AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
U	1		13

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0003	05 Aug 2026	See Continuation Sheet	

6. ISSUED BY CODE N62742

NAVFACSYSCOM PACIFIC
258 MAKALAPA DR STE 100, JBPHH HI 96860-3134
JBPHH, HI 96860-3134
UNITED STATES
Amber Mori, Email: amber.i.mori.civ@us.navy.mil

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

SCD: PAS:

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

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X)

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER
N6274226R1801

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
16 Jul 2026

☐ 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

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

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

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

See Section G - Contract Administration Data

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

CHECK ONE	
☐	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
☐	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
☐	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
☐	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (*Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

See Schedule

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

Previous edition unusable

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

Created On:
06 Aug 2026, 02:18 AM Greenwich Mean Time

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Block 14 (Description of Amendment/Modification):

The purpose of this Amendment is to incorporate revisions to the solicitation as identified below.

A. Section J:

The following J Attachments are revised:
1. J.7 Cost Model
2. J.8 Specialized Recent Project/Contract Experience Information
3. J.9 Workload Experience Form

B. Section M: Section M is revised. Changes are annotated by red font.

C. Questions and Government responses for Questions #27-#45 are provided.

D. All other sections/attachments remain unchanged.

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:

M1 COMPETITIVE RANGE:

The Government intends to evaluate all proposals received and award a contract without negotiations. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost/price and technical standpoint. However, if negotiations are deemed necessary, to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value, negotiations will be held with those Offerors within the competitive range. The Government may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly qualified proposals, considering cost and technical factors.

M2 ORAL PRESENTATIONS:

If negotiations are deemed necessary, the Government reserves the right to request oral presentations with Offerors within the competitive range. The oral presentation will be to augment the Offeror's written proposal.

M3. ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL:

The proposal must set forth full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract. By submission of the offer, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., key personnel, subcontractors, approach, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract and any substitutions will require prior Contracting Officer's approval.

M4 BASIS OF AWARD

The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to the responsible Offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined to be the most advantageous to the Government considering Cost and Non-Cost evaluation factors. Award may be made to other than the lowest cost Offeror or other than the highest Non-Cost rated Offeror. Business judgment and tradeoffs will be used to determine the proposal offering the best value to the Government. In determining the best value to the Government, the Government need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the best value decision.

M5 EVALUATION FACTORS

(1) The evaluation factors are as follows:

I. Non-Cost Evaluation Factors:

FACTOR 1, CORPORATE AND KEY PERSONNEL EXPERIENCE

FACTOR 2, SAFETY

FACTOR 3, PAST PERFORMANCE

II. Cost

(2) The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is the technical factors, Factor (1) Corporate and Key Personnel Experience and Factor (2) Safety, are of equal importance to each other and, when combined, are equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment factor, Factor (3) Past Performance. When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factors and past performance/performance confidence assessment factor combined (i.e., the non-cost/price evaluation factors) are significantly more important than cost.

(3) NON-COST EVALUATION FACTORS (FACTORS 1, 2, AND 3)

a. NOTES applicable to Factor 1, Corporate and Key Personnel Experience and Factor 3, Past Performance on Recent, Relevant Projects:

(1) Definition of "recent relevant project" is as follows:

A. In general, relevant project means projects whose scopes of work were similar to the types of projects that may be ordered against this contract that require the performance of one or more of the Specific Tasks described in Section C, paragraph 1.2. A relevant project must be either a standalone contract or task order under an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract. The submission of information or the description of the scope of a Basic IDIQ contract will not be considered a relevant project, except in Section M, paragraph M5.(3).b.(2)c and Attachment J.10, Key Personnel Experience/Qualifications. Information may be provided on Basic IDIQ contracts on Attachment J.10 for the Program Manager, Senior Project Manager, Contract Administration Manager, Quality Assurance Manager, and Health and Safety Manager.

B. A relevant project shall also be for an amount of at least $200,000 in dollar value and shall be at least 85% financially executed as of the issuance date of this solicitation. ~~A relevant project shall involve performance of remedial action services.~~

C. A recent project is defined as one that is completed or at least 85% financially executed within five (5) years from the issuance date of this solicitation, except in regards to Key Personnel in which a recent project is defined as one that is completed or at least 85% financially executed within the last ten (10) years from the issuance date of this solicitation.

(2) The distinction between Corporate and Key Personnel Experience and Past Performance is that Corporate and Key Personnel Experience pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work covered by this requirement, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past Performance pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well a contractor has performed on the contracts.

(3) Definition: "Offeror" typically refers to a single corporation or business entity submitting the proposal as a prime contractor. An "Offeror" can also be comprised of other entities that submit the proposal as a prime contractor, such as: Joint Ventures (JV), Limited Partnerships (LTD), or a Limited Liability Company (LLC). In its evaluation of past performance and experience, the Government's evaluation will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal (single corporation, individual JV partners, or the LTD or LLC identified on the SF33). Entities may not submit as Prime on more than one offer. Failure to comply with this may result in disqualification of the Offeror for contract award.

(4) If the Offeror is utilizing experience or past performance of an **entity other than (1) the Offeror; (2) if the Offeror is a JV, its JV partners jointly and severally liable for the contract; or (3) a firm that has been acquired by the Offeror and is now part of the Offeror,** the Offeror shall provide in its proposal a fully-executed teaming agreement or other contractual agreement. The teaming agreement or other contractual agreement shall, at a minimum, (1) be signed by the Offeror and other entity, (2) specifically reference this solicitation/contract, and (3) specify the work to be performed by the other entity such that it is clear that the other entity will be meaningfully involved in this contract **in a role that is consistent with that entity's role in the project submitted.** For item (3), clearly state the specific commitments of resources of the other entity in terms of the work it will specifically perform or manage in the performance of the contract at the worksite. Note that generalized statements concerning commitment of resources are not sufficient to demonstrate that an entity will be meaningfully involved in the performance of the contract. Examples of "generalized statements" include a commitment of resources merely based on an entity's "access" to resources and other generalized statements such as entity will "provide support and expertise on the project." The Government will only consider information provided in the teaming agreement for the purpose of determining whether the Offeror has clearly demonstrated that any entity (other than the Offeror and, if the Offeror is a JV, it's JV partners jointly and severally liable for the contract) will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. For experience and past performance information of a firm that has been acquired and is no longer a separate legal entity, provide an explanation of the acquisition sufficient to demonstrate 1) that the predecessor firm is now part of the entity identified in the SF33, and 2) that the entity currently possesses assets and personnel from the predecessor firm sufficient for the predecessor firm's experience and past performance to be reasonably predictive of the entity's performance on this contract.

(5) A subcontractor's experience and past performance will not be given the same level of consideration as that of either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner because there is no direct legal relationship between the Government and a subcontractor. The Government reserves the right to consider the experience or past performance of a subcontractor where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement which creates legal responsibility on the part of the subcontractor for this solicitation. If the Government chooses to do so, the subcontractor's experience and past performance will not be given the same level of consideration as either the prime contractor or a JV partner.

(6) Prime contractor and prime contractor-subcontractor teams/JVs/LLCs/LTDs with a demonstrated history of working successfully together on prior projects may be considered more favorably than those without such history.

(7) If the Offeror is a JV, relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the JV entity, if available. If the JV does not have shared experience, projects may be submitted for any of the JV members. Projects completed by the JV that are relevant may be considered more favorably than projects submitted by the individual JV members. Offerors who submit experience for all JV partners may be considered more favorably. Offerors are still limited to a total of eight (8) projects combined for Attachment J.8 Specialized Recent Project/Contract Experience Information.

(8) If an Offeror is relying on the experience performed under a previous JV, the Offeror shall demonstrate what portion of the work was performed by the entity offering on this contract under the prior JV and shall not include work performed by the JV as a whole unless all members of the prior JV are being proposed under this solicitation.

b. EVALUATION FACTOR 1 - **CORPORATE AND KEY PERSONNEL EXPERIENCE**

(1) The Offeror will demonstrate its technical experience and expertise in performing the requirements of this solicitation and their ability to recruit and employ qualified Key Personnel. This technical factor will be used to evaluate the probability of successful accomplishment of the work contemplated under this contract.

(2) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Offerors shall:

a. Use Attachment J.8 Specialized Recent Project/Contract Experience Information to describe experience on no more than eight (8) recent, relevant projects completed that individually or collectively are similar in scope, complexity, and size to the work described in Section C. The Offeror shall not submit more than two (2) pages single-sided per project. If more than two (2) single-sided pages are submitted, the agency will not consider the information on the additional pages.

b. Use Attachment J.9 Workload Experience Form to describe capability and capacity to deliver products similar to the type and complexity of the tasks described in Section C of this solicitation assuming a workload of at least ten (10) recent, relevant projects totaling a minimum of $10 million at a minimum of two (2) different site/locations ~~within the NAVFAC Pacific area of responsibility, as described in Section C subparagraph 1.1~~, occurring concurrently. The combined submittal for Attachment J.9 shall not exceed ten (10) single-sided pages. If more than ten (10) single-sided pages are submitted, the agency will not consider the information on the additional pages.

c. Use Attachment J.10 Offeror's Key Personnel Experience/Qualifications to detail experience for each person who will be assigned as Key Personnel to work on this contract. Key Personnel are the Program Manager, Senior Project Manager, Contract Administration Manager, Quality Assurance (QA) Manager, and Health and Safety Manager. The Offeror shall not submit more than four (4) single-sided pages per person submitted as Key Personnel. The Offeror shall provide information on a maximum of four (4) recent, relevant projects that were completed by each Key Personnel that would demonstrate their project experience. Experience that is not related to the work described in Section C of this solicitation should not be included in Attachment J.10. Letters of commitment shall be submitted for all Key Personnel including prime contractor-subcontractor teams/JV/LLCs /LTDs key personnel that do not currently work for the Offeror. Each letter of commitment shall be limited to two (2) single-sided pages and submitted with Attachment J.10. Letters of commitment page limit does not apply

toward the overall page limit of Attachment J.10. Offerors shall not submit Attachment J.10 for personnel who will not be assigned as Key Personnel under this contract. Key Personnel experience may include experience gained while not employed by the Offeror.

Contractors are required to use the Attachments noted above to document experience. Experience that is provided outside the furnished attachments will not be considered.

(3) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates recent, relevant Corporate and Key Personnel experience by the Offeror (including an evaluation of the applicable credentials such as training, education, and experience of Key Personnel) in performing the depth, breadth, and volume of work in Section C of this solicitation. Experience will be evaluated on the (1) complexity, (2) scope, (3) contract volume/project size and (4) location of the work performed as compared to the requirements contemplated under this solicitation and described in Section C.

a. Minimum Required Experience: To be considered for this contract, the Offeror must demonstrate experience Corporate experience (Attachment J.8) ~~(in Corporate AND Key Personnel experience)~~ in the following tasks described in Section C of this solicitation:

- Removal actions at sites regulated under CERCLA
- Remediation of various contaminants at sites regulated under CERCLA
- Expedited response actions
- Munitions response actions and closures
- Management as the prime contractor on a cost IDIQ contract

b. Minimum Required Experience: To be considered for this contract, the Offeror must demonstrate Workload Experience (Attachment J.9) to demonstrate capability and capacity to deliver products similar to the type and complexity of the tasks described in Section C of this solicitation assuming a workload of at least ten (10) recent, relevant projects totaling a minimum of $10 million at a minimum of two (2) different site/locations occurring concurrently.

~~b~~c. Corporate (Attachment J.8) and Key Personnel (Attachment J.10) experience in the following areas may be evaluated more favorably:

- Sediment removal and/or remediation
- Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) response actions

- Experience working for the ~~Navy/Marine Corps~~ Department of Defense

- Experience working in the majority of the following locations (Guam, Hawaii, California, Washington, and the Northern Marianas Islands)

~~c~~d. Workload experience submitted on Attachment J.9, in the following areas, may be evaluated more favorably:

- Experience performing a substantial amount of projects concurrently:
  - Totaling significantly in excess of $10 million in value
  - Overlapping for a substantial amount of time
  - With remediation of various media

~~c~~e. Minimum Key Personnel Requirements (Attachment J.10): Key Personnel must meet the education, training, and experience qualifications described in Section C, paragraph 1.3.3 to be considered for this contract.

~~d~~f. Failure to use, completely fill out or provide the required information in the templates referenced above will result in the proposals being considered deficient for this Factor 1 - Corporate and Key Personnel Experience.

c. EVALUATION FACTOR 2 - **SAFETY**

Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information: The Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate; and Total Case Rate (TCR) for the specified five (5) Calendar Years (CY), as well as a safety narrative, as described further below. For a partnership or JV, the Offeror shall submit separate DART rates and TCR for the specified five (5) CY for each contractor who is part of the partnership/JV; however, only one safety narrative is required. Any fatalities experienced within this 5-year timeframe must be explained in detail, to include root cause and corrective actions.

NOTE: DART and TCR shall not be submitted for subcontractors

1. DART Rate: Submit five (5) previous complete calendar years' [CY2021, CY2022, CY2023, CY2024, and CY2025] worth of data (not an overall average). If the Offeror has no DART rate, for any year, affirmatively state so and explain why. Should a negative trend occur above moderate risk levels, an acceptable/detailed explanation is required that includes any corrective actions taken for improvement.

a. DART cases include injuries or illnesses resulting in death, days away from work, and/or restricted work or transfer to another job days beyond the day of injury/illness.

b. Calculation of DART rate: Multiply the total number of DART cases by 200,000, and then divide by the number of employee labor hours worked.

$$\textbf{\textit{DART RATE}} = \frac{\text{Number of DART Incidents x 200,000}}{\text{Total Number of Employee Labor Hours Worked}}$$

2. TCR Rate: Submit five (5) previous complete calendar years' [CY2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025] worth of data (not an overall average). If the Offeror has no TCR rate, for any year, affirmatively state so and explain why. Should a negative trend occur above moderate risk levels, an acceptable/detailed explanation is required that includes any corrective actions taken for improvement.

a. TCR cases include injuries or illnesses resulting in death, days away from work, restricted work or transfer to another job days beyond the day of injury/illness, medical treatment beyond first aid, or loss of consciousness.

b. Calculation of TCR rate: Multiply the total number of TCR incidents by 200,000, and then divide by the number of employee labor hours worked.

$$\textbf{\textit{TCR RATE}} = \frac{\text{Number of TCR Incidents x 200,000}}{\text{Total Number of Employee Labor Hours Worked}}$$

3. Technical Approach to Safety: Submit a narrative that addresses the following:

a. Describe the Offeror's approach to implementing and executing a Safety Management System (SMS) including Management/Leadership involvement, Employee involvement, Hazard prevention, Hazard control, Worksite analysis, and Safety and health training, to include the standard(s) used to benchmark the SMS.

b. Describe the evaluation process used to select potential subcontractors.

c. Describe the processes of how the Offeror will oversee safety compliance of subcontractors at all levels throughout performance of the contract (to include the Offeror's own in-house workforce).

d. The Technical Approach to Safety narrative shall be limited to two (2) single-sided pages.

4. The Government reserves the right to review other available sources (public/Government internal) of information. These may include but are not limited to OSHA data, NAVFAC's Contractor Incident Reporting System (CIRS), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Electronic Contract Management System (eCMS), etc.

Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures for itself and its subcontractors. The evaluation will collectively consider the DART rate, TCR, and Technical Approach to Safety, and other sources of information available to the Government as part of such collective evaluation. The board will evaluate the DART rates and TCR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any negative trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating.

1. DART Rate: The board will evaluate trends over the last five years, considering changes that take it from one risk level (or more) to the next up or down. Negative trends occurring above moderate risk levels require the Offeror to provide a detailed explanation that includes any corrective actions taken for improvement.

a. Missing data without an explanation is considered a deficiency.

b. Declining trends that push the risk levels from Moderate Risk (MR) or higher to Low Risk (LR) or Very Low Risk (VLR) would indicate a strength.

c. An increasing DART rate trend could be considered a weakness (i.e. MR or better to High Risk (HR) or Extremely High Risk (EHR)) if an acceptable explanation is not provided for any trends that rise above Moderate.

d. This chart correlates the DART rate to the level of risk:

Risk	DART Rate
Very Low Risk	Less Than 1.0
Low Risk	From 1.0 to 1.99
Moderate Risk	From 2.0 to 2.99
High Risk	From 3.0 to 4.0
Extremely High Risk	Greater than 4.0

2. TCR Rate: The board will evaluate trends over the last five years, considering changes that take it from one risk level (or more) to the next up or down. Negative trends occurring above moderate risk levels require the Offeror to provide a detailed explanation that includes any corrective actions taken for improvement.

a. Missing data without an explanation is considered a deficiency.

b. Declining trends that push the risk levels from Moderate Risk (MR) or higher to Low Risk (LR) or Very Low Risk (VLR) would indicate a strength.

c. An increasing TCR rate trend could be considered a weakness (i.e. MR or better to High Risk (HR) or Extremely High Risk (EHR)) if an acceptable explanation is not provided for any trends that rise above Moderate.

d. This chart correlates the TCR rate to the level of risk:

Risk	TCR Rate

Very Low Risk	Less Than 2.49
Low Risk	From 2.5 to 3.49
Moderate Risk	From 3.5 to 4.49
High Risk	From 4.5 to 5.99
Extremely High Risk	Greater than 6.0

3. The Technical Approach to Safety Narrative. To determine the degree to which the Offeror:

a. Describes a viable SMS that addresses elements; such as Management/Leadership involvement, Employee involvement, Hazard prevention, Hazard control, Worksite analysis, and Safety and health training, to include the standard(s) used to benchmark the SMS.

b. Describes a methodical process of evaluating subcontractor's safety performance in their selection process.

c. Describes a logical management plan to hold themselves and their subcontractors accountable for adhering to the safety requirements of the contract.

d. The Technical Approach to Safety narrative shall be limited to two (2) single-sided pages. Information on pages beyond this will not be considered.

4. The Government reserves the right to review other available sources (public/Government internal) of information. These may include but are not limited to OSHA data, NAVFAC's Contractor Incident Reporting System (CIRS), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Electronic Contract Management System (eCMS), etc.

d. EVALUATION FACTOR 3 - **PAST PERFORMANCE**

(1) The Offeror's past performance evaluation will be based upon customer satisfaction in the execution of the same recent, relevant projects submitted for Factor 1 (Corporate and Key Personnel Experience), Attachment J.8 and completed projects per paragraph M.3.d.(2).d below within the last five (5) years that are similar to the tasks described in Section C. Customer satisfaction will include assessing quality control and timely performance.

(2) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

a. IF A COMPLETED TASK ORDER CPARS EVALUATION IS AVAILABLE, IT SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. IF THERE IS NOT A COMPLETED TASK ORDER CPARS EVALUATION, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation as Attachment J.11 is provided for the Offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the Offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 1, Corporate and Key Personnel Experience. AN OFFEROR SHALL NOT SUBMIT A PPQ WHEN A COMPLETED TASK ORDER CPARS IS AVAILABLE.

b. IF A TASK ORDER CPARS EVALUATION IS NOT AVAILABLE, ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed PPQs should be submitted with your proposal. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ (Attachment J.11), which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients /references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Amber Mori, via email at amber.i.mori.civ@us.navy.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

c. Also include performance recognition documents received within the last five (5) years for the projects submitted for Factor 1 (Corporate and Key Personnel Experience) on Attachment J.8, such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

d. Sources of Past Performance Information for evaluation that may be used are as follows:

- Past performance information provided by the offeror, as solicited;

- Past performance information obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; the Defense Contract Management Agency; and interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials using all CAGE/Entity Identifier numbers of the Offeror or any team member (partnership, joint venture, or teaming arrangement) identified in the Offeror's proposal.

e. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

(3) Basis of Evaluation: The degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g., CPARS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source) reflect a trend of satisfactory performance considering:

- A pattern of successful completion of tasks;

- A pattern of deliverables that are timely and of good quality;

- A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels (task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc.);

- Recency of tasks performed that are relevant to the task at hand; and

- A respect for stewardship of Government funds

a. Projects will be compared against the requirements of Section C for complexity, volume/size, scope, and location.

b. The Government reserves the right to consider the past performance of a subcontractor, but if the Government chooses to do so, a subcontractor's past performance will be given less consideration than a prime contractor's past performance. Prime-subcontractor or JV arrangements with a demonstrated history of working successfully together on prior projects may be considered more favorably than arrangements without such history.

c. An Offeror will not be rated favorably or unfavorably for Factor 3, Past Performance, if the Offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such a case an Offeror will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating.

(4) COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

a. Cost Proposal Submittal Requirement: See Section L, L1.

b. Basis of Evaluation. Cost proposals will not be assigned an adjectival rating but shall be evaluated for:

- Completeness- All information required under Section L, L1 of the solicitation.
- Price reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1.
- Cost reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-2.
- Cost realism in accordance with FAR 15.404-3.

The Government will evaluate all aspects of the cost proposal for completeness, reasonableness and realism. This Cost Proposal evaluation may include an analysis of each Offeror's proposed costs to determine whether the proposed cost elements are realistic and are consistent with other cost-related information (i.e. DCAA audits, historical rates, etc.) available to the Contracting Officer.

Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s). As part of the cost evaluation, the Government will evaluate the Option to Extend Services under FAR Clause 52.217-8. Offerors' Total Evaluated Cost (TEC) for the evaluation purposes shall be for the Base Year, Option Years 1 through 4, and the Service Extension.

Unrealistically low (or high) proposed costs or costs unbalanced between the various option years, initially or subsequently, may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the Offeror does not understand the requirement, or has made an unrealistic proposal.

Proposed costs may be adjusted for purposes of evaluation, based on the results of the cost realism evaluation to determine probable cost of performance. Offerors are reminded that for the purpose of evaluation under this solicitation, the direct labor ceiling rates (Attachment J.1 - Direct Labor Bid and Billing Rate Submission) and indirect ceiling rates (Attachment J.3 - Indirect Ceiling Rates and Fee Application) proposed by the prime, each JV member, and cost reimbursable subcontractors shall be proposed in Attachment J.7 (Cost Model Work Sheet) for each contract period, and will be used for cost realism evaluation of the Cost Model Work Sheet. The Government may reject an offer that reflects a serious lack of cost realism.

Any variance between indirect base rates used to develop the ceiling rates and historical rates, applicable forward pricing rates, DCAA approved rates, and/or approved CAS practices will be evaluated to ensure compliance with cost realism.

The proposed indirect rate ceilings will be reviewed for reasonableness and the degree to which it accomplishes the Government's desire to control costs.

The cost proposal volume will also be evaluated to ensure the completion of the representations and certifications in Section K of the RFP and the inclusion and submission of other information required.

The Offeror's Contractor Business Systems will be reviewed for adequacy and compliance with government regulations and standards. Contractor Business Systems are approved by cognizant contract administration offices such as the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) or the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA). The Offeror's demonstrated ability to maintain government approved systems in the following areas will be evaluated: accounting, estimating, and purchasing.

The Offeror will be evaluated to ensure that they have the financial capability to perform the contract given the magnitude of the proposed work.

The Government will evaluate Offerors' Compensation Plans for Professional Employees to assess the likelihood of attracting and retaining qualified professional personnel to ensure uninterrupted, high-quality performance. Professional compensation that is unrealistically low or not in reasonable relationship to the various job categories may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements.

The use of uncompensated overtime, as defined in the FAR 52.237-10 in Section L, will also be considered in the cost realism analysis and risk assessment.

The Government will not accept any assumptions in the Offeror's cost proposal.