DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
FORT WORTH DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
819 TAYLOR STREET
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102-0300

CESWF-CT 04 AUG 2026

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS AND INTERESTED INDUSTRY PARTNERS

SUBJECT: Sources Sought (RFI) - JBSA 91st Cyber Operations Center (MPLS163002)

1. **DISCLAIMER.** THIS IS A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) / SOURCES SOUGHT NOTICE ONLY. This notice is issued solely for market research, information, and planning purposes. It does not constitute a Request for Proposals (RFP), a Request for Qualifications (RFQ), or a commitment by the Government to write, issue, or award an agreement or contract. The Government will not pay for any information or administrative costs incurred in response to this notice. All response costs will be borne solely by the interested party.

2. **PURPOSE.** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Fort Worth District, is conducting active public market research to gauge industry interest, capacity, and capability from commercial construction firms, design-builders, and Non-Traditional Defense Contractors (NDCs). The intent is to gather critical feedback regarding advanced commercial construction methodologies, project delivery risks, and acquisition preferences to support our upcoming project delivery selection.

3. **ACQUISITION STRATEGY & NON-FAR MODEL.**

a. Statutory Authority: This project will potentially be executed as a Progressive Design-Build (PDB) project utilizing Other Transaction Authority (OTA) pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 2808a.

b. Non-FAR Environment: Prospective partners are advised that the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) does NOT apply to this procurement. The negotiated, bilateral Other Transaction (OT) Agreement will serve as the sole governing contract. Standard FAR clauses are inapplicable, though federal statutory constraints (such as federal fiscal law, criminal statutes, and general civil laws) remain fully applicable.

c. Phased Agreement Mechanics:

(1) Phase 1 (Design & Pre-Construction Services): Selected based purely on demonstrated qualifications and a negotiated design fee. There is no requirement to submit detailed price proposals or design concepts during the initial selection phase.

(2) Phase 2 (Final Design & Construction): Executed via a bilateral modification to the OT Agreement upon successful negotiation of a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) at approximately 65% design maturity. The Agreement contains an "off-ramp" termination clause allowing the Government to retain the design and procure construction separately if GMP negotiations fail.

1. **PROJECT OVERVIEW & SCOPE.**

a. Title: JBSA CNS 91st Cyber Operations Center.

b. Location: Joint Base San Antonio (JBSA) - Lackland, Texas.

c. Scope: Construct a secure, cyberspace operations facility of approximately 3,958 square meters (SM) to support the 91st Cyber Operations Squadron. Construction includes reinforced concrete foundations, structural steel framing, brick masonry exterior walls, and metal standing seam roofing on metal decking. Special facility requirements include a customized 200-ton capacity cooling system, two (2) 3,000 KW backup generators with utility water line redundancy, and secure spaces meeting strict Intelligence Community Directive (ICD) 503/705 standards.

d. Target Price Range (TPR): The Government has established a Target Price Range (TPR) for construction between **$82,560,000.00** (representing the strict Construction Cost Limit, or CCL) and **$90,912,000.00** (the estimated Construction Budget), within a total Programmed Amount (PA) of **$96,000,000.00.**

e. Projected Award Date: The Government targets the formal award of the Agreement Phase 1 (Design and Preconstruction Services) on or about **April 21, 2027.**

f. Period of Performance (POP): The projected construction timeline is approximately 800 calendar days following the execution of the Phase 2 Construction modification.

g. Product Service Code (PSC): Y1BG (Construction of Electronic and Communications Facilities).

h. NAICS Code: 236220 (Commercial and Institutional Building Construction).

1. **INNOVATIVE METHODOLOGIES & FEEDBACK AREAS.** In accordance with Air Force Civil Engineer Center (AFCEC) Design Instruction #3, the Government is seeking commercial industry feedback regarding the feasibility and market capacity for the following innovative methods:

a. Modular and Off-Site Prefabrication: Fabricating large sections of the facility or complex mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) systems in factory-controlled environments to compress the construction schedule.

c. 3D Printing: Utilizing large-scale 3D printing for secondary building components, non-load-bearing walls, or perimeter security fencing.

d. Advanced Materials: Incorporating self-healing concrete to reduce lifecycle maintenance and maximize structural integrity, or utilizing high-performance insulation (e.g., aerogels or vacuum-insulated panels) to meet "Tier IV" standards.

1. **PROJECT DELIVERY & ACQUISITION STRATEGY QUESTIONNAIRE.** Please review the following project delivery questions and submit your complete answers as a single Microsoft Word or PDF attachment:

a. Part I: Company Information & Bidding Intent.

(1) Company Name & CAGE Code:
_____

(2) Point of Contact (Name, Email, Phone):
_____

(3) Socioeconomic Status (Check all that apply):

[ ] Large Business

[ ] Small Business (SB)

[ ] 8(a) Business Development Program

[ ] HUBZone Small Business

[ ] Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)

[ ] Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB)

(4) Bonding Capacity:

Single Project Limit: $_____

Aggregate Limit: $_____(5) Intent to Propose (Check one):

[ ] Yes, as a Prime Contractor

[ ] Yes, as a Subcontractor

[ ] No

[ ] Undecided

(6) Anticipated Teaming Structure (Check one):

[ ] Standalone Prime

[ ] Joint Venture (JV)

[ ] Mentor-Protégé

[ ] Subcontractor / Designer Only

b. Part II: Delivery Method Feasibility & Risk.

(1) Question 1 (Design Control vs. Single-Point Responsibility): Given the project scale and complexity described in Section 4, which foundational approach poses the least risk to cost and schedule? (Check one):

[ ] Owner-Controlled Design: The Government should retain the design team but hire a builder early for constructability and pricing (IDAC / CM@Risk).

[ ] Single-Point Responsibility: The Government should shift design-completion risk to a single Design-Build entity (PDB).

(2) Question 2 (Feasibility of Early Price Certainty): Is it feasible to propose a reliable fixed price early in the process, or is the scope too undefined, requiring progressive design development (e.g., PDB)? (Check one):

[ ] Yes, a reliable price is achievable early based on the provided requirements.

[ ] No, there is too much risk, and we would need the design to reach a mature state before offering a GMP.

(3) Question 3 (Rationale): Please briefly explain the top 1–2 factors driving your answers to Questions 1 and 2: Response:
_____

(4) Question 4 (Relevant Delivery Experience): Has your firm successfully executed a project of similar size/complexity using your recommended delivery method in the last 5 years? [ ] Yes

[ ] No If Yes, please provide 1 brief project name/location:
_____

c. Part III: Budget, Cost Drivers & Schedule.

(1) Question 5 (Budget Realism): Based on current market data, does the target construction budget of **$82,560,000.00 to $90,912,000.00** appear realistic for this facility type and scale? Response:

_____

(2) Question 6 (Primary Cost Drivers): What specific mission needs or functional requirements do you anticipate driving the most cost? Response:

_____

(3) Question 7 (Schedule/Supply Chain Risk): What systems or trades present the most significant schedule risk (e.g., long-lead MEP, local labor)? Response:

_____

d. Part IV: Defining Value, Collaboration & Financial Drivers.

(1) Question 8 (Collaboration Priorities): Please rank the areas that would benefit most from early builder involvement during the design phase (1 = Greatest Benefit, 5 = Least Benefit):

[ ] Cost Certainty & Real-Time Estimating:

[ ] Schedule Certainty & Phasing:

[ ] Constructability & Quality Control:

[ ] Innovation & Scope Betterments:

[ ] Overall Risk Reduction / Site Mitigations:

(2) Question 9 (Industry Engagement): If the Government utilizes a delivery method that allows for confidential, one-on-one proprietary meetings during the solicitation phase to collaboratively discuss innovative solutions, would your firm participate? [ ] Yes [ ] No

(3) Question 10 (Proposal Costs): In highly collaborative procurement methods, offerors incur design and proposal development costs. Would the Government's offer of a stipend significantly influence your decision to compete? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If Yes, what is a commercially reasonable stipend amount for a project of this scale?
$_____

(4) Question 11 (Contract Incentives): What specific contract incentives would best drive innovation and maximize your firm's interest in this project?

[ ] Shared Cost Savings (e.g., within a GMP structure)

[ ] Award Fee for Quality / Innovation

[ ] Other (Please specify):

---

e. Part V: Overall Delivery Recommendation.

(1) Question 12 (Recommended Project Delivery Path): Considering all factors, which project delivery path is optimal for this specific project?

(Select One):

[ ] Design-Bid-Build (DBB): Scope is simple and fully defined; traditional FAR Part 36 and FAR 15 is sufficient.

[ ] IDAC / CM@Risk: Government needs to control the design but needs early builder collaboration.

[ ] Design-Build to Budget (DBtB): Requirements are understood enough to drive a competitive, fixed-price solution.

[ ] Progressive Design-Build (PDB): Scope is highly complex/undefined. Requires a single contract to collaboratively mature the design before locking in a GMP.

(2) Question 13: Please explain your selection above. Indicate if you recommend executing this via a standard FAR-based contract or an Other Transaction Authority (OTA): Response:

---

(3) Question 14 (Evaluation Strategy): For this specific project, what evaluation criteria do you believe the Government should weigh most heavily to ensure success? (Rank top 3: 1 being most important):

[ ] Past Performance

[ ] Technical Approach/Design

[ ] Price/GMP

[ ] Key Personnel & Team Integration

[ ] Other (Please specify):

(4) Question 15: Please provide any additional comments, overly prescriptive constraints to avoid, or commercial best practices the Government should consider: Response:

ACTION REQUIRED & SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS.

a. Submittal Format: Interested industry partners are requested to submit their complete response as a single, **consolidated PDF or Microsoft Word Document attachment**.

b. Required Contents: Your attached submittal file must include:

(1) A clear confirmation of your firm's interest in proposing on this project under the PDB/OTA model.

(2) A brief capability statement addressing your firm's experience with secure facility construction, progressive design-build mechanics, and the advanced technical methods outlined in Paragraph 5.

(3) Your firm's complete, numbered answers to the Project Delivery & Acquisition Strategy Questionnaire listed in Paragraph 6.

c. Technical Inquiries: All technical and administrative questions regarding this RFI must be submitted via email to the Point of Contact listed below no later than **Tuesday, August 18, 2026, at 10:00 A.M. Central Daylight Time (CDT).**

d. Submission Suspense: All response attachments must be emailed directly to the Contracting Specialist, SFC Jordan L. Kennedy, at jordan.l.kennedy@usace.army.mil, with a carbon copy (CC) to the Contracting Officer, Matthew S. Dickson, at matthew.s.dickson@usace.army.mil, no later than **Tuesday, August 25, 2026, at 10:00 A.M. CDT**

1. **FUTURE INDUSTRY DAY.** A virtual Industry Day is tentatively scheduled for October 6, 2026. During this session, the USACE Project Delivery Team (PDT) and AFCEC representatives will present comprehensive project requirements and discuss the collaborative mechanics of the PDB/OTA model. Registration details and access links will be published on SAM.gov in a subsequent Special Notice in September 2026.

2. **POINT OF CONTACT.** Technical or administrative questions regarding this memorandum should be directed to SFC Jordan L. Kennedy at (817) 886-1189 or jordan.l.kennedy@usace.army.mil.