Gov't Tracking #	PPI	PPI Response	Amendment #
072	We are requesting clarification on pricing forms H and I. The maximum funding for form H states $2M, but the pricing backup form I is going to be over $3B. Is it the intent that these forms are related? If not, what backup are we to provide for form H since form I direct costs cannot be changed?	The required Schedule of Prices - Seed Project Task Order, Alternative Technical Concepts (ATC) for Pachage No. 1 - Marine form (Attachment H) and Price Model form (Attachment I) are separate and distinct. Refer to the Basis of Evaluation of Total Price, which states "...The Government will evaluate the Offeror's financial readiness (Attachment G); as well as the combined total of the Offeror's proposed price for the ATC seed project task order consisting of CLIN 0001 (Attachment H) and the Offeror's total price (Line 19) of the price model form (Attachment I) to determine the reasonableness and completeness of the Offeror's proposal...".	0002
074	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2 – Design Experience (pg 14); Att B 1-2 & 8-11 2. Design Experience: Submit a maximum of five (5) design projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your design experience on relevant projects that are similar in recency, size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. The Government will only review five (5) projects for design. Any projects submitted in excess of five (5) for Design Experience will not be considered. Will second-tier design partners' relevant experience be recognized by NAVFAC? Or must the lead design firm independently satisfy the applicable design experience criteria and/or provide all five design references?	See response to PPI No. 015.	0002
075	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2 – Design Experience, Note 3 (pg 15) 3. Provide a fully executed teaming agreement or other contractual agreement between the Offeror and the designer-of-record(s) DOR), if the DOR(s) is not the Offeror. The teaming agreement or other contractual agreement at a minimum, (1) be signed by the Offeror (authority to bind the entity must be clearly stated) and the DOR, (2) specifically reference this solicitation/contract, and (3) specify the work to be performed by the DOR such that it is clear that the DOR will be meaningfully involved in this contract in a role that is consistent with that DOR's role in the project submitted for evaluation. The Government will only consider information provided in the teaming agreement for the purpose of determining whether the Offeror has clearly demonstrated that the DOR will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. For a separate design firm whose project references are submitted under Factor 2, what level of scope, staffing, worksite participation, design responsibility and/or management commitment will NAVFAC consider sufficient to demonstrate "meaningful involvement" in performance? Would a defined specialist design scope, named personnel, deliverables, hours/resources and responsibility matrix be sufficient where the lead designer retains overall design integration and DOR responsibility?	Yes	0002
076	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2 – Design Experience, Note 3 (pg 15) 3. Provide a fully executed teaming agreement or other contractual agreement between the Offeror and the designer-of-record(s) DOR), if the DOR(s) is not the Offeror. The teaming agreement or other contractual agreement at a minimum, (1) be signed by the Offeror (authority to bind the entity must be clearly stated) and the DOR, (2) specifically reference this solicitation/contract, and (3) specify the work to be performed by the DOR such that it is clear that the DOR will be meaningfully involved in this contract in a role that is consistent with that DOR's role in the project submitted for evaluation. The Government will only consider information provided in the teaming agreement for the purpose of determining whether the Offeror has clearly demonstrated that the DOR will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. Please confirm whether a fully executed, solicitation-specific teaming agreement between the Offeror and each proposed Designer of Record is sufficient to meet Factor 2, or whether NAVFAC requires a different form of agreement (e.g., design JV, subcontract, or other contractual arrangement). In addition to the minimum elements stated in Factor 2, are there any required provisions, forms, certifications or exhibits that the agreement must contain?	Confirmed. No additional documentation beyond the stated solicitation submittal requirements is necessary.	0002

Gov't Tracking #	PPI	PPI Response	Amendment #
077	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 1.2 – Organizational Roles and Responsibilities Narrative, (pg 12) 2. Organizational Roles and Responsibilities Narrative: Provide a narrative not to exceed three (3) 8-1/2" x 11" single-sided pages that includes a brief description of the role and responsibility of each entity. If the experience of an entity is being claimed in Factor 2 - Experience, that entity shall be reflected in the narrative. Does the solicitation permit an Offeror to identify more than one design firm for the MACC, with a designated lead design firm and one or more specialist firms whose scopes may vary by task order or technical discipline? If so, may the proposal distinguish the firm responsible for overall design integration and final signed/sealed design from a specialist firm providing defined technical services, constructability input or independent technical review without acting as DOR?	Yes, there are no restrictions on the number of proposed design firms so long as the solicitation submittal requirements are fulfilled for each entity.	0002
078	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 6(a) (pg 20); RFP Section 00 40 00, Attachment L – ATC Scope (pgs 1-2) Provide an ATC Management Plan narrative, not to exceed 10 single-sided pages, describing how the Offeror recommends the future ATC process be structured and used to identify, evaluate, and develop high-value ATC opportunities for MMDD. For Package 1 — Marine, please clarify the intended design responsibility and authority during and after the four-month ATC Task Order. Who will review, accept and incorporate ATC recommendations into the design, and who will be responsible for completing, coordinating, approving and sealing the final design for any subsequent Design-Build task order? Will the selected contractor's DOR have authority and responsibility for final design, or will NAVFAC's existing designer retain that role?	The Offeror's proposed ATC recommendations for the ATC Marine Package 1 will be reviewed by the Government for acceptance. The responsibility for final construction documents depends on the extent of the accepted ATC. If the ATC replaces an aspect of the Government's Final Design with a different solution, the Contractor's DOR will have the responsibility for final design and those drawings and/or specifications will be incorporated into the Package's construction documents. The Contractor's proposed ATC solution must be designed to a level sufficient for acceptance, but need not be fully detailed, signed, and sealed during the ATC phase and prior to Package 1's Proposal. If the Offeror is the selected awardee, the Contractor's DOR will be responsible for completing and sealing the final design documents prior to execution of that work product. If the accepted ATC requires modifications to the Government's Final Design, then the Government will modify the design accordingly to incorporate the accepted ATC.	0002
079	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2 – Design Experience (pg 15) 2. Design Experience: Submit a maximum of five (5) design projects for the Offeror that best demonstrates your design experience on relevant projects that are similar in recency, size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. Does the Design Experience need to be only as DOR or will detailed design under the management of another DOR be recognized as qualifying experience?	See responses to PPI Nos. 015 and 075.	0002
080	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2(i) – Design Experience (pg 15) (i)Recency: A project submitted under Design Experience will meet the recency requirement if: (a) the construction effort was completed or substantially completed within 10 years immediately preceding the solicitation issuance date, regardless of the design completion date. "Substantial Completion" is defined as 90% physically complete; OR (b) the construction effort is ongoing, but the design completion date was achieved within 10 years immediately preceding the solicitation issuance date. For a design project where construction is still ongoing, please confirm that it meets the recency criterion if the design completion date occurred within the ten years immediately preceding solicitation issuance, even if the construction project has not reached substantial completion. Please clarify what documentation NAVFAC expects to substantiate design completion and, where applicable, the project's 90% physical completion status.	See response to PPI No. 009. Additionally, refer to Section 00 22 00, Factor 2 - Experience, (a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements, (2) Design Experience, Note (2) which states "[t]he attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment B) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information....".	0002
081	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2, Note 1 – Design Experience (pg 14); Att B, Block 8 1. A project is defined as a complete design effort performed under a single task order or contract/subcontract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; instead, Offerors shall submit the work performed under an individually issued task order as a project. Does a qualifying design project reference need to represent a completed design effort through final plans and specifications, or may a project qualify where the firm performed a substantial but partial design scope (e.g., FEED, preliminary design, design criteria, or a defined discipline package)? Please identify any minimum design completion percentage or required deliverables beyond the categories listed in Attachment B.	See responses to PPI Nos. 009 and 080.	0002

Gov't Tracking #	PPI	PPI Response	Amendment #
082	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2, Note 3 – Design Experience (pg 14); Att B, Block 1 3. Provide a fully executed teaming agreement or other contractual agreement between the Offeror and the designer-of-record(s) DOR), if the DOR(s) is not the Offeror. The teaming agreement or other contractual agreement at a minimum, (1) be signed by the Offeror (authority to bind the entity must be clearly stated) and the DOR, (2) specifically reference this solicitation/contract, and (3) specify the work to be performed by the DOR such that it is clear that the DOR will be meaningfully involved in this contract in a role that is consistent with that DOR's role in the project submitted for evaluation. The Government will only consider information provided in the teaming agreement for the purpose of determining whether the Offeror has clearly demonstrated that the DOR will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. Please confirm how the experience rules apply where the construction Offeror is a contractor JV, but the proposed designer is a separate subcontractor/teaming entity rather than a member of the contractor JV. May the designer's project references be submitted as "Other" on Attachment B, supported by the required fully executed agreement, without adding the design firm as a member of the construction JV or registering a separate designer JV in SAM.gov?	Yes	0002
083	Reference: RFP Section 00 21 16, SAM Registration (pg 8); SF 1442; Att B, Block 1 SAM Registration. To be eligible for award, your firm(s) must be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as required by FAR 52.204-7, http://www.sam.gov. All Offerors, including Joint Ventures, must be registered in SAM prior to submitting a proposal for a DoD contract and shall continue to be registered until time of award, during performance and through final payment of any contract resulting from this solicitation. Review your firm's NAICS codes listed in the firm's SAM record to ensure all the MACC's stated NAICS for this procurement are included in your firm's Representations and Certifications. For additional information, including how to register, please go to www.sam.gov. Offerors not registered in SAM may be considered non-responsive to solicitation requirements. Please clarify which registration and identification requirements apply to a design firm whose experience is claimed under Factor 2 and which will be contractually committed to the Offeror, but is not itself the Offeror or a member of the Offeror's construction JV. Must that firm maintain active SAM.gov registration and provide its own UEI/CAGE at proposal submission, or are those requirements applicable only to the Offeror and any formal JV members?	The SAM registration requirements stipulated in the solicitation apply to the Offeror, as further defined by Section 00 22 00, Factor 2 - Experience, (a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements, (1) Construction Experience, Note (5) which states "[t[he 'Offeror' is defined as the exact name in Block 14 of the Solicitation, Offer and Award (SF1442). If the Offeror is utilizing experience and past performance information of any entity other than (1) the Offeror; (2) if the Offeror is a joint venture, its joint venture 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 (separate legal entities are not considered part of the Offeror), the Offeror shall provide in its proposal a fully-executed teaming agreement or other contractual agreement...".	0002
084	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2(b)6 – Basis of Evaluation 6) Proposals demonstrating construction experience on relevant projects where the Offeror and the proposed design firm(s) have previously worked together may be considered more favorably than those that have not worked together. The Factor 2 evaluation states that proposals may be viewed more favorably when the Offeror and proposed design firm(s) have previously worked together on relevant construction projects. For example, if the Offeror and proposed designer previously worked together on a project as members of a different JV, would that prior collaboration qualify for this consideration? If so, what documentation should be provided to demonstrate the prior collaboration?	See responses to PPI Nos. 009 and 080.	0002
085	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 2.2, Note 1 (pg 14) 1. A project is defined as a complete design effort performed under a single task order or contract/subcontract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; instead, Offerors shall submit the work performed under an individually issued task order as a project. For projects delivered under an IDIQ or multiple-award contract, please confirm that each reference must be an individually issued task order rather than the overall IDIQ/MACC contract, and clarify whether a task order may be used when its construction value is below the stated threshold but forms part of a larger overall program.	The inquiry regarding each relevant project must be an individually issued task order rather than the overall IDIQ/MACC contract is confirmed; however, the additional inquiry regarding task orders with construction values below the threshold stated in the solicitation does not meet the stated criteria for project relevancy as further defined by Section 00 22 00, Factor 2 - Experience, (a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements, (1) Construction Experience, (i)-(iv).	0002
086	Reference: RFP Section 00 22 00, Part I, Section 1.2 – Enforceability of Proposal (pg 11) 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. The awardee's proposal will be incorporated into the contract and all items proposed will become binding requirements of the contract. By submission of the offer, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., teaming agreements, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract. Any substitutions after contract award will be equal or better than as proposed and shall require Contracting Officer's approval prior to implementation. Will the addition of a JV partner be permitted after shortlisting of the MACC?	No	0002

Gov't Tracking #	PPI	PPI Response	Amendment #
088	RFP Section: Section 00 22 00- Supplementary Instructions, Evaluation Factors for Award. PART II. 2.3 Proposal Volume I: Non-Priced Evaluation Factors Factor 2 Experience 2. Design Experience Request: Please revise Recency criterion (b) to read: “the design completion date was achieved within ten (10) years immediately preceding the solicitation issuance date, regardless of the status of the subsequent construction effort.” Rationale: Because this factor evaluates Design Experience, we respectfully request that recency be measured based on completion of the design effort rather than the status of subsequent construction. For large, complex projects similar to this procurement, a substantial period may occur between design completion and the commencement of construction for reasons separate from the design effort. The proposed revision retains the Government’s ten-year recency threshold while allowing consideration of recent and relevant design experience without making qualification dependent upon subsequent construction timing. This would broaden competition among qualified Offerors without changing the stated ten-year standard for design recency.	See response to PPI No. 006.	0002
089	Reference: Part II, Section 2.3, Factor 1(a)3 – Bonding Capacity (pg 12) Bonding Capacity: a. The Offeror (as identified on the SF1442) shall provide completed Surety Letter(s) (Attachment A) from a corporate surety(ies) listed in the Department of Treasury Circular 570 "Companies Holding Certificates of Authority as Acceptable Sureties on Federal Bonds and Acceptable Reinsuring Companies" indicating the Offeror's: (i) single project bonding capacity in the amount of $1,000,000,000 or more; (ii) aggregate bonding capacity of. $3,000,000,000 or more; and (iii) current available bonding value. If the single project bonding capacity is subject to an aggregate uncompleted backlog, indicate the Offeror's current aggregate uncompleted backlog and current available bonding capacity. b. If the Offeror proposes utilization of two (2) or more Sureties, provide a narrative not to exceed two (2) 8-1/2" x 11" single-sided pages that includes a brief description for the Offeror's Bond Broker Plan detailing how the Offeror will fulfill the required minimum single project bonding capacity in the amount of $1,000,000,000 and required minimum aggregate bonding capacity in the amount of $3,000,000,000 through utilization of multiple Sureties. For an Offeror proposing to use multiple sureties, please confirm whether the response should include both option (a.) and (b.), or whether option (b.) replaces option (a.).	The bonding requirements stipulated by Section 00 22 00, Factor 1 - Technical Approach, (a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements, (3)(a) apply to ALL Offerors. Offeror's proposing the utilization of two (2) or more Sureties must also submit the narrative required by (3)(b) as stated in the solicitation.	0002