

VA101-13-R-0047, DALLAS LT-SCI PARKING GARAGE RFI RESPONSE SHEET

MUST BE SENT IN EXCEL FORMAT, NOT AS A .PDF *****OFFEROR RESPONSIBLE FOR			
Question No.	Reference (Sect/Para/Page)	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
1	General Design Request	<p>We acknowledge the garage is drawn utilizing a poured-in-place (PIP) post tension design.</p> <p>Would the VA consider a voluntary precast option if it resulted in no changes to form or function for the VA and/or its users?</p>	No, during the planning stage, use of a precast structure was considered and ruled out for this project. As the project is already designed, CIP (Cast In Place) is the method that will be used for this project.
2	Price Proposal	When submitting competitive numbers, prices from subcontractors get submitted to prime contractors right before bid time in order to protect their numbers from being shared. We have typically found that we get less competitive numbers and participation on Monday bids. In order to obtain more value for the government, would the government consider extending the due date to a Wednesday or Thursday to allow for more competitive pricing?	The due date remains the same at Monday, May 20, 2013.
3	Page 54 of 64, 22 of 64, and SF 1442	<p>Page 54 of 64 of the RFP states "The anticipated completion of this project is 534 calendar days after the notice to proceed". The SF1442 states that the completion shall be 534 calendar days from issuance of the notice to proceed as well.</p> <p>Page 22 of 64 of the RFP, Section 52.211-10 Commencement, Prosecution, and Completion of Work states "Complete the entire work ready for use not later than 525 calendar days."</p> <p>Will the government please confirm the anticipated completion date for this project? 525 calendar days or 534 calendar day?</p>	The mandatory completion time for this project is 534 calendar days. 52.211-10 should be changed from 525 calendar days to 53 calendar days.

VA101-13-R-0047, DALLAS LT-SCI PARKING GARAGE RFI RESPONSE SHEET

MUST BE SENT IN EXCEL FORMAT, NOT AS A .PDF *****OFFEROR RESPONSIBLE FOR			
Question No.	Reference (Sect/Para/Page)	QUESTION	GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
4	Evaluation Method, Page 56 of 64	<p>Will the government please confirm the evaluation method of this pursuit? (i.e Best Value, Low Price Technically Acceptable, Best Value Trade Off?).</p> <p>Page 56 of 64 states "The government reserves the right to make price/technical trade-offs that are inthe best interest of and advantageous to the government."</p> <p>Will the government please confirm what trade-offs may be more advantageous?</p> <p>If this is an LPTA (Low Price Technically Acceptable) project, will the government be removing the following language from the submission and evaluation criteria (found on page 55 of 64): "Relevant projects where the Prime and Subcontractors have previously worked together will receive a higher rating. Relevant projects that demonstrate design-bid-build experience will receive a higher rating".</p>	<p>The evaluation method used for this project is Best Value Trade Off. The determination of trade offs that are more advantageous to the Government cannot be determined until the evalution is conducted. Trade off is appropriate when it ma be in the best interest of the Government to consider award to the other than the lowest priced offeror ro other than the highest technically rated offer (as per FAR 15.101-1(a) & (b)).</p>
5	Factor 1 and Factor 2	<p>This is a Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) Set-Aside project. No small business will be able to meet the requirements of this RFP and still be a small business (i.e. if we had 5 projects over \$20-M that are specific to this criteria, we would exceed the size standard for this NAICS). In order to meet the requirements of this RFP and allow for reasonable small business competition, will the government consider projects in Factor 1 Construction Management and Factor 2, Past Performance to be a combination of projects that meet wither the size (\$20-50-M), scope, or complexity; rather than all three requirements on each of the 5 projects we submit?</p> <p>In other words, will the government evaluate projects favorably under Factor 1 and Factor 2 that demonstrate our ability to meet either size, scope, or complexity, as long as when combining the five projects submitted we meet all three criteria?</p>	<p>The RFP states a MAXIMUM of 5 projects of similar size and scope in the last seven (7) years. An offeror does not need to have a total of 5 projects. As stated in the RFP, an offeror will not be rated unfavorably; however, firms that provide more projects (maximum of 5) of similar size and scope will be more favorably rated.</p>