Offerors providing CPARS.
A13: Provided the PPQ meets the requirements of the RFP; CPARs and PPQs will be evaluated equally.

Continued Next Page

Q14. The Government responded to a Pre-Solicitation PPI by stating "Lack of past performance may not eliminate your firm from competition, but it may result in lower rating. If other firms receive an overall higher rating than your firm, this could affect your ability to remain competitive."

Q14a. For this Solicitation, the minimum contract value for relevant past performance is $500,000 – below the minimum threshold to receive CPARS evaluations. This may mean that Offerors may provide *only* PPQs in these submissions.
A14a. Please see the response to question 12 of this document.
Q14b. Given the still ongoing Government shutdown, it is unlikely that Government clients can or will return completed PPQs to Offerors who are depending on PPQs to satisfy the requirements of Factor 2.
A14b. Proposal due dates have been extended in this amendment.

Q14c. Will the Government a) confirm that if PPQs are not received back from the Project Client in time for submission that they are to fill out Blocks 1-5 and submit with their proposal and b) confirm that Offerors providing PPQs with only Blocks 1-5 completed due to the Project Client being unable and/or unavailable to complete the evaluation will **not** receive lower ratings than Offerors submitting either/or Completed PPQs and/or CPARS evaluations.
A14c: See response to question 14b. of this document.

Q15: M.3.3.b Factor 3 – Please confirm how the Government will assess evidence of working relationships with designers.
A15: Using the offerors narrative as required in L.5.3.b.

Q16: Given that evaluation criteria associated with the evaluation of "Offerors demonstrating comprehensive and robust organizational expertise across all these areas of construction may be rated higher" is found within the Basis of Evaluation for Factor 3 – a 5 page narrative and not within Factor 1 – Demonstrated project experience which includes specific project information, please clarify how the Government is associating ratings surrounding expertise across several types of construction work: evidenced through multi-discipline Project Experience they provide in Factor 1, or a general narrative format supplied in Factor 3 which may not contain specific project information (contract #s, relevant construction trades involved in the project and firms that provided that trade)?
A16: Per M.2.1. Evaluation Factors Order of Importance: Phase I factors are approximately equal to each other.

Q17: Amendment 0002 A7 references Consolidated Q&A #47 but A7 introduces a new requirement that, if the Offeror is a Joint Venture, each JV member must include at least one project. Please reconcile A7 with Q47 and Section L.5.1 and confirm that, consistent with 13 CFR 125.8, the Government will not require one project from each JV member and will allow reliance on either member's experience, with the protégé permitted to show lower-value projects rated equivalently, if any.
A17: See revised Section L.5 Amendment 0005 and per 13 CFR 125.8(e)(1), "A procuring activity has discretion whether to … require some level of past performance and/or experience of the protégé…" L.5.1.b states the contract value range.

Q18: Request confirmation of the applicable Buy American Act. The interpretation of the applicable Buy American provision is FAR 52-225-9 Buy American-Construction Materials (Oct 2022), notwithstanding the threshold amount, noted in FAR 25.1102(c), of $6,708,000, activating incorporation of FAR 52.225-11. Per FAR Part 25.401(a)(1), acquisitions set aside for small business are an exception to the applicability of FAR Part 25.4 Trade Agreements, therefore 52.225-11 Buy American-Construction Materials under Trade Agreements (Nov 2023) would not be applicable to this Solicitation and resulting award(s).
A18: Please see response to question 1 of this document.

Q19: Regarding Section K, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors, Item K.2 Congressional Information, subitems (2) & (3); how can this be completed at this stage of the solicitation, as this is an RMACC, where these locations are to be determined?
A19: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q20: Section H.33. VETS-4212 Registration requires *"SAM and **VETS-4212** registrations must be in the name/CAGE/UEI of the offeror identified on SF1442."* For an unpopulated Joint Venture, the Joint Venture itself would not have a VETS-4212 registration in the name of the JV's CAGE/UEI. Please confirm that Offerors submitting as an unpopulated Joint Venture may satisfy this requirement by submitting the current VETS-4212 registrations of each Joint Venture member.
A20: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q21: Section L.1 states: *"The Offeror also shall enter its EFT indicator, if applicable."* For entities with only one bank account registered in SAM.gov, there is no choice of multiple EFT indicators. Please confirm that if an Offeror has only one SAM banking account and no selectable EFT "suffix," the EFT indicator may be left blank/"N/A" and the current SAM.gov registration suffices.
A21: Confirmed.

Q22: Section L.2. Instruction for Submitting Questions Regarding Solicitation states that all questions must be submitted by October 16, 2025. Please confirm the October 16, 2025 questions deadline applies to all RMACC Regions, including those with later Phase I due dates.
A22: Addressed in Amendment 0004, question 25.

Q23: Amendment 0002 A7 appears to suggest that "projects cited under experience must include at least one project from each [Joint Venture] member." Section L.5.1 does not contain this mandate. Our question is specific to Joint Ventures where the members are in an SBA Approved Mentor Protégé Agreement. As outlined in 13 CFR Part 125, the regulations allow agencies to rely solely on the past performance and/or experience of the mentor. Please confirm that, in a Joint Venture where the members are in an SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé Agreement, the Government will evaluate capabilities, past performance, and experience in accordance with 13 CFR 125.8, and will allow experience and past performance of the mentor to satisfy the experience requirements (outlined in Factors 1 and 2) for the proposing Joint Venture.
A23: See response to question 17 of this document.

Q24: Section L.5.1(h) mandates the submission of Attachment B: Experience Information Form for all projects under Factor 1 and imposes a 3-page limit per project. Section L.5.1(i) grants Offerors the option to include "additional descriptive content" beyond the minimum information requested. Please clarify the expectation for the level of detail within the 3-page limit: Is the Government seeking a comprehensive, detailed narrative that utilizes the entire 3-page maximum for each project, or is the primary focus on completing the required data fields with only minimal, targeted additional content?
A24: The offeror determines what is relevant and the level of detail to provide remaining within the confines of the page limitation.

Q25: Attachment A, the Experience Overview Sheet, is instructed to be completed and submitted in its original Excel file format (Pages 80 and 100). However, the electronic proposal submission instructions (Page 104) state that all proposals must be submitted as PDF files. Please clarify: Should Attachment A be submitted in its original Excel file format or converted and submitted as a PDF file?
A25: Addressed in Amendment 0004, revised Section L.6.

Q26: This solicitation is for a Multiple Award IDIQ Contract. Beginning "performance" of an IDIQ contract vehicle within 15 days is often a confusing requirement. The 15-day start is typically intended for the first Task Order (the Phase II Seed Project) awarded under the contract. Page 6 (SF 1442, Block 11) – Performance Start: Block 11 of the SF 1442 states, "The contractor shall begin performance within 15 calendar days after receiving award." Please clarify if this 15-day period refers to the start of work on the Phase II Seed Project Task Order or to the administrative start date of the overall IDIQ Contract awarded after Phase I.
A26: USCG intent of this “15 days” is to notify offerors that USCG **may** begin issuing solicitations under RMACC III within 15 days of award. The seed project and any resulting task orders under RMACC III will designate performance individual start dates.

Q27: Section L.5.5.a requires the Offeror to "identify the socioeconomic program set aside for the region". Since the set-aside for each region is already identified in Section A, please clarify if the intent of this instruction is for the Offeror to: a) Re-state the set-aside; or b) Confirm they are currently certified/eligible under the stated socioeconomic program for that region and provide evidence/certifications.
A27: No need to identify socioeconomic program.

Q28: Can a project be submitted for Corporate Experience if final contract value is over $500,000?
A28: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q29: If is project was 95% complete but the most current CPAR is an interim CPAR for the project at 50% complete can the CPAR be submitted for Factor 2 or do you want a PPQ completed?
A29: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q30: Can columns be resized or formatted without invalidating the form?
A30: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q31: For the single photo/award page, can project titles and captions be included?
A31: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q32: Does the 12-point font requirement apply to tables and headers as well as narrative text?
A32: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q33: As we develop our project writeups using Attachment B, we are noticing that to respond to each required section properly and thoroughly, the writeup is 3.5 – 4 pages in length using the required 1-inch margins and 12 pt Times New Roman font. To meet the required 3-page limit, we must remove valuable information that the Government can use to evaluate each project. In order to preserve valuable information, would the Government consider extending the length of Attachment B to 5 pages (4 pages for the narrative sections + 1 page for photos)?
A33: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q34: If the Government does not wish to extend the length of Attachment B to 5 pages (4 pages for the narratives + 1 page for photos), would the Government consider either removing Block 6 entirely, or removing the request for the design Firm name? In the solicitation package, the Government is not requesting the submission of a formal design team and/or design projects, so removing part or all this section will assist in staying within the page limit for each project.
A34: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q35: Section L.5.a Formatting Requirements advises us to use Times New Roman, 12-point font in our proposals. Are we required to use Times New Roman, 12-point font or are we able to adjust to smaller fonts if needed (i.e. Form SF 1442, Attachment A, Attachment C, etc.)?
A35: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q36: Form SF 1442 number 11 has “complete within” line blank as well as “performance period” boxes unchecked. Do we leave blank/unchecked or do we need to fill in?
A36: Offeror does not need to complete Block 11 of the SF 1442.

Q37: Form SF 1442 number 30 – if submitting as a JV/mentor-protégé would a signature from either company’s officer be acceptable?
A37: Yes, authorized signatory of either member is acceptable.

Q38: Will electronic signatures be accepted on Past Performance Questionnaires?
A38: Only PPQs from other Federal or State agencies may be signed using electronic signature.

Q39: Attachment B Experience Information – Item 7 – please confirm this applies to Design-Build projects only.
A39: Addressed in Amendment 0005, revised Attachment B.

Q40: Attachment C Performance Questionnaire – Item 2 – please advise if "percent of project work performed" is percent of the contract completed or is it percent of work self-performed
A40: This section asks what percentage of the work offeror completed and in what role.

Q41: The solicitation states the following: "Each submitted project must have a contract value approximately $500,000 to $20,000,000 and must have achieved substantial completion (defined as 65% completion) within the six-year period preceding the issuance date of this Request for Proposals (RFP)". We have relevant, completed projects within the past six years that exceed the $20M value. Will the government consider projects with values above $20M to be relevant for use in Factor 1 if they meet all other Factor 1 criteria?
A41: Yes, the RFP states contract value **approximately** $500,000 to $20,000,000.

Q42: Given the government shutdown continuing, offerors may not be able to get PPQs filled out by the existing submission deadline. Will the government allow us to include the first page of the PPQ form that provides the reference POC information in the proposal?
A42: Please see response to question 14b of this document.

Q43: The scope of this RMACC includes "demolition" and "remediation". We have a project that includes these two scope items but does not include the subsequent construction that will be performed after our preparation/cleanup of the site. Does the government consider a project that only includes demolition and remediation as relevant for one of the 3-5 to be submitted in Factor 1?
A43: Per L.5.1.a The anticipated RMACC scope of work includes, but is not limited to, real property repairs, maintenance, general construction, marine construction, demolition, historical restoration, and remediation.

Q44: The Request for Proposal number on the cover sheet of the Solicitation is 70Z08725RRMACCIII. The one listed in SAM.gov is 70Z08725RRMACC003. Which should we use in the Phase I submission?
A44: As addressed in Amendment 0004, utilize 70Z08725RRMACCIII.

Q45: Section L.4.1 requires: "In addition, the offeror shall provide the UEI Number, CAGE code, and Federal Tax ID number with its proposal." The CAGE Code is part of Block 14 on the SF 1442. Q&A #21 has the UEI Number also being included in Block 14. Please confirm the Federal Tax ID number should be presented in Block 14 also.

A45: Follow the directive of the RFP: In addition, the offeror **shall provide** the UEI Number, CAGE code, and Federal Tax ID number with its proposal.

Continued Next Page

Q46: The Solicitation states: "Offerors are to submit proposals entitled “RMACC III Region [identify Region #] Phase I Proposal” via email to include the SF1442, Section K Completed Representations and Certifications, completed K.1 and K.2, and documentation addressing Phase I Evaluation Factors one through four."
Q46a:Where it says how the proposal should be entitled, does this mean that all the proposal content (including the Attachment A excel) is to be compiled into one PDF or is that the intended subject line for the email?
A46a: Email subject shall indicate “RMACC III Region XX Phase I Proposal.”

Q46b: If the response to the preceding question is that the title is intended for the email subject and multiple files may be submitted separately within the email, please confirm which files should be packaged together? Should all the completed Attachment B forms be separate from the completed K.1 and K.2?
A46b: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q46c: Should K.3 also be submitted with K.1 and K.2, or is K.3 only required as part of Phase II?
A46c: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q47: Solicitations often allow formatting variances for graphics, tables, captions, charts, etc. Would the Government allow a slightly smaller, though still legible font of 10-point Arial, Calibri, or other sans serif for those elements?
A47: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q48: L.5.a of the Solicitation states: "The USCG limits submission to 20MB." Please confirm that each email is limited to 20 MB and that is not the total of all files submitted in both emails combined.
A48: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q49: Section L.5.1.g.b. states: "b. Offerors have the option to include additional descriptive content on the Project Information Sheet (Attachment B) beyond the minimum information requested in item 1. above." This is reiterated on page 107 under M.3.1. Both citations explicitly state that Attachment B is optional and imply that the L.5.1 criteria is required separately. However, Attachment B does not align to the criteria defined under Section L.5.1.a and L.5.1.b. While this was addressed somewhat in Q&A #23, please clarify if Attachment B is optional or required. The top of Attachment A indicates Attachment B forms are required. Please clarify.
A49: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q50: L.5.1.h states: "Required Submissions for Factor 1: a. Offerors shall provide the following completed attachments for all projects submitted under Factor 1: Attachment A: Experience Overview Sheet (limited to 1 Excel file); Attachment B: Experience Information Form (limited to 3 pages)." This also suggests that Factor 1 may a separate requirement/submission from the Attachments A and B. Please clarify.
A50: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q51: The Solicitation states: "Photographs: A separate, single page (maximum one page) may be included exclusively for relevant project photographs. This dedicated photo page is not counted towards the three-page limit for textual project details." Should the photo pages for the five projects be combined into a single file for the second email?
A51: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q52: Under the M.3.1 Factor 1 – Corporate Experience, the Solicitation states: "If an Offeror is using experience information of an affiliate, subsidiary, or parent that is not the name as exactly stated on the SF1442, the proposal shall describe the business relationship between the firms and clearly demonstrate that the affiliate, subsidiary, or parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the awarded regional IDIQ contract." Where should this business relationship narrative be addressed -- within the Factor 1 narrative, Attachment B, as a separate appendix, or somewhere else?
A52: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q53: Please confirm attachments may 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 layout for certain information on Attachment B)?
A53: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q54: Attachment A includes the following language: "Attachment A has been included as an Excel file. Complete Attachment A (Excel file only) and submit with your proposal." Please confirm if this is to be a separate excel file or if it is to be included within a single Phase I pdf? If that latter, may we use 11 x 17 for this page to improve legibility for all columns?
If we are not permitted to adjust the Attachment A to 11 x 17, may we use a font smaller than 12 for the entries? The current font on the form includes 6-point text with narrow margins.
A54: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q55: Attachment B does not conform to the formatting requirements. For instance, it does not have the 1" margins. Please confirm that we may present the required information, formatted as required under L.5.a and using the headings from the form. Please also confirm that in so doing, we need not include the informational element #9 regarding the photo page.
A55: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q56: For projects that are Design-Bid-Build, can we simply put ‘Not Applicable’ under Block 6 of the Attachment B and omit the Discipline table?
A56: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Continued Next Page

Q57: Q&A #23 states: "As stated in L.6.1.3.b. Offerors have the option to include additional descriptive content on the Project Information Sheet (Attachment B) beyond the minimum information requested. Attachment B contains 2 pages. Contractors may add one single page of project descriptive content and remain within the page limitation (3 total pages-the photographs page does not count as one of the three)." However, Attachment B is in fact 3 pages. If we address the L.6.1.1 requirements on the one single page as indicated by this response, should we then make the Attachment B more compact to fit in two pages (since the form itself contains three pages) or would the Government consider allowing the full three pages for Attachment B.
A57: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q58: Please confirm whether any of following are required or allowed: title page, table of contents, list of figures, acronym list. If any of these are required or allowed, please confirm they are exempt from page limitation.
A58: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q59: In Section L.5.a of the RFP, it specifies that offerors must submit proposals in Times New Roman, 12-point font, with 1” margins from all sides. It also notes that page limits are specified for each factor and that the USCG limits submission to 20MB. Additionally, Attachment B allows photos, which may be submitted in a separate email.
A59: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q60: The form in Attachment B, specifically the Experience Information section, appears to exceed the 1” margin limit, with margins set at 0.5” on all sides. I wanted to check if it is acceptable to use the form as provided to us at 0.5” margins?
A60: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q61: "Per the identified section, the RFP states: ""however, the Government reserves the right to off-ramp or select to not exercise any option period for a RMACC awardee that does not submit a proposal on three (3) task order RFPs during the course of each year of the contract.""
We respectfully request clarification on whether the government would consider increasing this limit or allowing additional flexibility based on workload, contractors participation, and project volume. Increasing or allowing discretion in the off-ramp limit would better reflect realistic proposal bandwidth while still supporting the government's intent to maintain active and responsive contractors."
A61: Addressed in Amendment 0004.

Q62: Will the government allow Attachment A- Experience Overview Sheet as an 11x 17 format?
A62: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q63: L.5.3.a Regional Management Capabilities. This section allows a total page count of five pages. We kindly request the government considers increasing the page limit to 8 to 10 pages to allow the offeror to sufficiently address all requirements of the RFP.
A63: Page limitations remain unchanged.

Q64: L.5.3.b Organizational Technical Capabilities. This section has a total page count of four pages. We kindly request the government considers increasing the page limit to 8 to 10 pages to allow the offeror to sufficiently address all requirements of the RFP.
A64: Page limitations remain unchanged.

Q65: Can the Offeror include an introduction or overview section at the beginning of Factor 1 to provide context and organization for the projects being presented?
A65: Offeror may include introduction, but it will count toward page restrictions.

Q66: Per Amendment 001, the required submission includes Attachment A (limited to one Excel file) and Attachment B. Does the Government want Offerors to submit Attachment A in its native file Excel forms or should it be converted to PDF and included in the final submission file?
A66: Addressed in Amendment 0005.

Q67: Does the Government require Offerors to include designer Letters of Commitment with the proposal submission? If so, should these be included within the relevant Factor or placed at the end of the volume as an appendix?
A67: The RFP does not require letter of commitment.

Q68: When including experience of a subsidiary in Factor 1- Corporate Experience, where in the proposal should the Offeror demonstrate that the subsidiary will have meaningful involvement on this contract? Will letters of commitment suffice and include at the end of the volume to demonstrate their participation?
A68: Letters of Commitment not required, offeror shall adhere to page limitations.

Q69: Minimum bonding—exact thresholds & format. Section M and the acquisition summary refer to “minimum bonding requirements,” but we don’t see the explicit single/aggregate numbers or prescribed surety letter language. What are the minimum single and aggregate capacities required for Phase I acceptability, and will separate letters from each JV member be acceptable (vs. one combined)?
A69: Refer to Section L.5.3.c.b. Separate letter acceptable for Phase I, but JV must show bonding capabilities if invited to participate in Phase II of solicitation.

Continued Next Page

Regional proposals are due on the date in table below by 5:00 PM Eastern time.

RMACC Contract Region	Regional CEU	Contract Set-Aside	Revised Proposal Due Dates
Region 1 (USCG Northeast District, formerly District 1)	CEU Providence	8(a)	26 November 2025
Region 5 (USCG East District, formerly District 5)	CEU Cleveland	SDVOSB	19 November 2025
Region 7 (USCG Southeast District, formerly District 7)	CEU Miami	8(a)	23 December 2025
Region 7.5 (USCG Southeast District, formerly District 7.5)	CEU Miami	To Be Determined	To Be Determined
Region 8 (USCG Heartland District, formerly District 8)	CEU Miami	HUBZone	19 November 2025
Region 9 (USCG Great Lakes District, formerly District 9)	CEU Cleveland	8(a)	23 December 2025
Region 11 / 13 (USCG Southwest/Northwest District, formerly District 11/13)	CEU Oakland	SDVOSB	19 November 2025
Region 14 (USCG Oceania District, formerly District 14)	CEU Honolulu	8(a)	26 November 2025
Region 17 (USCG Artic District, formerly District 17)	CEU Juneau	Total Small Business	26 November 2025