STREAMLINED SOLICITATION

General Information

Document Type:	Combined synopsis/solicitation
Solicitation Number:	**W912CL26QA036**
Posted Date:	12 August 2026
Site Visit	19 August 2026
Question Due Date:	20 August 2026
Original Response Date:	1000 CST, 2 September 2026
Current Response Date:	1000 CST, 2 September 2026
Product or Service Code:	5410 Prefabricated and Portable Buildings
Set Aside:	N/A
NAICS Code:	332311 Prefabricated Metal Building and Component Manufacturing
Contract type:	Firm Fixed Price (FFP)

Contracting Office Address
Theater Contracting Center – Americas
410th Contracting Support Brigade
4130 Stanley Road, Building 1026
JBSA Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-2726

Description:
This is a combined synopsis/solicitation for commercial products or commercial services prepared in accordance with FAR part 12. This announcement constitutes as the only solicitation. Offers are being requested and a separate written solicitation will not be issued. Solicitation number **W912CL26QA036** is issued as a request for quotation (RFQ). This acquisition is not set-aside for small business concerns. This solicitation incorporates provisions and clauses by reference. The full text of provisions and clauses may be accessed electronically at www.acquisition.gov.

The associated North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code for this procurement is 332311, with a size standard of 750 employees.

The 410th Contracting Support Brigade is seeking to purchase modular relocatable facilities to be delivered to Base Aeronaval Cristobal Colon in Colon, Panama

All interested companies shall provide *"quotation(s)"* for the following:

CLIN	Supply	QTY	Unit	Unit Price	Total Price
0001	Office Space RLB 50x50 2500 SF	1	EA		
0002	Office Space RLB 40x50	2	EA		
0003	Student Billeting RLB 40x50 2000SF	5	EA		
0004	Cadre Barracks 50x50 2500 SF	3	EA		
0005	Clinic RLB 1200-1600 SF	1	EA		
0006	Conditioned Storage Facility 40x50 2000 SF	2	EA		
0007	Covered Canopy/Lightning Shelter 40x50 2000 SF	2	EA		
OPT 1001	Student Billeting RLB 40x50 2000SF	1	EA		
OPT 1002	Cadre Barracks 50x50 2500 SF	1	EA		
OPT 1003	Conditioned Storage Facility 40x50 2000 SF	2	EA		
OPT 1004	Office Space RLB 40x50	1	EA		
OPT 1005	Office Space RLB 50x50	1	EA		
OPT 1006	Generators	13	EA		
OPT 1007	Generator (Resilient Power backup)	1	EA		

Refer to the technical exhibits and the PWS for RLB and installation specifications required delivery date for the first RLB (CLIN 001) is 29 September 2026.

A Site visit will be held at Base Aeronaval Cristobal Colon on August 19th, 2026. Contact the POCs listed in this solicitation to inform them of your intent to intend and to receive the site visit time.

Print Name_____ Signature: _____ Date:_____

Company Name: _____

Unique Entity Identifier (UEI): _____

SUBMISSION OF QUOTE AND OTHER INFORMATION

52.212-1 Instructions to Offerors Addendum

Submission of quotes. Submit signed and dated offers to the office specified in this solicitation at or before the exact time specified in this solicitation. At a minimum, offers shall include—

1. The solicitation number;
2. The name, address, telephone number of the Offeror;
3. The Offeror's Unique Entity Identifier (UEI), CAGE Code, and, if applicable, Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) indicator;
4. Information necessary to evaluate the factors contained in the provision at 52.212-2 addendum, or as described in the solicitation;
5. Responses to provisions that require Offeror completion of information, representations, and certifications (other than those collected via the System for Award Management (SAM)); and
6. A statement specifying the extent of agreement with all terms, conditions, and provisions included in the solicitation and any solicitation amendments.
7. Each priced CLIN must show the individual price, and the total for the line item

RFQ: Instructions for Redacted Submissions. To facilitate an unbiased, technical evaluation, offerors are required to submit both a complete (unredacted) quote and a fully redacted duplicate copy of their submission.

Submission Element	**Unredacted Copy**	**Redacted Copy**
Volume I: Technical Approach	Full technical approach, including team experience and methodology.	Remove all company names, sub-contractor names, logos, or identify staff names. Use generic terms (e.g., "Offeror," "Lead Engineer").
Volume II: Schedule & Milestones	Complete project schedule with key milestones and delivery dates.	Remove all company branding. Ensure no proprietary software names or unique team identifiers are visible in the Gantt chart or timeline.
Volume III: Price Quote	Comprehensive cost breakdown, labor rates, and total price.	Black out/remove all dollar amounts, labor rates, indirect rates, and fee percentages. Only the underlying labor categories and hours should remain visible to evaluate effort.

Contract award. The Government intends to evaluate offers and award a contract without discussions with Offerors. Therefore, the Offeror's initial offer should contain the Offeror's best price and technical narrative and a letter to the KO explaining any unacceptable past performance records. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions, if necessary. The Government may reject any or all offers if such action is in the public interest, accept other than the lowest offer, and waive informalities and minor irregularities in offers received.

Below is a checklist to ensure all the proper documents are returned for consideration on this solicitation.

Failure to strictly adhere to the instructions could result in the offerors quote being deemed unacceptable and therefore may result in elimination of the proposal from further consideration in this award competition.

Items

- ☐ Submit Recent and Relevant Past Performance
- ☐ Submit Technical approach and Schedule
- ☐ Complete Quote(s)
- ☐ Submit Additional Quotation, Schedule and Technical Approach Redacted
- ☐ **See Attached CLIN Schedule- CLIN Schedule filled out completely is REQUIRED**
- ☐ **Signed Amendments if Applicable (Blocks 15a -15c) Note:** Check schedules for mathematical errors
- ☐ You must have an active SAM registration prior to award
- ☐ All documents must be a PDF file in English. **PDF is the only authorized format: HAND WRITTEN CLIN SCHEDULES WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED!** If that is not possible, contact contracting office prior to submission of quote
- ☐ Send all questions to the email provided 20 AUG 2026 at 10:00 CST
- ☐ Submit all questions and quotes via email to the 410th Contracting Support Brigade, Theater Contracting Center- Americas, Dr. Joseph Schwener at joseph.g.schwener.civ@army.mil and SSG Kala Roman at kala.r.roman2.mil@army.mil . Please courtesy copy: SFC Rebecca Malpica, Contracting Officer at Rebecca.a.malpica.mil@army.mil

Title the subject line of your email: W912CL26QA036 Cristobal Colon Relocatable Buildings

Quoters shall submit their quotations no later than 2 September 2026 at 10:00 CST. The deadline/closing time for receipt of quotes will be strictly adhered to and enforced.

Quotations shall be in U.S. Dollars. All unit prices should be filled in as well as total prices. Pricing shall be fully inclusive of all costs and fees associated.

ADDENDUM TO 52.212-2 EVALUATION--COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES (NOV 2021)

In the following paragraphs, pursuant to FAR Subpart 12.203(c), FAR Provision 52.212-2, Evaluation – Commercial Items, paragraph (a) is replaced in its entirety by addendum as follows:

1**. Basis of Award. This will be a firm fixed price contract as depicted in the CLIN structure above**. The award will be made based on the best overall (i.e., best value) quotes that are determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the three (3) evaluation factors: Technical Approach, Present and Past Performance, and Price. To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for the Technical Approach factor, a rating of no less than "Satisfactory Confidence" or "Neutral Confidence" must be achieved for the Present and Past Performance factor. The Price factor will be evaluated to establish reasonableness of the otherwise successful offeror's price but will not receive an evaluation rating. Offerors are responsible for submitting offers, and any modifications, revisions, or withdrawals, so as to reach the Government office designated in the solicitation by the time specified in the solicitation.

The following evaluation factors will be set forth in the solicitation:

Factor 1: Technical Approach and Schedule

Factor 2: Present and Past Performance

Factor 3: Price

2. Tradeoff Source Selection. A tradeoff source selection approach will be used in evaluation of quotes. In a tradeoff source selection, the relative importance of cost or price may vary in relation to other evaluation factors as communicated by the Government to potential offerors in the solicitation per RFO FAR Subpart 15.4. For this solicitation, Technical Approach is more important than Present and Past Performance. Both factors combined are significantly more important than Price. Offerors are cautioned that the awards may not necessarily be made to the lowest-priced offers.

3. Evaluation Approach. Each quote received will be evaluated with the criteria outlined in the solicitation for the purpose of assessing the quote and the offeror's ability to perform the prospective contract successfully. The Technical Approach factor will be assigned an adjectival rating using the combined technical/risk ratings from the DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 August 2022. The Present and Past Performance factor, on the basis of "recent" past performance information, relevancy rating, quality assessment, and a subsequent performance confidence assessment rating. The Price factor will be evaluated to establish reasonableness of the otherwise successful offeror's price and will not receive an evaluation rating.

All quotes shall be subject to evaluation by the Source Selection Team. The overarching evaluation approach for all factors is as follows:

> a. Adequacy of Response. The quote will be evaluated to determine whether the offeror's methods and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified in the RFQ. The quote will be evaluated to determine the extent to which each requirement has been addressed in the quote in accordance with the quote submission section of the RFQ.
>
> b. Feasibility of Approach. The quote will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The quote will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The quote will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror is expected

to be able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

4. Factor 1 - Technical Approach and Schedule. The Technical Approach and Schedule factor evaluates the offeror's technical approach and schedule in terms of adequacy of response and feasibility of approach to meeting the PWS requirements and meeting the governments required timeline. This factor is met when the offeror submits, as part of its technical quote, specific narrative details and/or description of its technical approach (to include supplements) with actual methods, processes, and procedures that demonstrate the offeror's compliance and understanding of the minimum solicitation requirements. Any proposed approach, method, or process determined unacceptable may render the entire technical quote as unacceptable.

a. The Government will evaluate technical approach using a combined technical/ risk rating methodology. The combined technical/risk rating reflects the degree to which the proposed technical approach meets or does not meet the minimum performance requirements. A combined technical/risk rating of no less than "Green/Acceptable" must be received for Factor 1. Only those offerors whose technical approach has been determined to be no less than "Green/Acceptable" will receive further consideration for award. Technical approaches rated less than "Green/Acceptable" will not be considered for award. However, the PCO may conduct discussions with offerors whose approach(es) are determined to be reasonably capable of being corrected without a major rewrite of the technical approach. Only those technical approaches determined "Green/ Acceptable", either initially or as a result of exchanges, will be considered for award. The Government may incorporate into the contract an offeror's proposed performance above mandatory minimums.

(1) Combined Technical/Risk Ratings. The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. The combined technical/risk evaluation shall utilize the combined technical/risk ratings listed in Table 1 and the risk descriptions identified in Table 2. The following color/adjectival ratings will be used in evaluating the offeror's technical approach:

Table 1. Combined Technical Risk/Ratings

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Approach meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Purple	Good	Approach meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Approach contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Green	Acceptable	Approach meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.

Yellow	Marginal	Approach does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The approach has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Approach does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Approach is un-awardable.

Table 2. Technical Risk Descriptions

Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Low	Approach may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Approach contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Approach contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Approach contains a material failure of a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

5. Factor 2 - Present and Past Performance. The Government will evaluate the offeror's record of present and past performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the PWS.

a. The Government will focus its inquiries on the offeror's (and major subcontractors') record of performance as it relates to all solicitation requirements, including cost, schedule, performance and management of subcontractors. Major subcontractors are defined as members of an offeror's overall team who are expected to perform 25 percent or more of the proposed effort. A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the evaluation process. Therefore, offerors will be reminded to include the most recent and relevant efforts (within the past three years) in their quote. Absent

any recent and relevant past performance history or when the performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror will be assigned a "neutral confidence rating" and its quote will not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably on past performance. In other words, a "neutral confidence" rating, by itself, represents neutrality, and has no relative meaning. However, in a comparative analysis, a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" present and past performance rating. The Government may use data provided by the offeror in its quote and data obtained from other sources, including data in Government files or data obtained through interviews with personnel familiar with the contractor and their current and past performance under Federal, State or Local government or commercial contracts for same or similar services as compared to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) **332311**.

b. Offerors shall submit present and past performance information for up to three (3) Government and/or commercial contracts for the prime offeror and each major subcontractor in performance or awarded during the past three years, from the issue date of this RFQ, which are relevant to the efforts required by this RFQ. The Government may consider a wide array of information from a variety of sources, but is not compelled to rely on all the information available.

c. The present and past performance factor considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in providing services that meet the contract requirements. There are four aspects to the present and past performance evaluation: recency, relevancy, quality, and performance confidence assessment.

(1) Recency. The first step of the present and past performance evaluation is assessing the offeror's present and past performance to determine if the performance effort is considered recent. To be recent, the performance effort must have occurred within the last three years prior to the issuance date on the solicitation. In addition, present and past performance includes "present performance," i.e., work efforts that are currently in performance, provided that such performance began no later than three months prior to the solicitation issuance date. If a present and past performance effort is not recent, it will not be further evaluated, and it will not be considered in the Government's assignment of performance confidence assessment ratings, except where a rating of "Neutral Confidence" applies. If a present and past performance effort qualifies as recent, the Government will proceed to evaluate it for relevancy and quality.

(2) Relevancy. The second step of the present and past performance evaluation is to assess the offeror's present and past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. More relevant present and past performance will be given more weight than less relevant present and past performance. Relevancy is not separately rated; however, the following Table 3 identifies the criteria will be used to establish what is relevant. The primary elements of relevance include similarity of service/support, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontract/ teaming.

Table 3. Present and Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

Rating	Definition
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.

(3) Quality Assessment. The third step of the present and past performance evaluation is to assess the quality of the offeror's present and past performance on those recent efforts that were determined relevant by determining how well the contractor performed on the contracts. Documented results from CPARS, and other sources form the support and basis for this assessment.

(4) Performance Confidence Assessment. The final step is for the present and past performance team to arrive at a single consensus performance confidence assessment for the offeror, selecting the most appropriate rating from Table 4 below. This rating considers the assessed quality of the recent/relevant efforts gathered. Ensure the rationale for the conclusions reached are included.

Table 4. Performance Confidence Assessments

Rating	Definition
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 be able to successfully perform the required effort.

6. Factor 3 - Price. The Government will evaluate price reasonableness for this effort by utilizing various price analysis techniques to include comparison to the IGE, and comparison to government projects of similar size and scope and price competition.

a. Adequate price competition pursuant to RFO FAR 12.204 (a) is anticipated to determine price reasonableness of the Price factor. Additionally, the Government may use any of the following price analysis techniques pursuant to RFO FAR 15.404-1(b) to determine price reasonableness: comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation; comparison of proposed prices to historical prices paid, whether by the Government or other than the Government, for the same or similar items or services; comparison with competitive published price lists or market prices; comparison of proposed prices with independent Government cost estimates; comparison of proposed prices with prices obtained through with market research; and/or, analysis of data other than certified cost or pricing data provided by the offeror.

b. The Total Evaluated Price will be calculated by adding the sum for all the contractor-proposed estimated prices for the Base CLIN and all option CLINs.

c. In addition, proposed unit prices will be evaluated for unbalanced pricing (IAW RFO FAR 15.404-6(b)) per CLIN. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more CLINs/sub-CLINs appears to be significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. An offeror's quote may be rejected if the PCO determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

d. Given that FAR 52.217-8 provides the Government may exercise the Option to Extend Services at the rates specified in the contract (i.e., the rates in effect when the Extension of Services option is exercised), for purposes of evaluating the Option to Extend Services, the PCO will consider the prices submitted for the one-year ordering period as binding should the Option to Extend Services be exercised.