

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 30 July 2001	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

6. ISSUED BY CODE DACW17	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE
-----------------------------	---

USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, JACKSONVILLE 400 WEST BAY STREET ATTN: CESAJ-CT (ROOM 867) JACKSONVILLE, FL 32202-4412	IF BY HAND, DELIVER TO "ISSUED BY" USAED JACKSONVILLE, P.O. BOX 4970 ATTN: CESAJ-CT JACKSONVILLE, FL 32232-0019
--	--

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)	(✓)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DACW17-01-R-0001
	X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 4/20/01
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDER NO.
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers tended. is extended, is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(✓)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

STORMWATER TREATMENT AREA, 1-EAST, CONTRACT 5, C-51 C&SF PROJECT, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.

ANY ENCLOSURES ACCOMPANYING THIS AMENDMENT SHOULD BE INSERTED IN THE PLANS AND/OR SPECIFICATIONS AS APPLICABLE. ALL SUPERSEDED MATERIALS SHOULD BE REMOVED OR ADEQUATELY MARKED TO INDICATE THEY HAVE BEEN SUPERSEDED.

THE PROPOSAL DUE DATE IS CHANGED FROM 8/3/01 AT 16:00 TO 8/9/01 AT 16:00.

(SEE CONTINUATION SHEET FOR CHANGES).

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Harley R. Hartley, Contracting Officer		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 30 Jul 2001

SECTION SF-30 BLOCK CONTINUATION SHEET

Central and Southern Florida Project, Stormwater Treatment Area 1-East,
Contract 5, C-51, Palm Beach County, Florida

RFP: DACW17-01-R-0001 dated 20 April 2001, Amendment #0004.

SPECIFICATIONS: The specifications have not been edited to indicate the changes listed in Items 1, 3, and 4. The changes listed in Items 1, 3, and 4 are descriptive. The changes listed in Item 2 are attached as a part of this amendment.

1. Section 00010, on SF1442 (Page 00010-1) in Box 10, **Delete** the sentence " Performance period is 206 calendar days" ; and in Box 13A, **Delete** the date " 8/03/01" and **Insert** the date " 8/09/01" .
2. Section 00100, **Delete** Pages 00100-A1 through 00100-A9 and **Insert** new Pages 00100-A1 through 00100-A7.
3. Section 01000, at the end of Paragraph 1.7 (Page 8), **Insert** the sentences " Total contract completion time is 560 calendar days after receiving notice to proceed. Tasks not specified may be completed concurrently or after the tasks specified below."
4. Section 02300, at the end of Paragraph 3.4.1 (Page 11), **Insert** the sentence " The contractor shall spread excess material throughout a cell such that the final elevation is within the specified tolerance relative to the finished grades shown on the drawings."

DRAWINGS: The drawings have not been edited. The following changes are descriptive.

1. Drawing 2/37. At the end of the notes, **Insert** " 6. CUT AND FILL QUANTITIES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATION ONLY. OFFERORS HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF DETERMINING THEIR OWN QUANTITIES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THEIR OFFERS." and " 7. MATERIAL NEEDED TO BRING CELL 7 TO THE FINISHED GRADE ELEVATION SHALL BE OBTAINED FROM CELL 6." .

PROPOSAL EVALUATION INFORMATION

PART I – PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

P-1 Notice. The Government intends to make award without holding discussions with offerors. Therefore, offerors are encouraged to include their best terms and conditions (both price and technical) in the initial offer. By submitting an offer in response to this solicitation, offerors are agreeing to comply with all terms and conditions contained in the solicitation. (See item 17, Standard Form 1442.) Unless the solicitation specifically invites the offeror to submit exceptions, the Contracting Officer may reject any offer that contains exceptions. If, despite the warning given in this paragraph, the offeror elects to include exceptions, the exceptions must be specifically and clearly identified on a separate page. In this solicitation, the words “offer” and “proposal” are used interchangeably. (See definition of “offer” at FAR 2.101.) Except for any portions of the offeror’s proposal incorporated into the resulting contract by specific reference, the terms and conditions included in the solicitation, including any amendments, shall take precedence over the offeror’s proposal.

P-1.1 Certain positions and/or items of work are considered particularly critical to successful completion of the project. The Government will consider the qualifications of these persons/subcontractors during its evaluation of the offeror’s proposal. In accordance with the Limitations On Substitutions For Certain Positions And/Or Subcontractors paragraph of Section 00800 of this solicitation, if the offeror is awarded a contract the offeror will not be permitted to make substitutions without the approval of the Contracting Officer of Administrative Contracting Officer. Limitations apply to the following positions and/or items of work; therefore, the offeror shall name in its proposal the persons/subcontractors it proposes to use for these positions and/or items of work: Project Manager, Field Superintendent, and Quality Control Personnel.

P-2 The Proposal. Each offeror shall submit a written proposal consisting of the following documents:

P-2.1 Completed SF 1442 with price schedule.

P-2.2 Offer guarantee (or bid bond) if required by item 13B, Standard Form 1442.

P-2.3 Completed representations & certifications (Section 00600 of this solicitation).

P-2.4 Past performance information for all relevant contracts and subcontracts started or completed within the past 3 years (measured from the date of this solicitation). Submit a separate Past Performance Information Collection Sheet for each project. (A copy of the sheet is attached to the solicitation.) Include past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, and subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the work. (For proposed subcontractors, clearly identify the work each will perform.) For each project submitted, explain why it is relevant to this project, and provide information on problems encountered and the actions taken to correct such problems. (Relevancy is defined in the DOD guide to collection and use of past performance as “information that has a logical connection with the matter under consideration and applicable time span.”)

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – (SEE FAR 3.104)
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DACW17-01-R-0001

P-2.5 A technical proposal consisting of:

SUBFACTOR	SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT (Note: To ensure the proposal adequately addresses areas the Government considers important, the offeror should review paragraph E.3 Evaluation Factors in Part II of this Section prior to preparing the proposal.)
Management Plan	Contractor must submit a plan in sufficient detail to indicate he has a thorough knowledge of the type and extent of work to be performed. Plan should detail proposed methods, including a schedule, to accomplish within time required by contract. Plan must also include quality control procedures.
Organization Chart And Resumes	Contractor must submit an organizational chart, integrating major subcontractors. Submission must include resumes of key personnel to include project manager, field superintendent, and quality control personnel. Include names, qualifications, duties, responsibilities and authority levels.
Resources	Submittal must include a list of type, number and availability of equipment to be used on the project. State whether equipment is owned or rented. Include estimated production rates for equipment to be used.
Subcontracting Plan	If the offeror is not a small business firm, a subcontracting plan. (See the Army's Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Guide (AFARS Appendix CC) at http://acqnet.sarda.army.mil/library/afar/apcc.htm for guidance for preparing an acceptable plan.)

P-2.6 Packaging the Proposal. The proposal shall be divided as indicated in the following table and each division shall be submitted in a separate sealed package. Each package shall be marked with the offeror's name, the solicitation number, and the package number.

Package	No. of Copies	Items
1	2	Price proposal, bond, representations & certifications (Paragraphs P-2.1, P-2.2, and P-2.3). Each copy shall be separately bound.
2	12	Past performance information (Paragraph P-2.4). Each copy shall be separately bound.
3	12	Technical proposal (Paragraph P-2.5). Each copy shall be placed in a common 3-ring binder. DO NOT INCLUDE PRICING INFORMATION IN THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.

PART II – SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS

E-1 Applicable Regulatory Guidance. This source selection will be conducted in accordance with procedures prescribed in FAR Part 15.

E-2 Determining Best Value. The Contracting Officer will use a trade-off process to determine which offer represents the best value to the Government. This process allows the Contracting Officer to consider making award to other than the lowest priced offer or other than the highest technically rated offer. All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – (SEE FAR 3.104)
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DACW17-01-R-0001

E-3 Evaluation Factors. The following factors and significant subfactors will be used to determine best value. The relative importance of non-price factors/subfactors is as indicated.

EVALUATION FACTORS (TRADE-OFF)		
FACTOR	SUBFACTOR	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE/OTHER INFORMATION
Price	N/A	See paragraph E-2 above.
Past Performance	N/A	Past Performance is significantly less important than Technical Merit.
	Timely Completion of Work	(Past performance subfactors are not ranked by order of relevance. All are equal.)
	Quality of Work	
	Customer Satisfaction	
	Cost Controls for Additional Work	
	Compliance with Subcontracting Requirements	
Technical Merit	N/A	Technical Merit is significantly more important than Past Performance.
	Management Plan	Relevance: Technical Merit subfactors are not ranked by order of relevance. All are equal.
		Minimum Requirement for a "Satisfactory Rating" as defined in the Table found at Paragraph "E.4" of this Section. Contractor must present a plan in sufficient detail to indicate he has a thorough knowledge of the type and extent of work to be performed. Describe in detail the proposed method, including performance schedule, to accomplish work in required times as specified in Section 01000 paragraph 1.4 Commencement, Prosecution, and Completion of Work and paragraph 1.26 Order of Work. Plan must also include quality control procedures to ensure compliance with the Plans and Specifications and include a complete understanding of and experience with the USACE safety manual (EM 385-1-1).
Organization Chart and Resumes	Desirable: None	
	Organization Chart and Resumes	Relevance: Technical Merit subfactors are not ranked by order of relevance. All are equal.

		<p>Minimum Requirement for a “Satisfactory Rating” as defined in the Table found at Paragraph “E.4” of this Section. Must include an organization chart showing lines of supervision, key personnel, major subcontractors and planned staffing levels to sufficiently accomplish all work as specified. Must include resumes of key personnel to include project manager, field superintendent, and quality control personnel that show each have at least 3 years experience with relevant type work.</p>
		Desirable: None
	Resources	<p>Relevance: Technical Merit subfactors are not ranked by order of relevance. All are equal.</p> <p>Minimum Requirement for a “Satisfactory Rating” as defined in the Table found at Paragraph “E.4” of this Section. Must include a list of type, number and availability of equipment to be used on the project. State whether owned or rented. Estimated production rates for clearing and grading must be included. Equipment plan must be sufficient to execute the work as specified and within the specified schedule.</p>
		Desirable: None
	Subcontracting	<p>Relevance: Technical Merit subfactors are not ranked by order of relevance. All are equal.</p> <p>Minimum Requirement for a “Satisfactory Rating” as defined in the Table found at Paragraph “E.4” of this Section. A score of 71 points when evaluated in accordance with AFARS Appendix CC, Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Guide, which may be viewed at http://acqnet.sarda.army.mil/library/afar/apcc.htm.)</p>
		Desirable: None

E-4 Rating Definitions. Following table shows ratings for each type of evaluation and gives definitions for the ratings.

TECHNICAL MERIT ratings reflect the Government’s confidence in each offeror’s ability, as demonstrated in its proposal, to perform the requirements stated in the RFP.	
RATING	DEFINITION
Excellent	Proposal demonstrates excellent understanding of requirements and approach that significantly exceeds performance or capability standards. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government.
Good	Proposal demonstrates good understanding of requirements and approach that exceeds performance or capability standards. Has one or more strengths that will benefit the Government.
Satisfactory	Proposal demonstrates acceptable understanding of requirements and

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – (SEE FAR 3.104)
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DACW17-01-R-0001

	approach that meets performance or capability standards. Acceptable solution. Few or no strengths.
Marginal	Proposal demonstrates shallow understanding of requirements and approach that only marginally meets performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance.
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the proposal.
PROPOSAL RISK ratings assess the risks and weaknesses associated with each offeror's proposed approach to performing the requirements stated in the RFP. It is an overall assessment derived from the technical evaluation and is driven by each of the subfactors within the technical factor.	
RATING	DEFINITION
Low Risk	Any proposal weaknesses have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will probably minimize any difficulties.
Moderate Risk	Approach has weaknesses that can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. However, special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will probably minimize difficulties.
High Risk	Approach has weaknesses that have the potential to cause serious disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
PERFORMANCE RISK (Past Performance) ratings assess the risks associated with each offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the RFP based on that offeror's demonstrated performance on recent, relevant contracts.	
RATING	DEFINITION
Very Low Risk	Offeror's past performance record provides essentially no doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Low Risk	Offeror's past performance record provides little doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Moderate Risk	Offeror's past performance record provides some doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
High Risk	Offeror's past performance record provides substantial doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Very High Risk	Offeror's past performance record provides extreme doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Risk	The offeror has no relevant performance record. A thorough search was unable to identify any past performance information.
PRICE/COST is not rated. It is evaluated for reasonableness.	

E-5 Proposal Evaluation. In accordance with the Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisition provision of this solicitation (FAR 52.215-1), the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. Further, if the Contracting Officer determines that discussions are necessary and if the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. The following table synthesizes the evaluation methodology:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – (SEE FAR 3.104)
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DACW17-01-R-0001

ELEMENT	METHOD
General Review	Review of entire proposal to ascertain completeness and offeror's eligibility for award.
Price	Price will not be given a score. It will be reviewed for possible mistakes and eligibility for award, and evaluated for reasonableness.
Past Performance	Will be evaluated for risks associated with the proposal. Possible ratings are: very high risk, high risk, moderate risk, low risk, very low risk, and unknown risk. An "unknown risk" rating will have neither a favorable nor an unfavorable impact on the overall evaluation of the proposal.
Technical Merit	Will be evaluated for merit and proposal risk. Possible ratings for merit are: excellent, good, satisfactory, marginal and unsatisfactory. Possible ratings for proposal risk are: low, moderate, and high. Proposals will be ranked. (Note: Subcontracting [which is a subfactor of Technical Merit] will be evaluated in accordance with AFARS Appendix CC, Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Guide, which may be viewed at http://acqnet.sarda.army.mil/library/afar/apcc.htm .)
Source Selection Decision	Evaluators will provide results of evaluations to the Contracting Officer who will, through a trade-off process involving all evaluation factors, determine which proposal represents the best overall value to the Government.

E-5.1 General Review.

E-5.1.1 Offerors will be checked against the *List of Parties Excluded From Federal Procurement and Nonprocurement Programs*. Any offeror who is listed will be eliminated without further consideration.

E-5.1.2 Bid bonds will be reviewed for acceptability. Any offeror whose bid bond is unacceptable, will be eliminated without further consideration unless the Contracting Officer later determines that discussions are necessary and decides that the offeror's proposal should be included in the competitive range.

E-5.1.3 Proposals will be checked for minor informalities or irregularities. The Contracting Officer will follow guidance at FAR 14.405 when resolving minor informalities or irregularities. The Contracting Officer either will give the offeror an opportunity to cure any defect resulting from a minor informality or irregularity or waive the defect, whichever is to the advantage of the Government.

E-5.2 Price Evaluation.

E-5.2.1 Prices will be reviewed for minor or clerical errors. If necessary, offerors will be afforded an opportunity to resolve any such errors. Any exchange with offerors under this subparagraph shall be for the purpose of clarification (FAR 15.306(a)) and shall not constitute negotiations as defined at FAR 15.306(d). In the event of discrepancy between a unit price and the extended amount, the unit price shall be controlling.

E-5.2.2 Prices will be reviewed for apparent mistakes. Should this review reveal any prices that seem unreasonably low, the Contracting Officer will contact the offeror and ask the offeror to confirm the questioned price. If the offeror confirms the price, no further action will be taken under this subparagraph. If, however, the offeror alleges a mistake, the offeror may withdraw the proposal (FAR 52.215-1) or elect to continue with the proposal as originally submitted. The offeror will not be allowed to revise the proposal unless the Contracting Officer later determines that discussions are necessary and decides that the offeror's proposal should be included in the competitive range.

E-5.2.3 After resolution of minor or clerical errors and/or mistakes, prices will be reviewed for reasonableness.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – (SEE FAR 3.104)
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DACW17-01-R-0001

E-5.3 Technical Merit Evaluation.

E-5.3.1 Using the Technical Merit factor and subfactors listed in paragraph E-3 above, each evaluator will conduct an independent evaluation of each proposal documenting the strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and risks associated with each proposal. Upon completion of individual evaluations, the entire evaluation team will form a consensus opinion of each offeror's ability to accomplish the project work and prepare a narrative supporting the team's conclusions. In the event the team is unable to form a consensus, the team will prepare majority and minority opinions for the Contracting Officer's consideration.

E-5.4 Past Performance Evaluation. The Government will consider currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the offeror's performance. Information will be weighted in accordance with its relevance. The Government may use information supplied by the offeror and information obtained from other sources. The evaluation will be conducted by telephone. If, during the course of the evaluation, the Government obtains adverse information that the offeror has not previously been made aware of, the Government will afford the offeror an opportunity to respond to the information. The Government will not disclose the names of persons who provide performance information. The evaluation will take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, and subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the work. (Note: Although the Government may obtain past performance information from other sources, it is the offeror's responsibility to provide past performance information and explain how the information is relevant to this acquisition.)

E-5.5 Source Selection Decision. Following table summarizes information the Contracting Officer will use in making the source selection decision.

EVALUATION MATRIX – OFFEROR A				
TECHNICAL MERIT				
Management Plan	Organization Chart and Resumes	Resources	Subcontracting Plan	Overall
Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating
PROPOSAL RISK				Rating
PERFORMANCE RISK				Rating
PRICE				
\$ _____				