

RFIs for 36C257-18-R-0346 Design-Build Parking Garage Phase I

Q1. Phase 1 Evaluation Ratings

How will Factor 1 be rated (i.e. Pass/Fail/Neutral)? If we cannot meet all of the requirements for Factor 1, will our Phase 1 proposal be considered unacceptable?

A1. Please see below Rating Definitions.

(Phase I - Technical Evaluation Factors 1 and 2 will be evaluated as follows)

RATING DEFINITION

E- Exceptional (Blue) Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.

VG-Very Good (Green) Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

S-Satisfactory (Yellow) Proposal 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.

M-Marginal (Orange) Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

U-Unsatisfactory (Red) Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is not awardable.

(Phase I - Past Performance Factor 3 will be evaluated as follows)

RATING DEFINITION

E- Exceptional (Blue) The proposal is very comprehensive, in-depth, clear and uniformly outstanding in quality. Consistently high quality performance can be expected. The proposal, as written, exceeds requirements and demonstrates an exceptional understanding of goals and objectives of the acquisition. One or more major strengths exist and no significant weaknesses exist.

S-Satisfactory (Green) The proposal meets all minimum requirements and generally is of high quality. Proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of goals and objectives of the acquisition. There may be both strengths and weaknesses, but the

strengths outweigh the weaknesses. Deficiencies are minor and easily corrected. Proposal is acceptable as written. Satisfactory can be expected.

M-Marginal (Orange) The proposal fails to meet minimum requirements. Proposal demonstrates a fair understanding of the goals and objectives of the acquisition. Weaknesses outbalance any strength that exists. Weaknesses will be difficult to correct and would require negotiations.

U-Unsatisfactory (Red) The proposal fails to meet minimum requirements. Proposal fails to meet an understanding of the goals and objectives of the acquisition. The proposal has one or more significant weaknesses that will be very difficult or impossible to correct. Major proposal revision(s) are required for minimum acceptability.

N-Neutral (Purple) This rating is applicable to past performance only. Insufficient customer satisfaction questionnaires were received and past performance could not be evaluated.

Q2. Technical Experience

Will the VA accept (1) parking structure of similar size and magnitude completed by the Prime Contractor, rather than a minimum of (2)?

A2. The VA will not accept one (1) parking structure of similar size and magnitude, shall be as stated in the solicitation.

Q3. Design Firm Requirements - Factor 1 Technical Experience Factor 1 states "Design firms must be the Designer of Record on a minimum of two projects submitted." Does this mean the Design firm that we propose for this project must be the Designer of Record on at least two of the Prime Contractors parking structure projects that are submitted in the narrative? Or, can the Design Firm submit technical experience on two completed projects of their own?

A3. The design firm can submit technical experience on two completed projects of their own.

Q4. Contractor's License

Factor 2 states that offerors are to submit a copy of their current Texas Contractors License. Will a Contractor's License from another state be sufficient?

A4. Factor 2, Sub-factor (4) Contractor's Texas Contractor License requirement is hereby removed entirely.

Q5. Reference Block 11 of the SF1442 regarding completion calendar days. It states that performance is to be completed within 365 calendar days from NTP. Is this for construction only, or is it your intent that this duration be for design and construction? If the latter, we do not feel that 365 days is ample time assuming the normal VA design process is followed. Please clarify.

A5. The 365 days is for the entire design build project.

Q6. Reference Block 13.b. of the SF1442 regarding the offer guarantee. Please confirm that this is not required until Phase 2.

A6. Correct, this is for Phase II.

Q7. Reference "Instructions to Offerors", page 7 of 68, regarding sending proposals both electronically and hard copy. Are both the electronic copy and hard copy due prior to the proposal due date and time, or can the electronic copies be submitted by the official date and time with the hard copies to follow via overnight delivery?

A7. Both the electronic and hard copy must be received on or by the due date.

Q8. Reference "Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 1 – Technical Experience", page 18 of 68. Regarding the statement "The offeror must provide information demonstrating that a Design Build project of this size and magnitude has already successfully been performed within the last five (5) years", can this be any design/build project of size and magnitude, or does it have to be a parking garage?

A8. The design build shall be a parking garage.

Q9. Reference "Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 1 – Technical Experience", page 18 of 68. Regarding the statement "Offeror must provide a narrative stating that at least TWO (2) parking structure construction projects of equal or greater size and complexity as the Parking Garage Phase II project in the price range of \$5,000,000 - \$10,000,000 have been completed as a Prime Contractor", do the projects have to be 100% complete?

A9. Yes, the projects must be 100% completed.

Q10. Reference "Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 1 – Technical Experience", page 18 of 68. Regarding the statement "Offeror must provide a narrative stating that at least TWO (2) parking structure construction projects of equal or greater size and complexity as the Parking Garage Phase II project in the price range of \$5,000,000 - \$10,000,000 have been completed as a Prime Contractor", can the past experience of a teaming partner be used?

A10. Yes, if the Contractor team arrangement meets the definition under FAR 9.601 and 9.603 (provided below).

9.601 Definition.

"Contractor team arrangement," as used in this subpart, means an arrangement in which—

(1) Two or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor; or

(2) A potential prime contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract or acquisition program.

9.603 Policy.

The Government will recognize the integrity and validity of contractor team arrangements; provided, the arrangements are identified and company relationships are fully disclosed in an offer or, for arrangements entered into after submission of an offer, before the arrangement becomes effective. The Government will not normally require or encourage the dissolution of contractor team arrangements.

Q11. Reference "Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 1 – Technical Experience", page 18 of 68. Regarding the statement "Design firms must be the Designer of Record on a minimum of two projects submitted", is this to mean that of the projects submitted by the offeror, the design firm that we are proposing to use for the Temple project has to have been the DOR on at least 2 of the projects used as past performance? Or does this mean that you are requiring that the proposed design firm must also submit 2 separate projects of reference that they were the DOR on?

A11. The designer of record must have completed two (2) projects either with the prime or on their own.

Q12. Reference "Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 1 – Technical Experience", page 18 of 68. Regarding the statement "This information shall be submitted in a narrative format and a separate form shall be submitted for each contract", is there a page limit for this portion of Factor 1? What separate form is being referred to here, or is this to mean that a separate sheet, or page, shall be used for each project narrative?

A12. The page limit is 15 pages total for all projects/contracts provided; the separate form means a new sheet/page (or combination, if more than 1 page is needed to describe a specific contract) per project/contract used for Factor 1.

Q13. Reference "Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 2 – Construction Management", item (4) Contractor's Texas Contractor License, page 19 of 68. Texas does not require a General Contractors License at the state level and only some cities require any type of licensing. We are currently performing work at the Dallas VAMC and have worked throughout the state of Texas on various military bases without ever having to obtain any sort of Texas licensing. In light of there not being a Texas GC License, what is required for this section?

A13. Factor 2, Sub-factor (4) Contractor's Texas Contractor License is hereby removed entirely.

Q14. Reference “Instructions, Conditions and Other Statements to Bidders/Offerors, Factor 3 – Past Performance”. Are the projects listed under this factor to be the same as those listed in Factor 1, or different projects? Are the PPQs only to be used for the projects submitted under Factor 3, or are they to be used on the projects listed in Factor 1 also, assuming they are different?

A14. Factor 1 and Factor 3 are separate Factors and evaluated separately, as such Offerors are not required to submit Past Performance for the project identified in Factor 1 proposals, however Offerors may choose to do so. NOTE: Factor 3 states that the past performance shall be similar in size and scope to this project. Whereas Factor 1 specifies that the Technical Experience must be a Design-Build project of this size and magnitude for a Parking Structure.

Q15. Reference the Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaire form that was issued as a separate document with the solicitation. It states that the completed questionnaires are to arrive to the contract specialist NOT LATER THAN March 20, 2018. This date has passed. Do you want us to revise this document, and if so, what is the correct date to put on here?

A15. The correct date is April 20, 2018.

Q16. What is the appropriate method for submitting RFIs? Should offers submit RFIs to Camille Dye at Camille.dye@va.gov?

A16. RFIs shall be submitted electronically to camille.dye@va.gov

Q17. Factor 1 – Technical Experience, asks for Offerors to, “Provide a narrative stating that at least TWO (2) parking structure construction projects of equal or greater size and complexity as the Parking Garage Phase II project in price range of \$5,000,000 - \$10,000,000 have been completed as a Prime Contractor.” As a SDVO Small Business set-aside project, it is very restrictive to expect small businesses to have two \$5M-\$10M parking structures completed within the past five (5) years. We understand that demonstrating experience on parking structures is important, only very few small business SDVOSBs have more than one parking garage. In an effort to maximize competition, would the VA please consider revising the evaluation criteria for Factor 1 to state, “at least ONE (1) parking structure construction project of equal or greater size and complexity as the Parking Garage Phase II project in the price range of \$5,000,000 - \$10,000,000 have been completed as a Prime Contractor.” This would ensure adequate competition while demonstrating competency on parking structures.

A17. The requirement for 2 parking structure construction projects will remain as stated in the solicitation. The Government will not consider revisions at this time.

Q18. Are Offeror’s allowed to use key subcontractors’ technical experience to demonstrate at least two (2) parking structure construction projects of equal or greater size and complexity?

A18. As stated under Factor 1 - The technical experience shall be that of the Offeror/Prime Contractor.

Q19. Factor 3, Past Performance, are those projects submitted under this factor to be the same as those submitted under Factor 1?

A19. Factor 1 and Factor 3 are separate Factors and evaluated separately, as such Offerors are not required to submit Past Performance for the project identified in Factor 1 proposals, however Offerors may choose to do so. NOTE: Factor 3 states that the past performance shall be similar in size and scope to this project. Whereas Factor 1 specifies that the Technical Experience must be a Design-Build project of this size and magnitude for a Parking Structure.

Q20. Factor 3, Past Performance, can offerors submit previously completed PPQs?

A20. Yes, if it meets the requirements as stated in the solicitation.

Q21. If there is a Final CPARs/CCASS or ACASS Performance Evaluation in the system, are offerors to submit that instead of the PPQ?

A21. No

Q22. Factor 2, Construction Management, asks for Offerors to submit a copy of its current Texas Contractor License. Texas does not require general contractors to be licensed, only specialty trades (i.e., mechanical, plumbing, electrical, roofing, fire protection, etc.). As a VA project, performed on federal property, please remove the requirement to provide current Texas Contractor Licenses as it's not applicable.

A22. See A4 above

Q23. There is a SF 1442 form provided with this solicitation. Typically, even for Phase 1 proposals, Offerors are to provide a signed SF 1442, and SF 30s for all amendments. Does the VA intend for Offerors to sign the SF1442, and all applicable SF30s? If so, where (i.e., behind what tab) should Offerors include these forms in our Phase 1 proposals?

A23. Yes, Offerors shall sign the SF1442 and all applicable SF30s; no specific tab designated.

Q24. Please confirm that there is no page count for Phase I proposals.

A24. The solicitation is hereby changed to incorporate the following page limits, any Offeror's whose proposal exceeds the page limit per factor are hereby advised that the Evaluation will stop at the last page of the page limit and any information included in additional pages will not be considered during evaluation.

Factor 1 – Technical Experience: 15-page limit

Factor 2 – Construction Management: 20-page limit

Factor 3 – Past Performance: 15-page limit (page limit is inclusive of Past Performance Evaluation Questionnaire's)

Q25. Please specify the minimum and maximum number of projects Offerors can submit for Factor 1, including those for Designers of Record.

A25. Minimum 2, Maximum 4 – NOTE: Factor 1 submissions must follow the page limits addressed under Answer 24.

Q26. Factor 3 states to provide a minimum of two and maximum of three projects. However, Factor 1 states to provide two relevant projects, and the Designer of Record should demonstrate a record of a minimum of two projects. Therefore, are projects submitted for Factor 3 to be the same as projects submitted for Factor 1? If so, will the VA revise the language for Factor 3 to state that a minimum of four projects should be submitted?

A26. Factor 1 and Factor 3 are separate Factors and evaluated separately, as such Offerors are not required to submit Past Performance for the project identified in Factor 1 proposals, however Offerors may choose to do so. NOTE: Factor 3 states that the past performance shall be similar in size and scope to this project. Whereas Factor 1 specifies that the Technical Experience must be a Design-Build project of this size and magnitude for a Parking Structure.

Q27. Factor 2, Proposed Safety Plan, asks Offerors to provide a plan to address the overall safety for this project, and proof of required OSHA training. Will the VA please specify the required OSHA training?

A27. 10-hour certified Construction Safety Course and Supervisor or other competent person shall have a 30-hour certified course per OSHA requirements (<https://www.osha.gov/dte/>)

Q28. Factor 2 references an evaluation chart (e.g. Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal or Unsatisfactory), which is not provided in the solicitation. Please provide this evaluation chart.

A28. (Phase I - Technical Evaluation Factors 1 and 2 will be evaluated as follows)

RATING DEFINITION

E- Exceptional (Blue) Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.

VG-Very Good (Green) Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

S-Satisfactory (Yellow) Proposal 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.

M-Marginal (Orange) Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

U-Unsatisfactory (Red) Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is not awardable.