

Question 1: Reference: PPVA Bldg 371; Folding Partition Finish Specification Section 10 22 26.13 & 09 06 00:

Specification Section 10 22 26.13 makes at least two references to the panel finish being “fabric”. (1.5-C and 2.1-A.) However, please confirm that the WilsonArt Plastic Laminate per Section 09 06 00 is the required finish material for this partition.

Answer 1: Folding partition panels shall be a fabric finish as described in spec section 10 22 26.13 not a plastic laminate. Spec section 09 06 00 Accordion folding doors, can be deleted from this section.

Question 2: Reference: PPVA Bldg 371; Accordion vs Operable Partition Specification Section 10 22 26.13 paragraph 1.4-B:

At various locations within the bid documents, mention is made to an “accordion” door for the divider between Rooms B132 & B133. Please confirm that the contract documents require solid folding panels, or what is also referred to as an “operable partition” for this application, as opposed to an accordion door, which is basically a flexible divider curtain, and not available with the STC Rating required by the 10 22 26.13, 1.4-B.

Answer 2: A folding operable partition shall be provided between these rooms as shown on 1/A101b and on detail 3/A501.

Question 3: Reference: Part II-Instruction to Offeror, G. Volume 2-Past Performance, page 94, paragraph 2:

Is a completed PPQ (attachment 5) to be included by the offeror in the Volume 2-Past Performance binder?

Answer 3: No; please place a PPQ with offeror’s customer/client information in volume 2, (a copy of the PPQ that was sent to your customer/client); this will allow the Gov’t to verify if the PPQ was received from the offeror’s customer/client.

Question 4: Reference: Attachment 6, Construction Cost Breakdown, Solicitation, page 95 of 108, paragraph H. Volume 3- Cost/Price Proposal:

Do we need to use the exact same format as the example provided for Attachment 6- Construction Cost Breakdown?

Answer 4: Please refer to amendment 2 to VA245-17-R-0041

Question 5: Reference: Solicitation, Part II/page 95 paragraph H.1.:

Paragraph H Volume 3-Cost/Price proposal requires the offeror to submit a cost breakdown with the proposal. The paragraph references “attachment 6” and directs the offeror to complete the attachment. However, the attachment included in the solicitation appears incomplete. Will a complete cost breakdown for each seed project be provided by the VA?

Answer 5: Please refer to amendment 2 and no a completed cost breakdown will not be provided; a disclosure of magnitude has been provided for each seed project.

Question 6: Reference: Page 97 of 108 para J

In the solicitation document states no alternate bids will be accepted, sheet G003 of the VA Perry Point RRTP bid documents request alternate pricing to be provided. Please provide a 1442 form with spaces for alternate bid pricing to be filled in as requested.

Answer 6: Offeror should include pricing as indicated for the whole construction project and include the three alternate (deducts) on the SF 1442, block 17 and Attachment 6, Construction Cost Breakdown, page 2, rows 25-41 (per amendment 2). Amendment 4 contains sample wording of pricing to be inserted in Block 17, SF 1442 for the Maryland Geographic Area.

Question 7: Reference: Site Visit

Due to a scheduling issue, we were not able to make the scheduled site visit. Would it be possible to schedule a second visit?

Answer 7: No additional site visit(s) will be conducted.

Question 8: Reference: Cost Proposal VA RRTP; Specification Section 283100-Fire Detection and Alarm existing system modification 1.1A:

Section 283100 states in paragraph 1.1A...”provide extension of existing fire system”. Since Building 371 is new construction please confirm the intent of the fire alarm system specifications.

Answer 8: The intent of the fire alarm system specifications and drawings is for the contractor to furnish and install a stand-alone fire alarm system inside the building. The new fire alarm system is to communicate trouble, supervisory, and alarm signals to the main 24-hour staffed fire station headquarters and the boiler plant on the campus.

Question 9: Reference: Attachment 5: Past Performance Questionnaire, solicitation page 94 of 108 paragraph G. Volume 2-Past Performance (Factor 2):

Do we need to include completed Past Performance Questionnaires in our Past Performance Volume per the solicitation (i.e. “the offeror is responsible for submitting all completed questionnaires with their past performance volume.” Or are we to follow the instructions in the body of the cover letter provided (i.e. “do not return them to the contractor.”)?

Answer 9: Refer to Question/Answer #3

Question 10: Reference: DC VAMC Seed Project- Renovate Research Labs Phase 3.

- *On Page 5 of 5 of the Specifications Table of Contents there is a reference to a Supplementary Appendices – Asbestos Assessment Volume 1. The referenced Appendices cannot be located in the document.*
- *In the specifications in Section 02-82-11-5 under 1.1.2 Extent of Work the document refers to the VA ACM Inventory Table and pages 66-99 and the drawings H6-1 thru H6-6 dated 11-17-11....*
- *We would request that any hazardous material assessment report and drawings be disclosed to provide an accurate proposal.*

Answer 10: Asbestos report for DC VAMC Seed Project is part of Amendment 4.

Question 11: Reference: Solicitation Package

Each Volume requests one original and 3 **redacted** Hard copies. What is required to be redacted?

Answer 11: All references to offeror to include names of individuals.

Question 12: Reference: Solicitation Package:

Para E. OFFERS (page 91 of 108) states Volume 3 Cost/Price (including SF 1442). Para H. Volume 3 (pg 95 of 108) does not require SF 1442. Para I. Volume 4-Administrative (pg 96 of 108) requires the SF 1442. Please clarify

Answer 12: SF 1442 page 2 shall be included in volume 3, as well as page 2 of Attachment 6, Construction Cost Breakdown, rows 25-41 for the geographic area selected by the offeror. Volume 4 requires the SF1442 as well.

Question 13: Reference: Electronic Copy of Proposal, Solicitation, page 90 of 108, paragraph 16

Statement of Work for Construct New RRTP Beds states 3 Deductive Alternates may be exercised by the VA. The SF 1442 does not include these alternates. Please provide a SF 1442 with all bid items listed.

Answer 13: Please refer to Question/Answer 6.

Question 14: Reference: Solicitation; page 90 of 108, Section D., paragraph 16:

Per the information presented in the solicitation, the electronic copies of the offerors' proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by Microsoft (MS) Word 2010, Excel, Project and Power Point 2010. Would it be acceptable if the electronic copies were submitted by PDF's?

Answer 14: Yes, PDF is acceptable

Question 15: Reference: Per Part 2 of Attachment 4, Past Performance Information Sheet, it states that, the additional information required...need only be provided once in your submission package." Can this section (part 2) be its own attachment (4A, for example) and included only once, since we need to submit separate attachment 4-Past Performance Information Sheet for every past performance project we are submitting?

Answer 15: Part 2 as indicated by the sheet only needs to be presented once; additional Past Performance Information Sheets, attachment 4's submitted do not require resubmission of Part 2.

Question 16: Reference: Cost Proposal VA RRTP, Subsurface Investigation Report, Pg 7 Stripping and Excavation:

The subsurface investigation report states that a geotechnical engineer should review subsurface conditions after stripping operations are completed. Is the geotechnical engineer mentioned in the report to be hired by the contract or the VA?

Answer 16: Contractor shall hire the geotechnical engineer. The contractor shall identify who they intend to use.

Question 17: Reference: Cost Proposal VA RRTP, Subsurface Investigation Report, Pg 7
Stripping and Excavation:

The subsurface investigation report details varying depths of topsoil through the site. For bidding purposes please establish a topsoil depth to be stripped from the site

Answer 17: The Government has provided sufficient details regarding a topsoil depth to be stripped.

Question 18: Reference: Cost Proposal VA RRTP, Subsurface Investigation Report, Pg 7
Stripping and Excavation:

The subsurface investigation report states that existing fill onsite maybe used as structural backfill. The report goes on to say that existing soils are sensitive to moisture and may be unusable in certain cases (time of year/moisture content) unless the soils are spread and dried. Are bidders to assume the existing soils are suitable for fill as is or are we to include costs for spreading and drying the fill?

Answer 18: The Contract Drawings, Specifications and Geotechnical Report define the intent and requirements of the project and provide a reference regarding various acceptable approaches to achieving a suitable structural backfill (in the case of the geotechnical report). It is the offerors responsibility to determine the means and methods in which they intend to complete the required site work and meet the requirements of the project in preparing their bid.

Question 19: Reference: Instructions to offerors:

Under the Instructions to Offerors, Page 90 of 108, Item 16, lists the requirements for the electronic copies of the proposals. Will Adobe PDF files or scans also be an acceptable format for some of the files on the CD?

Answer 19: Please refer to Question/Answer 14.

Question 20: Reference: Instruction to offerors:

Under the Instructions to Offerors, Pages 91 - 95, it is noted that an original and 3 redacted copies are to be provided for Volumes 1, 2, & 3. What information is to be redacted?

Answer 20: Please refer to Question/Answer 11.

Question 21: Reference: Instruction to Offerors:

There is conflicting information for SF 1442. On Page 91 of 108, Section E. Offers, shows the SF 1442 to be included in Volume 3, but page 96 of 108 shows it and any amendments to be included under Volume 4. Please advise as to which volume the SF 1442, Amendments and Bid Bond should go.

Answer 21: SF 1442 page 2 shall be included in volume 3, as well as page 2 of Attachment 6, Construction Cost Breakdown, rows 25-41 for the geographic area selected by the offeror . Volume 4 shall include SF 1442 completed in accordance with the instructions detailed on page 96, paragraph 1 and 2. Amendment 4 adds direction to include bid bond in Volume 4-Administrative. Reminder in accordance with 52.228-1 Bid Guarantee and this request for proposal a bid bond is required.

Question 22: Reference: West Virginia Seed Project:

Please provide the duration for the seed project for the West Virginia Geographical Area.

Answer 22: Period of Performance shall be 360 calendar days

Question 23: Reference: Bond Requirements, RFP Page 93 subfactor 3 paragraph 1

Currently Bond Requirement for each proposal is \$10M-will the packages submitted for DC and West Virginia have the same \$10M requirement, or \$5M as per the maximum of \$5M per task order-Attachment 2 (WV) and Attachment 3(DC)?

Answer 23: Please refer to Part III, Section 2.0 Evaluation Factors, subfactors, elements, paragraph 2.1.3-Subfactor 3 – Bonding & SDVOSB Status states the bonding requirement for this MATOC. Do not confuse performance and payment bonds with bid bonds (Bid Guarantee FAR 52.228-1).

Question 24: Reference: Specification Section 23 09 23 DDC System for HVAC Page 6 (195/467), para 1.1.F:

Please provide contact information for the VA's preselected controls service provider (control System Integrator). If it is Johnson Controls how do we procure integration and installation under separate contracts?

Answer 24: Johnson Controls Inc.

Question 25: Reference: Stainless Steel Duct; Specification Section 23 31 00 HVAC Ducts and Casing Page 4 (309/467), para 2.2. Drawings M601 Ductwork Construction Note 6:

Specifications call for stainless steel ducts to be fully welded. Does this include the joints or just the seams?

Answer 25: Fully welded includes joints and seams.

Question 26: Reference: Page 89 of 108 / Paragraph 9; Referenced item states: “...*Each page shall be counted except the following: executive summary, blank pages, title pages, tables of contents, tabs, and glossaries...*”

The above contains the only reference to an “Executive Summary”. Is this an optional or mandatory requirement? Is it to be placed at the beginning of Volume 1?

Answer 26: It is optional; just an example of items that will not be counted toward the page limitations provided within.

Question 27: Reference: Sol. No. VA245-17-R-0041, Page 91 of 108 / Section F & Multiple Other

Referenced item states: *F. VOLUME 1 – TECHNICAL (FACTOR 1) (One Original and 3 redacted Hard Copies, 1 Electronic Copy. Page Limitation: 25 pages total)*

The term “redacted” has multiple definitions by varying Federal agencies and DoD branches; some require “redacted proposals” to have extensive redactions in eliminating all references to the submitting firm and names of key personnel. We are requesting a definition of the term “redacted” as intended for this procurement.

Answer 27: Please refer to Question/Answer 11.

Question 28: Reference: VA245-17-R-0041 Page 94 of 108 / Section G, Para. 1

Are we correct in assuming that Attachment 4 should be included for “each project the offeror submits”, and includes not only the up-to-six projects for the submitting Prime, and up-to-three projects submitted as qualifying experience for a teaming partner and/ or JV partner but no attachment 4’s are required for key subcontractors?

Answer 28: Yes a PPIS, Attachment 4, should be submitted for each project; and up to three projects submitted as qualifying experience for teaming partner and/or Joint Venture partner, and no attachment 4’s for key subcontractors.

Question 29: Reference: VA245-17-R-0041 Page 94 of 108 / Section G, Para. 2

Referenced item states:

*2. The offeror is responsible for ensuring the Past Performance Questionnaire, (Attachment 5), is completed by the customer's project manager or CO or COR for the respective project. Offerors shall complete Section 1 of the Past Performance Questionnaire and distribute it along with the Performance Questionnaire Letter to the customer's project manager/CO/owner/COR (or commercial equivalent). The customer's project manager/CO/owner/COR shall complete Sections 2 thru 5 of the Past Performance Questionnaire and return it to the MATOC CO/CS as identified in C1. Offeror's shall only submit Past Performance Questionnaires for those projects that do not have completed reports in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). ***THE OFFEROR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SUBMITTING ALL COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES WITH THEIR PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME****

Are we to disregard the above portion of the requirement stating that the completed PPQ be sent to the VISN CO/CS, but be forwarded to the submitting Prime for inclusion in the solicitation response?

Are PPQ's required for the up-to-three subcontractor projects?

Answer 29: Please refer to Question/Answer 3. Sub-contractor PPQ's are not required.

Question 30: Reference: VA245-17-R-0041 Page 96 of 108 / VOL. 4 / Para. 4

Referenced item states:

5. Teaming Arrangement(s) and/or Letter(s) of Intent: Joint Venture (JV) relationships are not assumed IAW 13 C.F.R. 121.103(h). Therefore, Offerors shall identify whether they are bidding as JVs, and if so, the organization of the relationship. Offeror shall include as an attachment any written contract/teaming arrangement agreements. All written contract teaming arrangements and letters of intent shall be signed by all parties.

Does the VISN require the inclusion of Teaming Agreements with Key Subcontractors?

Answer 30: No

Question 31: Reference: Past Performance Factor 2 recency, G. Volume 2-Past Performance Factor 2 recency:

Recent contracts are defined in the solicitation as "past performance shall consist of work currently being performed for 6 months". If we have a \$3M project that is currently working but has not been working for over 6 months, but is more than 75% complete, can that project be used for our past performance? Contract duration is over 180 days total.

Answer 31: Please refer to solicitation evaluation criteria defining relevancy and recency.

Question 32: Reference: West Virginia Seed Project - VFD's; drawing MH-102:

Concerning the VFD's, there is a note 8 on drawing MH-102 that states "new VFD" and the only place this note shows up is by EF-31. Should this note be at EF-32, AH-31 and AH-32?

Answer 32: Drawing MH-102 is for reference only. ES201 note 10 references VFD installation

Question 33: Reference: Instruction to Offerors:

There is conflicting information in the Instructions regarding Past Performance. Page 94 of 108 states that the Offeror is responsible for submitting all completed questionnaires with their past performance volume, but Attachment #5 states to return them to the VA, "Do not return them to the contractor". Please advise which is correct, as we would like to get these questionnaires out for responses as soon as possible.

Answer 33: Please refer to Question/Answer 3.

Question 34: Reference: Past Performance (factor 2)/WV Geographic Area, Page 94.

In reference to past performance. Is it acceptable to submit projects completed at VISN 5 (VA Clarksburg/VA Martinsburg) locations? Is so, would it be a conflict of interest for those CO or COR's to complete the past performance questionnaire?

Answer 34: Yes it is acceptable. No it would not be a conflict of interest. Reminder: Solicitation Part II, Section G, paragraph 2 (page 94 of 108), "Offeror's shall only submit Past Performance Questionnaires for those projects that do not have completed reports in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)."

Question 35: Reference: G.Volume 2 - Past Performance 2. Past Performance Questionnaires:

Can a previously filled out PPQ be utilized for this solicitation?

Answer 35: No; Refer to Question/Answer 3.

Question 36: Reference: Solicitation Package

Please provide the bid results for solicitation VA24515B0190 on 2/17/16 for the RRTP project. My understanding is that this was a public opening.

Answer 36: Offeror may complete a request via the Freedom of Information Act. The current project is a redesign of any previous project/solicitation.

Question 37: Reference: Solicitation Package

It appears that the Wage Decision for Cecil County has been modified since the solicitation issuance. Please provide the latest version. This is for the RRTP project

Answer 37: Amendment 4 contains updated wage determination for the three geographic areas.

Question 38: Reference: Solicitation Package

Please confirm that spec section 05 12 00 para. 3.6 Survey for the RRTP project is required.

Answer 38: The entire specification section 05 12 00 Structural Steel Framing from the VA TIL is required for this project, to include the survey under specification section 05 12 00 Structural Steel Framing.

Question 39: Reference: Item F. Volume 1- Technical (page 91 of 108)

Please confirm that item 1. should be considered as “Subfactor 1- Construction Approach”. It does not have a “Subfactor” associated with this item whereas Subfactor 2 has Program Management Plan, Subfactor 3 has Bonding & SDVOSB Status etc is stated for Volume 1

Answer 39: Yes, item should be considered Subfactor 1; Part II, Section F, Volume 1- Technical (Factor 1) paragraphs 1 & 2 (pages 91-92) are Subfactor 1 of Factor 1-Technical.

Question 40: Reference: Renovate Research Labs Phase 3 (DC VA Medical) Project #688-14-006

What areas are allowed for Contractor Parking and Laydown Area / Dumpster Location?

Answer 40: Amendment 4 to the solicitation contains an attachment with drawing.

Question 41: Reference: Renovate Research Labs Phase 3 (DC VA Medical) Project #688-14-006

Is there a freight elevator available to be used for removal of demo material and for getting new/stocked material to areas of work?

Answer 41: Yes

Question 42: Reference: Renovate Research Labs Phase 3 (DC VA Medical) Project #688-14-006

Who is responsible for Medical Equipment that is in rooms. (Government removes or Contractor stores equipment/demo)?

Answer 42: Government will be responsible for the removing/demolition of the medical equipment/furniture

Question 43: Reference: Renovate Research Labs Phase 3 (DC VA Medical) Project #688-14-006

For Scheduling please provide expected phasing plan (are all rooms free and clear once project is awarded or is some rooms going to be occupied during construction)?

Answer 43: Please refer to SOW Paragraph 4 Scope for the phasing

Question 44: Reference: Renovate Research Labs Phase 3 (DC VA Medical) Project #688-14-006

Please provide hours of Operation that construction can start and expected end time for each day.

Answer 44: 0600-1430, unless outages/shutdowns are needed. Outages/shutdown will be planned to minimize impact to patients

Question 45: Reference: Past Performance Projects

Would the VA consider lowering the past performance projects to \$700,000. Much of the work accomplished by SDVOSBs is less than the \$1M minimum requirement. Many project meet all the requirements except for the contract amount.

Answer 45: No, however the VISN/NCO 5 is contemplating a MATOC II with task order thresholds of \$2,000.00 minimum and \$1,000,000.00 maximum; this requirement is being drafted.

Question 46: Reference: Solicitation

Please advise where the Staging Location for this construction crew is to be located. Please also indicate the route to be used to travel from staging to work area. Will dumpsters and chutes be allowed adjacent to the work site? Will all work outside the work space need to be conducted on “off day shift hours”?

Answer 46: Refer to Specification Section 01 00 00 and 02 41 00 and paragraph F in general requirements states “work isn’t to interfere with medical center operations”; after normal business hours and weekends.

Question 47: Reference: PPQ, Factor 2 Past Performance

Can we use existing PPQ’s from other projects?

Answer 47: Refer to Question/Answer 3.

Question 48: Reference: Solicitation Document

Will there be price pages provided the West Virginia and DC Seed Tasks?

Answer 48: Pricing should be provided on attachment 6, Construction Cost Breakdown, page 2, rows 25-41 and in block 17 of the SF 1442 for each respective geographic location(s) selected by the offeror. Offeror is responsible for inserting pricing on the SF 1442, Block 17.

Question 49: Reference: AHU MATOC Seed project at Clarksburg VAMC

Concerning the roof penetrations on this project who is the roofing manufacturer and is there a warranty in place on the existing roofs?

Answer 49: Firestone and no warranty exist.

Question 50: Reference: AHU MATOC Seed project at Clarksburg VAMC

Drawing MD101 has a note printed between columns 16 & 17 and D & E. The note states: All work in this area will need to be closely coordinated with the owner due to the sensitive areas located below. Since it is believed this work is over O.R. rooms will this work be required to be completed off shift or after hours

Answer 50: Some work maybe coordinated to be completed during normal business hours; however the majority of work will be completed after normal business hours.

Question 51: Reference: Solicitation Package

Paragraph G. Volume 2 item 4. Recent and Relevant Contracts (page 94 of 108) requires the Offeror and teaming partner and/or joint venture partner to submit recent contracts demonstrating performance abilities on the MATOC. Please confirm that this is for “MATOC” type contracts and not for projects which is addressed in item 1 of Volume G

Answer 51: Please refer to Part III, paragraph 2.2-Factor 2-Past Performance (Volume 2).

Question 52: Reference: WV Clarksburg Seed Project, drawing MD101

A discrepancy is located on Drawing MD101 in the key note section #1. This note directs you to the phasing plan on drawing M104 however, there is no such drawing provided within the bid documents. With this project having phasing documentation inclusion as part of the bid package submittal requirements we feel that this could have an adverse effect on the bid packets.

Answer 52: There is a typo as there is no M104 drawing. The only reference to a phasing drawing is on MD101. The drawing constantly refers to having the new RTU fully functional before doing any work to the existing AHU-32. Some phasing is referenced with respect to piping, but it is outlined on the drawings MD101/M102. Phasing may not be the best word to use, it should read coordinate.