AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
J	1		3

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0003	24 NOV 2025		HUBZONE MATOC

6. ISSUED BY	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)*	CODE
W072 ENDIST LOUISVILLE KO CONTRACTING DIVISION, 600 DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR PL LOUISVILLE, KY 40202-2230 UNITED STATES JOEL HUBERMAN, EMAIL: JOEL.HUBERMAN@USACE.ARMY.MIL TELEPHONE: (502) 315-7409	W912QR	SCD: PAS:	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*	(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER
	☒	W912QR26RA008
		9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 06 OCT 2025
	☐	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER
		10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*
CODE / FACILITY CODE		

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☒ is extended. ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 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.)*

Due to an administrative error "Personnel Resume/Experience" were added by accident. "Personnel Resume/Experience" has been removed. The following two clauses have been added for Contractor Compliance with the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirement. The Due Date has been extended to Wednesday 26 November at 11:00 AM Eastern Time.

1. 252.204-7021 Contractor Compliance with the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirement (Nov 2025).
2. 252.204-7025, Notice of Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirements (Nov 2025)

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)*	
		JOHN BUTTS	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	24 NOV 2025

Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 11/2016)
Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Section 00 00 00 - Procurement and Contracting Requirements

The following changes have been made:

INFORMATION	FROM	TO
Response Due Date	24 Nov 2025	26 Nov 2025

Section 00 01 15 - List of Drawing Sheets

The attachments table has changed from:

Identifier	Document Name	Document Description	Reference Identifier	Date	Line Item	Page Numbers	Document Type	Provided Under Separate Cover
0001	SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS	Statement of Work		06 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0002	ProjNet Instructions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0003	PIEE Directions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0004	REPS AND CERTS	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0005	UAI 5152.236-9011	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0006	Section 00 22 16_Revised 11.21.2025	Statement of Work		21 Nov 2025			Attachment	No
0007	Veterans Employment	Statement of Work		19 Aug 2025			Attachment	No

To:

Identifier	Document Name	Document Description	Reference Identifier	Date	Line Item	Page Numbers	Document Type	Provided Under Separate Cover
0001	SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS	Statement of Work		06 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0002	ProjNet Instructions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0003	PIEE Directions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0004	REPS AND CERTS	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0005	UAI 5152.236-9011	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0006	Section 00 22 16_Revised 11.24.2025	Statement of Work		21 Nov 2025			Attachment	No
0007	Veterans Employment	Statement of Work		19 Aug 2025			Attachment	No
0008	DFARS 252.204-7025	DFARS 252.204-7025		24 Nov 2025			Attachment	No

The following contract documents were added:

DFARS 252.204-7025
Section 00 22 16_Revised 11.24.2025

The following contract documents were deleted:

Section 00 22 16_Revised 11.21.2025

The following contract documents Page Counts were changed:

DOCUMENT PAGE COUNTS		
DOCUMENT NAME	**FROM**	**TO**
Section 00 22 16_Revised 11.24.2025		none

Section 00 72 00 - General Conditions

The following clauses were added:

DFARS Clauses Incorporated by Reference

Number	Title	Effective Date	Alternate/ Deviation	Variation Effective Date
252.204-7021	Contractor Compliance with the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirement.	Jan 2023		

252.204-7025 NOTICE OF CYBERSECURITY MATURITY MODEL CERTIFICATION LEVEL REQUIREMENTS (NOV 2025)

(a) Definitions. As used in this provision, controlled unclassified information (CUI), current, Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) status, Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification unique identifier (CMMC UID), Federal contract information (FCI), and Plan of action and milestones have the meaning given in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement 252.204-7021, Contractor Compliance With the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirements, clause of this solicitation.

(b)(1) Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) level. The CMMC level required by this solicitation **will be determined at the Task Order level**. This CMMC level, or higher (see 32 CFR part 170), is required prior to award for each contractor information system that will process, store, or transmit Federal contract information (FCI) or controlled unclassified information (CUI) during performance of the contract.

(2) The Offeror will not be eligible for award of a contract, task order, or delivery order resulting from this solicitation if the Offeror does not have, for each of the contractor information systems that will process, store, or transmit FCI or CUI and that will be used in performance of a contract resulting from this solicitation--

(i) The current CMMC status entered in the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) (https://piee.eb.mil) at the CMMC level required by paragraph (b)(1) of this provision; and

(ii) A current affirmation of continuous compliance with the security requirements identified at 32 CFR part 170 in SPRS.

(c) Plan of action and milestones. If the Offeror has a CMMC Status of Conditional, the Offeror shall successfully close out a valid plan of action and milestones (32 CFR 170.21) to achieve a CMMC Status of Final.

(d) CMMC unique identifiers. The Offeror shall provide, in the proposal, the CMMC unique identifier(s) (CMMC UIDs) issued by SPRS for each contractor information system that will process, store, or transmit FCI or CUI during performance of a contract, task order, or delivery order resulting from this solicitation. The Offeror also shall update the list when new CMMC UIDs are generated in SPRS. The CMMC UIDs are provided in SPRS after the Offeror enters the results of self-assessment(s) for each such information system.

(End of provision)

SECTION 00 22 16 - PHASE I

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL AND EVALUATION OF OFFERS FOR PHASE ONE

1.0 OVERVIEW.

1.1 The intent of this solicitation is to target ten (10) contractors for a firm-fixed-price Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) for primarily Design/Bid/Build (D/B/B) and Design/Build (D/B) Construction Activities for the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Mission Boundaries.

1.2 This is a two-phase procurement, and the basis of award is the Best Value Trade-Off Process.

Potential offerors are invited to submit the information described in this Section 00 22 16 for review and evaluation by the Government. Following completion of the evaluation of Phase I, up to a maximum of ten (10) most highly qualified offerors will be selected to participate in Phase II. The selected offerors for Phase II will be invited to submit the information described in Section 00 22 18, Procedures for Submittal of Offers for Phase II, for review and evaluation by the Government. Price will be evaluated in Phase II through use of a sample project and binding contract rates. No seed task order will be awarded as a result of this solicitation. Only the base MATOC contracts will be awarded.

2.0 SUBMITTAL OF OFFERS.

2.1 Offerors submitting proposals for this project should limit submissions to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and monies will have been expended in preparing information required herein. However, in order to be effectively and equitably evaluated, the proposals must include information sufficiently detailed to clearly describe the offeror's capability for successfully completing the solicited project. Requirements stated in this Request for Proposal (RFP) are minimums. Proposals should follow in the order of sequence set forth in the RFP. Information provided out of sequence may not be evaluated and may result in the offerors disqualification from award.

2.2 Offerors shall submit their proposals to the US Army Corps of Engineers, using the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation Module no later than the time and date specified in Block 13 of Standard Form 1442. **NOTE: The Louisville District is in the Eastern Time Zone.**

2.3 The Government is using a two-phase procurement approach for D/B/B or D/B Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) MATOC contract. For Phase I, offerors are required to submit a proposal consisting of the information identified in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 below. All proposal materials shall be submitted in binders with a table of contents and tabbed section dividers. Phase I proposal sections should parallel the submission requirements identified herein.

2.4 Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance

- Prime Contractor
- A-E Designer of Record Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach

NOTE: Provide the complete Volume I proposal submittal including text, renderings, drawings, photographs, etc. in one file and provide the complete Volume II proposal submittal in a separate file. Offerors are responsible for ensuring the accuracy of their electronic proposal. Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab (factor or sub-factor) may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information. Any specified page limits will be strictly adhered to and enforced. Information submitted which exceeds the specified limit will not be evaluated.

2.5 Volume II for Phase I shall be submitted in a separate electronic file that is clearly indexed, and logically assembled and includes the following information:

- Volume II – Tab A: Standard Form 1442

- Volume II – Tab B: Joint Venture Agreements
- Volume II – Tab C: Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability
- Volume II – Tab D: Pre-Award Information

NOTE: Phase I does NOT involve pricing submission. Volume II shall be submitted in a separate file through PIEE. Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab (factor or sub-factor) may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information.

3.0 Proposal Evaluation Process

3.1 A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) comprised of representatives of the Corps of Engineers, User/Customer, and other required personnel will evaluate the proposals. Offerors are advised that the technical evaluation and rating of proposals will be conducted in strict confidence. The number and identities of offerors will not be revealed to anyone who is not involved in the evaluation and award process or to other offerors. Proposals will be evaluated based on the factors described herein, and the basis of award is a Best Value Trade-Off.

3.2 The evaluation process for Phase I essentially consists of two parts: (1) proposal compliance review and responsibility determination; and (2) past performance/technical evaluation.

3.2.1 Proposal Compliance Review: This is an initial review to ensure that all required forms and certifications are complete and that the offeror is financially capable of sustaining performance under the contract and is able to obtain the required level of performance and payment bonds from an acceptable surety.

3.2.2 Past Performance / Technical Evaluation: The SSEB will evaluate and rate the proposals against the RFP requirements. Factor I – Past Performance will be rated based on overall confidence in performance (using Table 2, below), with the final confidence assessment rating based on the extent of recent, relevant past experience (using Table I, below), and the quality of the offeror's performance on that experience. Factor II – Technical Approach will be rated using an adjectival-based system (using Table 3, below). The Contracting Officer / Source Selection Authority will select up to a maximum of ten (10) most highly qualified offerors to continue on to Phase II.

4.0 Phase I Proposal Information and Related Evaluation Factors

4.1 Phase I proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the factors below, listed in relative order of importance. Offerors are reminded to include their best technical approach in their initial offer and not to automatically assume that they will have an opportunity to participate in discussions or be asked to submit a revised offer. The Government may make award of a conforming proposal without discussions, if deemed to be within the best interest of the Government.

4.2	Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance	1st
	• Prime Contractor	Equal to A/E
	• A/E Designer of Record	Equal to Prime
4.3	Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach	2nd
4.4	Volume II – Pro Forma Information	
	Tab A Standard Form 1442	Not Rated
	Tab B Joint Venture Agreements	Not Rated
	Tab C Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability	Not Rated
	Tab D Pre-Award Information	Not Rated

4.5 Ratings: Evaluators will apply the adjectival rating for the definition that most closely matches the evaluation.

TABLE 1

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
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.

TABLE 2

Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	**Description**
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 Confidence	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 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 successfully perform the required effort.

TABLE 3

Technical Assessment Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

4.6 Definitions:

Deficiency. A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

Strength. An aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Significant Strength. An aspect of an offeror's proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Significant Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Uncertainty. Any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the offeror is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission or mistake).

Clarification. Limited exchanges between the Government and offerors that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated. See FAR 15.306(a)(1).

Adverse Past Performance. Past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation. Adverse past performance that must be addressed with Offerors includes unfavorable comments received from sources such as those received from respondents from past performance questionnaires or interviews that have not been finalized within a formal rating system.

5.0 Phase I – Volume I – Factor I - Past Performance

5.1 Submission Requirements:

Prime Contractor

5.1.1 Provide descriptions of up to (3) three projects substantially complete or completed by the prime contractor within the last 5 years (from the solicitation issue date) that are similar in size and scope. Projects

completed more than 5 years before issue of solicitation date may be considered for evaluation purposes but may lessen the overall relevancy rating for that project. Projects are considered substantially complete if enough work has been performed such that it demonstrates the ability to successfully complete all phases of the project. An Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract may be submitted only if a single task order could be considered similar to this project. Task orders may not be combined for the project to be considered similar.

5.1.2 To be considered similar in size, projects must include a minimum of 1,500 square feet of either horizontal or vertical new construction or renovation and must have a minimum construction value of $500,000.

5.1.3 Projects considered similar in scope shall be horizontal or vertical new construction or renovation D/B or D/B/B projects and must demonstrate work covering multi-engineering disciplines (architectural, mechanical, structural, civil, and/or electrical) to be considered similar. Additionally, at least one project shall demonstrate renovation or new construction that has a minimum of 1,500 square feet. Similar projects include but are not limited to new building construction, building renovation, all types of building/facilities demolition, building debris type removal, structural repairs, site work, utility installation/replacement, paving, civil works (flood damage reduction, such as channel improvements, bank stabilization, levees, and floodwalls), industrial repairs, equipment upgrades, landscaping, geotechnical work, instrumentation, architectural, security systems, lead paint, PCB, HTRW, and asbestos abatement and design associated with all of the various aforementioned tasks.

If D/B/B projects are submitted, please note they may be considered less relevant than D/B projects given the lesser degree of overall complexity of D/B/B projects.

5.1.4 The prime contractor must have self-performed at least 20% of the cost of the contract, and this percentage of work shall consist of direct contract labor (including testing and layout personnel), exclusive of material, equipment, or subcontractors to be considered similar.

5.1.5 Additional consideration may be given for the following:

- Previous successful working relationships between the prime contractor and Designer of Record (DOR) for this solicitation.
- Demonstrated experience with construction projects for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

5.1.6 The following information shall be provided for each project:

- Project Title, Contract Number, and Location.
- Current percentage of construction complete and when it was or will be completed.

  <u>For projects that are not yet complete, provide description of work remaining to be completed.</u>
- Scope of the project to include purpose/use of facility.
- Size of the project; differentiate square footage of new construction versus renovation (if the project includes both).
- Type and percentage of work that was self-performed.
- Whether the project was Design/Build (include the name of the Designer of Record (DOR)) or Design/Build/Build.
- Customer Primary Point of Contact and alternate POC (name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current and correct phone number, and current and correct email address)

NOTE: The inclusion of a callout box or graphic merely indicating a risk without a supplemental narrative will not be deemed sufficiently detailed to trigger consideration as a strength.

NOTE: Each project description shall not exceed one (1) page (front and back) including all narratives and pictures. Any information provided beyond the one (1) page (front and back) limit for the project description will not be considered.

5.1.7 For this factor, also include any ratings, letters, awards, etc. which support past performance on these projects. Any of this information that is submitted shall clearly identify to which of the submitted projects it pertains. A sample Past Performance Questionnaire is attached for your convenience. If used, the Past Performance Questionnaire must be submitted by the offeror with the proposal submission and NOT sent directly to the agency from the reference.

A-E Designer of Record

5.1.8 Provide descriptions of up to (3) three projects substantially complete or completed by the A-E Designer Record within the last 5 years (from the solicitation issue date) that are similar in size and scope. (see paragraphs 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 above). In order to be considered similar, the proposed A/E firm must have been the DOR on the submitted project. The listed design firm must be used on the project. No deviations will be permitted unless approved by the Contracting Officer. Identification of more than one (1) design firm will result in an evaluation based on the least qualified firm. In addition to the above and below, provide the information requested in paragraph 5.1.6 and 5.1.7.

The offeror must affirmatively state who their proposed DOR for the project will be and provide the DOR's Unique Entity Identification (UEI) number and CAGE Code.

5.1.9 Additional consideration may be given for the DOR projects that contain the following features:

- Experience with USACE Design/Build Criteria (i.e., AT/FP, UFC, Specs Intact.)

- Previous successful working relationships between the Designer of Record (DOR) and Prime Contractor for this solicitation.

NOTE: For purposes of evaluating past performance, the Prime Contractor is defined as the contractor identified in Block 14 of the Standard Form 1442. Projects performed by contractors other than the offeror, including, but not limited to, teaming partners, subcontractors, sister or parent companies, and affiliates will not be evaluated for past performance, unless those other contractors are part of a joint venture offeror as demonstrated by a signed joint venture (JV) agreement. If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, then a signed JV agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the JV shall be registered as such in the System for Award Management (SAM). However, each party of the JV must submit their own Unique Entity Identifier Number (formerly known as DUNS number) with the JV proposal. Projects performed by other contractors than the offeror, such as teaming partners or subcontractors, will not be evaluated for past performance, unless those other contractors are part of a JV offeror as demonstrated by a signed JV agreement. If the offeror represents the combining of two or more companies as a JV for the purpose of this RFP, each company in the JV may submit project examples, but the total submitted by the JV will not exceed five (5).

NOTE: Each project description shall not exceed one (1) page (front and back) including all narratives and pictures. Any information provided beyond the one (1) page (front and back) limit for the project description will not be considered.

5.2. Evaluation Criteria:

5.2.1 For both the Prime and DOR, the SSEB will first evaluate the relevancy of recent past performance identified in the proposal in response to paragraph 5.1 above. By using the criteria identified above, the SSEB will determine how relevant a past project is when compared to the scope, size, and magnitude of effort and complexities of the solicited project. A relevancy rating will be assigned to each submitted

project using the Past Performance Relevancy Ratings table above.

5.2.2 For both the Prime and DOR, the SSEB will next review how well the offeror performed on those projects. The Government reserves the right to check any or all cited references to verify supplied information and to assess owner satisfaction. The Government also reserves the right to not contact the provided references. In addition to the information submitted by the offeror, the Government reserves the right to review any other sources of relevant information for evaluating past performance, including projects other than those submitted by the offeror. The Government will, at a minimum, review past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), including Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all CAGE/Unique Entity Identifier numbers. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved from inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

5.2.3 The SSEB will review all past performance information collected for both the Prime and DOR. The SSEB will determine the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate this information into the performance confidence assessment. The SSEB will assign a final, overall Performance Confidence rating, using the ratings in the Performance Confidence Assessment table above, based on the SSEB's assessment of (1) the degree of the offeror's recent, relevant experience, and (2) how well the offeror performed that experience.

NOTE: The Past Performance of both the Prime and A/E DOR will be weighted equally in the establishment of the overall Performance Confidence rating.

6.0 Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach

6.1 Submission Requirements:

6.1.1 Collaboration: Provide a narrative that describes the offeror's philosophy and intended technical approach for executing Design-Build projects. Clearly and concisely describe the offeror's Design-Build team, and how key members (e.g., Construction PM, Construction Superintendent, Construction Quality Control, SSHO, Design PM, and Design Quality Control) of the team will work collaboratively to ensure timely, quality completion of the project.

6.1.2 Quality Control: Describe the Design-Build team's quality control approach, corporate systems and capabilities to maintain quality control of the design and construction. Describe the proposed quality control organization, including the proposed staffing plan.

- Provide specific information on how you will manage design quality control, track design evolution and changes during design to meet the schedule and to facilitate Government reviews.

- Provide information on how you will handle internal and external requests for information, shop drawings, submittal reviews, progress meetings, site visits, contract completion, closeout, as-built, and completion documentation.

- In addition to the required designer-of-record (DOR) roles specified within the RFP for maintaining integrity of the design, describe any other DOR involvement in the quality control process, if any. There is no need to submit a quality control plan as the successful offeror will provide that after award.

6.1.3 Communication Plan: Describe interactions and communications both within the Design-Build team and with the Corps of Engineers throughout the entirety of the project life cycle.

6.1.4 Planning and Scheduling: Describe the offeror's schedule control capabilities and any systems the offeror will use to plan design and construction activities. Explain how the schedule will be used to manage design

and construction. Discuss internal procedures for handling delays to minimize time growth or "schedule creep," include any consideration of fast-tracking design and construction. Discuss how you plan to streamline construction, manage labor, and handle any other resource constraints to reduce cost and achieve task order completion within the period of performance.

NOTE: There is a page limit of six (6) single-sided, 8.5" x 11" pages, using a minimum font size of 11 and a minimum margin of one-half inch on all sides, for the Technical Approach narrative.

6.2 Evaluation Criteria:

6.2.1 The Government will evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and any deficiencies in the technical approach. The Government will evaluate the firm's understanding of the design/build process (and the requirements described in the Division 01 requirements of the Solicitation) and how well it has demonstrated its ability to successfully execute the project. Some additional specific evaluation considerations are listed below. This list is not all-inclusive.

6.2.2 Organization: The Government will evaluate clarity and strength of the overall organization, the structure and staffing to execute the entire scope of work.

6.2.3 Collaborative Approach for Design/Build: The Government will evaluate the integration of the design and construction firms during design and construction. Proposals demonstrating that construction personnel will be actively involved in the design process may be viewed more favorably by the SSEB. The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding of the design process and the roles of the designers of record and the Government reviewers. The Government will evaluate the role of the designer in maintaining design integrity throughout the process, including its key roles during construction.

6.2.4 Planning and Scheduling: The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding of and ability to manage an integrated fast track Design/Build schedule. Offerors that propose effective methods to streamline construction, minimize delays, and to manage labor and other resource constraints may be viewed more favorably by the SSEB.

6.2.5 Quality Control: The Government will evaluate the offeror's capabilities and understanding of the contractually required quality control processes for both design and construction. The Government places value upon continued participation by the DORs during the construction quality control process. The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the staffing plan to cover all required tasks and responsibilities. The Government will evaluate the strength of the offeror's proposed system to control and track revisions to the design.

7.0 Volume II – Pro Forma Information

NOTE: Phase I does NOT involve pricing submission.

7.1 Tab A – Standard Form 1442.

7.1.1 Submission Requirements:
The offeror shall complete and submit the Standard Form 1442.

7.1.2 Evaluation Criteria:
The Standard Form 1442 will not be rated. The form will be reviewed to determine if required information is provided, amendments are acknowledged, and the offer signed.

~~**7.2 Tab B – Joint Venture and Mentor-Protégé Agreements**~~

~~7.2.1 Submission Requirements:~~
~~If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, or the offeror listed in Block 14 is a joint venture (JV), then a signed JV agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the offeror shall be registered in the~~

~~System for Award Management (SAM) as a legal entity separate from the individual joint venture members. However, each member of the JV must submit its own Unique Entity Identifier (formerly known as DUNS number) with the proposal.~~

~~Small business offerors (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone, SDVOSB) submitting a proposal as a JV or Mentor-Protégé shall submit evidence from the offeror's SBA Servicing Agency that the offeror has notified and discussed the proposed joint venture for this specific project with the appropriate SBA Representative or Business Opportunity Specialist. Joint Venture agreements and approved 8(a) Mentor-Protégé agreements must be submitted with the proposal.~~

~~7.2.2 Evaluation Criteria:~~

~~This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated. Joint Venture Agreements and Mentor-Protégé agreements must comply with the relevant regulations in Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations in order for an offeror to be eligible for any small business-related price preference.~~

7.2 Tab B – Joint Venture Agreements

7.2.1 Submission Requirements:

If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, or the offeror listed in Block 14 is a joint venture (JV), then a signed JV agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the offeror shall be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as a legal entity separate from the individual joint venture members. However, each member of the JV must submit its own Unique Entity ID (UEI) with the proposal.

In addition to the JV agreement, Small Business offerors (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone, SDVOSB, etc.) submitting a proposal as a Mentor-Protégé JV under the SBA Mentor-Protégé program (MPP) shall submit a copy of their SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé Agreement. Joint Venture agreements and approved Mentor-Protégé agreements must be submitted with the proposal.

7.2.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated. Small Business Joint Venture Agreements and Mentor-Protégé agreements must comply with the relevant regulations in Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations in order for an offeror to be eligible for any small business-related price preference.

7.3 Tab C – Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability

7.3.1 Submission Requirements:

- Financial Capability. Submit Proof of Financial Ability (most recent financial statement covering assets and liabilities). Include the name, address and telephone number of firm's banking institution.

- Bonding Capability. Submit information showing offeror's ability to be bonded for projects up to the task order limit of the awarded contract. Include the name, address and telephone number of the firm's bonding company. Bonding information shall include the offerors current single and aggregate performance and payment bond limits.

7.3.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated.

7.4 Tab D – Pre-Award Information

7.4.1 Submission Requirements:

A. The offeror shall submit one completed copy of Section 00 45 00, Representations and Certification.

B. The offeror shall submit the following information:

- Number of years the firm has been in business
- Name, address, and telephone numbers of two credit/trade references
- A list of present commitments, including the dollar value

C. The offeror shall submit the name, address, and Unique Entity Identifier (formerly known as DUNS number) for any and all A-E subcontractors identified in the proposal.

7.4.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated.

Prime Past Performance Project Detail Sheet

Your firm's name _____

Name of Project/Location/Square Footage_____

_____

General Scope of Project:

_____

_____

_____

Your role (prime, joint venture, subcontractor) and work your company self-performed:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Percentage of Work completed by Prime Contractor Personnel: _____%

Construction Cost:

At Award: $_____ Reason for the cost growth: _____

Final Cost $_____

Award Date: _____

Scheduled Completion: _____ Reason for the time growth: _____

Actual Completion: _____ _____

Extent and type of work you subcontracted out:

_____

_____

Owner's Point of Contact (POC) for reference (name and company and telephone number):

_____

A-E DESIGNER OF RECORD DESIGN FIRM EXPERIENCE

Name of your firm: _____

Project Name/Location:

_____

General Scope of Project:

_____

_____

Your role (prime, joint venture, subcontractor) and the work your firm self-performed:

_____

_____

_____

Description of work subcontracted to others:

_____

_____

Design Fee: $_____ Construction cost of work designed $_____

Award Date: _____ Completion: _____

Your performance evaluation by Owner

_____

_____

Your performance evaluation by Prime for this project:

_____

_____

Owner's POC for reference (name and company and telephone number):

_____

Prime contractor's POC for reference (name and company and telephone number):

_____

Past Working History/Relationship with Prime (including joint ventures and partnering experience):

_____

_____

NAVFAC/USACE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Form PPQ-0)

CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)

1. Contractor Information

Firm Name: CAGE Code:

Address:

Phone Number: Unique Entity Identifier (formerly DUNS):

Email Address:

Point of Contact: Contact Phone Number:

2. Work Performed as: ☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Sub Contractor ☐ Joint Venture ☐ Other (Explain)

Percent of project work performed:

If subcontractor, who was the prime (Name/Phone #):

3. Contract Information

Contract Number:

Delivery/Task Order Number (if applicable):

Contract Type: ☐ Firm-fixed-price ☐ Cost Reimbursement ☐ Other (Please specify):

Contract Title:

Contract Location:

Award Date (mm/dd/yy):

Contract Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):

Actual Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):

Explain Differences:

Original Contract Price (Award Amount):

Final Contract Price (*to include all modifications, if applicable*):

Explain Differences:

4. Project Description:

Complexity of Work ☐ High ☐ Med ☐ Routine

How is this project relevant to project of submission? (*Please provide details such as similar equipment, requirements, conditions, etc.*)

CLIENT INFORMATION (Client to complete Blocks 5-8)

5. Client Information

Name:

Title:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

6. Describe the client's role in the project:

7. Date Questionnaire was completed (mm/dd/yy)**:**

8. Client's Signature:

NOTE: NAVFAC/USACE REQUESTS THAT THE CLIENT COMPLETES THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUBMITS DIRECTLY BACK TO THE OFFEROR. THE OFFEROR WILL SUBMIT THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO USACE WITH THEIR PROPOSAL, AND MAY DUPLICATE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FUTURE SUBMISSION ON USACE SOLICITATIONS. THE

GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO VERIFY ANY AND ALL INFORMATION ON THIS FORM.

ADJECTIVE RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS TO BE USED TO BEST REFLECT YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE

RATING	DEFINITION	NOTE
(E) Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.	An Exceptional rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed multiple significant events that were of benefit to the Government/Owner. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
(VG) Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	A Very Good rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed a significant event that was a benefit to the Government/Owner. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.
(S) Satisfactory	Performance meets minimum contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	A Satisfactory rating is appropriate when there were only minor problems, or major problems that the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. Per DOD policy, a fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.
(M) Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	A Marginal is appropriate when a significant event occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming which impacted the Government/Owner.
(U) Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	An Unsatisfactory rating is appropriate when multiple significant events occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming and which impacted the Government/Owner. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating.
(N) Not Applicable	No information or did not apply to your contract	Rating will be neither positive nor negative.

TO BE COMPLETED BY CLIENT

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.

1. QUALITY:						
a) Quality of technical data/report preparation efforts	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements (without adverse effect on performance)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
2. SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:						
a) Compliance with contract delivery/completion schedules including any significant intermediate milestones. *(If liquidated damages were assessed or the schedule was not met, please address below)*	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Rate the contractor's use of available resources to accomplish tasks identified in the contract	E	VG	S	M	U	N
3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:						
a) To what extent were the end users satisfied with the project?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor was reasonable and cooperative in dealing with your staff (including the ability to successfully resolve disagreements/disputes; responsiveness to administrative reports, businesslike and communication)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) To what extent was the contractor cooperative, businesslike, and concerned with the interests of the customer?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Overall customer satisfaction	E	VG	S	M	U	N
4. MANAGEMENT/ PERSONNEL/LABOR						
a) Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors, suppliers, materials, and/or labor force?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Ability to hire, apply, and retain a qualified workforce to this effort	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Government Property Control	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Knowledge/expertise demonstrated by contractor personnel	E	VG	S	M	U	N
e) Utilization of Small Business concerns	E	VG	S	M	U	N
f) Ability to simultaneously manage multiple projects with multiple disciplines	E	VG	S	M	U	N
g) Ability to assimilate and incorporate changes in requirements and/or priority, including planning, execution and response to Government changes	E	VG	S	M	U	N
h) Effectiveness of overall management (including ability to effectively lead, manage and control the program)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
5. COST/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT						
a) Ability to meet the terms and conditions within the contractually agreed price(s)?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) If this is/was a Government cost type contract, please rate the Contractor's timeliness and accuracy in submitting monthly invoices with appropriate back-up documentation, monthly status reports/budget variance reports, compliance	E	VG	S	M	U	N

with established budgets and avoidance of significant and/or unexplained variances (under runs or overruns)						
d) Is the Contractor's accounting system adequate for management and tracking of costs? *If no, please explain in Remarks section.*	Yes			No		
e) If this is/was a Government contract, has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending terminations? *Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.*	Yes			No		
f) Have there been any indications that the contractor has had any financial problems? *If yes, please explain below.*	Yes			No		
6. SAFETY/SECURITY						
a) To what extent was the contractor able to maintain an environment of safety, adhere to its approved safety plan, and respond to safety issues? (Includes: following the users rules, regulations, and requirements regarding housekeeping, safety, correction of noted deficiencies, etc.)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor complied with all security requirements for the project and personnel security requirements.	E	VG	S	M	U	N
7. GENERAL						
a) Ability to successfully respond to emergency and/or surge situations (including notifying COR, PM or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent contractual issues).	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Compliance with contractual terms/provisions *(explain if specific issues)*	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Would you hire or work with this firm again? *(If no, please explain below)*		Yes			No	
d) In summary, provide an overall rating for the work performed by this contractor.	E	VG	S	M	U	N

Please provide responses to the questions above (*if applicable*) and/or additional remarks. Furthermore, please provide a brief narrative addressing specific strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, or other comments which may assist our office in evaluating performance risk *(please attach additional pages if necessary.*