

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 01-Aug-2004	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CODE AFGHANISTAN ENGINEER DISTRICT US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS KABUL APO AE 09356		W917PM	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) CODE See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)			X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W917PM-04-R-0012	
			X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 28-Jul-2004	
				10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer 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 _____ 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 <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> 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.) Add Basis of Award					
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)		
			TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
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 01-Aug-2004

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

(End of Summary of Changes)

The following items are applicable to this modification:**BASIS OF AWARD****Design-Build Kandahar Runway Repair
Kandahar Air Field, Afghanistan
BASIS FOR AWARD**

A. Proposal Checklist/Evaluation: The following items are required to be submitted with and made a part of each offeror's proposal. Extreme care and careful attention should be given to assure that all required items are included in the proposal. A space is provided beside each item for checking as each action is completed. Offerors must submit an original and two complete copies of their complete proposals.

1. PRICE/CERTIFICATION SUBMITTAL:

- a. Signed Solicitation, Offer and Award, SF 1442 with Blocks 14-20c completed, including acknowledgement of all amendments
- b. (1) Completed Proposal Schedules for the base bid and optional bid items located in Section 00010, and Attachments.
(2) Completed "Cost Breakdown" for the base bid items Nos. 1 to 6 and optional item No. 7.
- c. Completed Representations and Certifications, including Corporate Certificate/Authority to Bind Partnership (Section 00600)

NOTE: The offeror shall complete all items contained in the Representations and Certifications, Section.

- (1) If the offeror is a corporation, completed Corporate Certificate, OR
- (2) If the offeror is a partnership, completed Authority to Bind Partnership and provide a copy of the Partnership Agreement, OR
- (3) If the offeror is a joint venture, completed Corporate Certificate for each member of the joint venture and provide a copy of the Joint Venture Agreement

2. TECHNICAL SUBMITTAL for Performance/Proposal Evaluation Information in Section 00100, Paragraph B. "Basis For Awards":

- a. Management Concepts Documentation
- b. Technical Capabilities Documentation
- c. Experience Documentation
- d. Past Performance Documentation

COST SUBMITTAL:

1. Separate Cost Proposals for both the base bid and optional bid items.
2. All required accompanying written supporting documentation for both base bid items and optional bid items.

B. BASIS FOR AWARDS

The Government intends to make one award. The award will be made to the proposal representing the best overall value to the Government. Competing proposals shall be evaluated against the requirements of the solicitation in order to assess *strengths, weaknesses and associated risks, and deficiencies*. (A *deficiency* is defined as a shortcoming in the offeror's presentation that if left uncorrected would preclude award of a contract to the offeror involved.) In addition to risk assessments, the non-pricing evaluators will assign ratings to each of the non-pricing factors and associated sub-factors (except where specifically noted otherwise) using the adjectives of (from highest to lowest) *excellent, good, satisfactory, marginal, and unsatisfactory*. The factor of *pricing* and its associated sub-factors will not be assigned adjective ratings but will have risk assessments made. The tradeoff process of evaluation between non-pricing and pricing aspects of the offerors' presentations will be used to determine those offers that should result in award of a contract. One contract shall be awarded. Implicit in the Government's evaluation and selection process is its willingness to accept other than the lowest priced offers.

Evaluation Process: In evaluating the proposals, the Government will consider the following five evaluation factors: *management concepts, technical capabilities, experience, past performance, and price*. The Government will evaluate the offerors' proposals in such a manner as to assign adjective ratings to the first four factors and their associated sub-factors. The Government will not assign adjective ratings to the fifth factor or its associated sub-factors but will evaluate whether the cost and pricing portions of the proposals are complete, reasonable and realistic.

1. The four non-pricing factors are of equal weight or importance in the evaluation and selection processes. The four non-pricing factors, taken as a group, have significantly more weight than the pricing factor in the evaluation and selection process.
2. In evaluating proposals and making the awards, the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior non-pricing features than with making awards at significantly higher overall pricing features. Stated another way, the Government prefers to select offerors with superior *management concepts* and *technical capabilities* along with proven *experience* and *past performance* for at least most of the types of work involved rather than to select offerors with relatively small price savings but with much less advantages in their non-pricing potentials.

C. Mandatory requirements and non-mandatory requests for information: There are contained within non-pricing factors to be rated certain mandatory or minimum requirements. Failure to satisfy any mandatory or minimum requirement shall result in a determination that an offer is *unacceptable*. (A final determination by the Government's Source Selection Authority [SSA] that an offer is *unacceptable* means that an award to the offeror involved, without correction first being made, cannot occur. Corrections are normally made only as a part of discussions. The Government makes no representation as to whether discussions will or will not be held. Any decision in regard to the matter of discussion will be at the sole discretion of the SSA.) Use of words in the evaluation criteria such as "will," "shall" or "must" indicates a mandatory requirement for which failure to comply, by the time and date for submission of proposals, shall result in the proposal being disqualified from consideration for award (unless the Government elects to initiate discussions with some or all of the offerors in accordance with appropriate provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation [FAR], as supplemented. Failure to comply with non-pricing or pricing requirements that are annotated with words such as "should" or "may" might result in a lowering of an offeror's non-pricing ratings involved or may have significant effect upon an offeror's price evaluation, the precise nature of the circumstances involved being the determining factors.

D. Conduct of discussions: Offerors are informed that the Government does not intend to conduct discussions as a part of the evaluation and selection process. (However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if it is determined by the Government's Source Selection Authority to be in the best interests of the Government to do so.) Therefore, offerors are cautioned to provide all the information required and requested by the solicitation at the time of its initial proposal submission.

Non-pricing Evaluation Factors and Sub-factors:

1. Any information that an offeror desires to be considered in the non-pricing evaluation process must be included within clearly identified separate and distinct divisions or sections within the offeror's non-pricing presentation. Failure of an offeror to comply with this instruction may result in the information presented not being evaluated for the non-pricing factor that was intended by the offeror. This in turn might result in lower evaluation ratings being assigned, and a fewer number of strengths and more weaknesses being identified which might also affect the selection process. Such failures as the result of an offeror not following this instruction will be the sole responsibility of the offeror and not that of the Government.

2. All non-pricing evaluation criteria shall be evaluated using reasoned judgment that results in the assignment of adjective ratings (e.g., from high to low: *excellent, good, satisfactory, marginal, or unsatisfactory*). Proposals that are determined to be non-responsive (lacking in mandatory information) will be determined to be *unacceptable*. In addition, *risk* evaluations will be made based upon the adjective ratings of (*low risk, medium risk, or high risk*).

3. Offerors are cautioned to explicitly explain which of its offices will be responsible for the various areas of interest to the Government that are addressed in the sub-factors described below. Failure to explicitly describe how these areas of interest will be accomplished, and by whom, in the offeror's organization may result in lower ratings or additional weaknesses and associated risks.

4. Offerors that are joint ventures or partnerships should clearly describe the separate roles to be performed by the participants in those joint ventures or partnerships regarding the two factors of management concepts and technical capabilities and their associated sub-factors. Offerors that have major subcontractors should be clearly identified so that the subcontractors are clearly made known to the Government at the time proposals are submitted. The Government will take note of the *technical capabilities, experience, and past performance* of these subcontractors but to a much less favorable degree than the Government would if those same subcontractors were members of a joint venture arrangement. There is an exception to this rule: if the offeror convincingly demonstrates that a particular major subcontractor has had a long term contractual relationship with the offeror (to include only one member of a joint venture) then the Government will give greater weight to that subcontractor's *technical capabilities, experience and past performance* contribution to the offeror's organization. The Government considers so-called "teaming arrangements" as being similar to prime-subcontractor arrangements. If a participant in a *teaming arrangement* is not to be a signatory to the contract with the Government then the Government considers that non-signatory participant as a subcontractor to the prime contractor offeror. In such a case, the Government will conduct its evaluation accordingly. However, if the offeror's designer(s) are either a part of *teaming arrangement* or simply subcontractor(s) to the offeror then the Government will evaluate the designer(s) as if it were a full member of a joint venture as far as *technical capabilities, experience, and past performance* are concerned. The Government will not evaluate subcontractors of any kind as a part of the offeror's prime organization as far as being the factor of *management concepts* and its associated sub-factors are concerned.

5. The non-pricing evaluation criteria include the factors of *Management Concepts, Technical Capabilities, Experience and Past Performance*. All four of these factors are of equal weight or importance in the evaluation process. Detailed descriptions for these factors and their associated sub-factors are as indicated below.

a. *Management Concepts* (a factor): The Government will evaluate an offeror's business *management concepts* regarding how it will perform its overall management and organize its supervision for the performance of task of repairing the Kandahar Runway, Kandahar, Afghanistan. The first three sub-factors associated with this factor are of equal importance or weight. The fourth sub-factor will not be assigned adjective ratings by the Government but may be the basis for a risk assessment. The offerors should provide all information pertaining to these sub-factors in realistic and convincing manners and take into account, whenever appropriate, any unique or special circumstances and requirements associated with the performance of work in the potential geographic areas that might be involved. Offerors are cautioned not to provide more than a total of twenty pages of

information pertaining to this factor and all of its associated sub-factors. (Offeror's most recent financial statement [or *statements* as concerns joint venture arrangements] is not included in this page submission limitation.) Offerors may divide this number of pages between this factor and its associated sub-factors in any manner they desire. Failure to adhere to this page limitation requirement will result in all information in excess of the twenty pages being discounted in the evaluation process. Doing so may lead to significantly lower ratings.

1. *Management of contracts* (a sub-factor): An offeror should fully and completely describe how it intends to manage multiple phased tasks for the Runway repair. If an offeror is a partnership or joint venture, then the offeror should clearly and explicitly describe the major functions that each partner or participant in the joint venture will perform.

2. *Management of Subcontractors* (a sub-factor): An offeror should convincingly describe its system for the selection and management of subcontractors and principal suppliers in order to ensure compliance with the offeror's methods, approaches and goals for the successful completion of the work. An offeror should convincingly explain how integration and coordination of subcontractor work efforts with prime contractor activities will be achieved. (Offerors should fully and completely address this sub-factor even if they do not intend to use subcontractors in the performance of task order work. Simply stated, the Government does not accept that the offeror will be able to perform all of its task order work without employing from time to time the services of subcontractors. Failure to provide this requested information will result in an *unsatisfactory* rating with *high risk* for this sub-factor even if an offeror states its intent not to employ subcontractors in the performance of task order work. (If an offeror has already all or some of its subcontractors then that offeror should identify those subcontractors and fully and completely explain how they were selected.)

3. *Scheduling systems* (a sub-factor): The Government is interested in how the offeror manages project schedules. Offerors should fully and completely describe in a convincing manner its scheduling systems. Offerors should provide evidence that these systems are in place and fully operational. Offerors should fully and completely describe how it will integrate subcontractor scheduling and actual progress information into its own master project scheduling systems.

4. *Most recent financial statement* (a sub-factor [not to be rated]):

Offerors are requested to provide copies of their most recent financial statement. Financial statements are only requested from prime contractor offerors. However, if a prime contractor offeror is a joint venture, then financial statements from each member of the joint venture is requested. Financial statements pertaining to major subcontractors or design firms that are not a part of a joint

venture are not being requested; however, they may be submitted at the discretion of the offerors involved.

b. Technical Capabilities (a factor): The Government will evaluate an offeror's *technical capabilities* regarding technical expertise and technical resources presently associated with its firm and its ability to assemble additional expertise and resources in an expeditious manner sufficient to perform the Runway Repair, Kandahar, Afghanistan. The four sub-factors associated with this factor are of equal importance or weight. Information requested should be provided in realistic and convincing manners taking into account whenever appropriate any unique or special circumstances and requirements associated with the Runway Repair. Offerors are cautioned not to provide more than a total of twenty pages of information pertaining to this factor and all of its associated sub-factors. Offerors may divide this number of pages between this factor and its associated sub-factors in any manner they desire. Failure to adhere to this page limitation requirement will result in all information in excess of the twenty-five pages being discounted in the evaluation process. Doing so may lead to significantly lower ratings.

1. Construction capabilities (a sub-factor): An offeror should present information that convincingly describes its capability to readily access qualified and experience personnel (including senior and midlevel management, field supervision, and project work force); material and supplies; and equipment resources for the accomplishment of a wide range of tasks that may involve design-build and repair at the Kandahar Runway Repair project Kandahar, Afghanistan. Information pertaining to the full range of site grading, drainage, Portland cement concrete, electrical work; phased construction; roads; and civil works. An offeror that provides convincing information regarding all of these technical disciplines will receive a higher rating than an offeror that provides convincing information regarding most but not all of these technical disciplines. The Government will evaluate the complementary technical capabilities contributed to a joint venture by its separate partners thereby treating a bone fide joint venture as a whole. Construction capabilities contributed to the offeror by major subcontractors will not receive nearly as much weight unless the offeror convincingly demonstrates that the subcontractors involved have had a long term contracting relationship with the offeror or with a member of the offeror's joint venture.

2. Design capabilities (a sub-factor): An offeror should present information that explicitly identifies its designer(s) (in-house staff, joint venture partner[s], subcontractor[s]), etc.). In the case of multiple designer entities, an offeror should thoroughly and completely describe which types of designs (structural, architectural, electrical [high and low voltage], mechanical, etc.) that will be performed by each designer entity. Full and complete information should be provided that identifies the current design capacities of each design entity, geographic location(s) of design resources that may be utilized. In describing design capabilities, an offeror such provide information pertaining to numbers and expertise of the design personnel involved, geographic location(s)

where those personnel are located, and information concerning their previous design experience. To the extent that the designer firm(s) involved is a subcontractor or a firm that will not be a signatory to the contract with the Government, an offeror should provide credible and convincing evidence (such as a written agreement) demonstrating that this designer will actually be available to perform the design work being attributed to it.

3. *Construction Environmental Quality* (a sub-factor): An offeror should provide detailed and convincing information concerning its present or planned capability to minimize environmental damages to the surrounding facilities, workers, and military personnel during construction. Environmental damages include excessive noise, dust, smoke, cold, or heat, release of hazardous vapors and fumes, and temporary creation of tripping or falling hazards. The contractor shall demonstrate a plan to minimize these effects and a method to monitor environmental quality during the construction.

4. *Logistical capabilities* (a sub-factor): The offeror should provide detailed and convincing information concerning its present or planned capabilities regarding the procurement, shipment, tracking, handling, receipt, and storage of materials and supplies purchased in Europe and or the United States and expeditiously shipped to the contractor storage at the Kandahar Runway project. More weight to present capabilities existing with the prime contractor offeror's organization (whether a single entity or a joint venture) over planned capabilities or those to be provided by an agent or subcontractor unless that agent or subcontractor has had a long term arrangement with the offeror or at least one member of the joint venture.

c. *Experience* (a factor): The Government will evaluate each offeror's experience and rate offerors on the basis of the depth and breadth of their experience in managing and executing projects. Of particular interest to the Government are the following types of projects: new runways; repair of runways; design-build, new construction, renovation, rehabilitation, and operations and maintenance activities, or projects involving site work, flexible paving, Portland cement concrete paving, structural, electrical work; site drainage systems; roads; and civil works. Offerors are cautioned not to rely upon advertising or glossy brochures in an attempt to demonstrate past work experience. Doing so will not enhance an offeror's evaluation ratings.

An offeror can maximize its potential for higher evaluation ratings by simply providing the type of information requested for as many projects as practicable.

1. Offerors are required to provide information concerning at least four airfield construction projects that have been performed outside the Continental United States that are at least seventy percent complete at the time of submission of their price and non-pricing proposals in response to this solicitation. (A higher than

a *satisfactory* rating for this sub-factor will, in all likelihood, require the submission of significantly more than the minimum number of qualifying four projects unless there are extraordinary characteristics associated with the projects submitted such as their sizes, characteristics, geographical locations, etc.) (A lower than *satisfactory* rating might be assigned if only four qualifying projects are presented if those projects, taken as a whole, are not indicative of a wide range of technical disciplines mentioned in the paragraph immediately above.)

2. Information concerning projects presented should include project name, location, client or owner for whom the work was performed (to include contact names and means of contacting such as telephone or facsimile numbers, e-mail addresses, internet home pages, etc., if available, of persons familiar with these offerors' performance), total dollar value at time of award, description of work actually performed by an offeror, whether that offeror was the prime contractor or a subcontractor, contract award date, and contract completion date (actual or projected).

3. The Government will give more weight to offerors that have performed (i) design-build projects rather than purely construction or purely design projects; (ii) pre-stressed concrete runway construction, and runway repair work; (iii) projects greater in value than \$ 5,000,000; (iv) projects that have or are being performed in Afghanistan; (v) and projects that demonstrate significant expertise in phased construction.

4. If an offeror is a joint venture or partnership, then these submission instructions apply separately and equally to all participants in the joint venture or partnership unless the project(s) submitted were performed by the joint venture or partnership as presently constituted. Although the Government prefers all members of a joint venture or partnership to have satisfied or excelled in all of the above indicated areas pertaining to their experience, the Government will consider the complementary aspects of the separate participants in a joint venture or partnership, by evaluating the joint venture or partnership as a whole. In the latter case it is probable that the adjective ratings assigned would be lower than would occur in the former case. In like manner, a fewer number of strengths and/or more weaknesses with associated risks might occur as well.

5. Offeror's that present themselves as *teaming* arrangements are notified that participants in such *teaming* arrangements that are not signatories to the contract with the Government will be evaluated as if they are subcontractors to the prime contractor offeror. As such, subcontractor experience will not carry much weight in the evaluation process unless the offeror can convincingly demonstrate that those subcontractors have had a long-term contractual arrangement with the offeror or a member of the offeror's joint venture organization.

6. The Government will consider projects that were performed within

Afghanistan. However, offerors must provide convincing written descriptions explaining how those projects performed will enhance its ability to perform the solicitation work in the Runway Repair project. Failure to provide the accompanying written explanations will result in those projects not being considered in the evaluation process.

d. *Past Performance* (a factor): The Government will evaluate information about each offeror's past performance. The Government will do so in light of the requirements of the Request for Proposal. Offerors are cautioned not to rely upon advertising or glossy brochures in an attempt to demonstrate past performance. This kind of presentation will have no beneficial effect upon evaluation ratings. An offeror can maximize its potential for higher evaluation ratings by simply providing the information requested. There are two sub-factors both having equal importance or weight in the evaluation process:

1. The first sub-factor concerns the offeror's reputation for satisfying its customers by delivering *quality work* in a *timely manner* at *reasonable costs*.

2. The second sub-factor pertains to the offeror's reputation for *reasonable and cooperative conduct*, *overall commitment to customer satisfaction*, and a record of providing *safe working environments* for its work force and its subcontractors.

Other considerations in responding to this factor and its two sub-factors:

a. *Evidence of Past Performance*: Items that offerors may submit for evidence of past performance are, but not limited to, letters of commendation, performance awards, performance evaluations, evidence of repeat work with the same clients or owners particularly when non-competitively obtained, etc. Offerors may submit documentation such as letters of commendation, recommendation, etc., that are either contemporaneous with performance of the projects involved or are dated more recently. Offerors should address instances of performance problems in any contracts or projects mentioned in the non-pricing presentation and provide explanatory information pertaining to those past problems along with a point of contact within the offeror's organization with telephone and facsimile machine numbers as well as e-mail address if available.

b. *Joint Ventures or Partnerships*: If an offeror is a joint venture or partnership, information pertaining to the above six identified areas of interest (reputations for quality work, timely performance, cost effectiveness, cooperative conduct, overall commitment to customer satisfaction, and safe working conditions) should be presented for each participant in the joint venture or partnership unless the information being presented is in regard to the joint venture or partnership as presently constituted. Although the Government prefers all members of a joint venture or partnership to have satisfied or excelled in all the above indicated areas pertaining to their

past performance, the Government will consider the complementary aspects of the separate participants in a joint venture or partnership, by evaluating the joint venture or partnership as a whole. In the latter case it is probable that the adjective ratings assigned would be lower than would occur in the former case. In like manner, a fewer number of strengths and/or more weaknesses with associated risks might occur as well.

c. Information from Other Sources: In addition to the evidence submitted by an offeror, the Government may consider information from other sources, including but not limited to: past and present customers and their current and former employees; current and former employees of the offeror; federal, state and local agencies (including court records); and private consumer organizations.

d. No Record of Past Performance: In the event that an offeror does not have a record of past performance, a written explanation of the reason(s) why no record is available is requested. In this case, a neutral rating for this factor may be assigned as the appropriate rating.

Price Evaluation Factors:

The Government will evaluate the *completeness, reasonableness* and *realism* of each offeror's proposal using the cost or pricing information as well as the accompanying *written descriptions* pertaining to *methods, techniques, approaches, assumptions, etc.*, that offerors provide. *Completeness* will be determined by comparing the items contained within an offeror's price proposal with the Government's estimate. *Reasonableness* will be determined by comparison of an offeror's proposed prices against each other and the Government's estimate. Since the Government's evaluation of the cost proposal will represent a portion of the total evaluation, it is possible that an offeror might not be selected for an award because of unreasonable, unrealistic, incomplete, inaccurate, non-current cost proposal information. Offerors are cautioned to make all accompanying written descriptions complete, clear and understandable. The Government will not be responsible for any misunderstandings concerning the basis for costs proposed by an offeror that results from that offeror's failure to provide written descriptions that are clear, complete and easily understood.

E. INQUIRIES

Inquiries concerning this solicitation document shall be faxed to the issuing office: U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Afghanistan Engineer District, ATTN: CEAED-CT/Jim Barr, email: Jim.Barr@tac01.usace.army.mil. Answers to questions shall be provided to all offerors being solicited. Offerors are instructed specifically to contact only the solicitation issuing office in connection with any aspect of this requirement prior to contract award.

F. CHANGES MADE PRIOR TO DATE SET FOR OPENING PROPOSALS

The Government reserves the right to revise or amend this Request For Proposal prior to the date set for opening proposals. Such revisions, if any, will be announced by an amendment or amendments to this Request For Proposal. If the revisions and amendments are of a nature which requires material changes in quantities or prices proposed, or both, the date set for opening proposals may be postponed by such number of days as in the opinion of the issuing officer will enable offerors to revise their proposals. In such cases, the amendment will include an announcement of the new date for opening proposals.

G. HAND-CARRIED AND EXPRESS MAIL PROPOSALS

Hand-carried proposals must be delivered to the address indicated below:

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Afghanistan Engineer District
ATTN: Peter Kho/Sherry Gaylor
TAC House Charahi-Sherpor
Next to UNAMA Compound A

DHL and Federal Express Mail Packages can be sent to:

Peter Kho/Sherry Gaylor
Afghanistan Engineer District
TAC House (Next to Old Unama Compound)
Kabul, Afghanistan

Proposals Sent by the United States Postal Service Can be sent to:

Peter Kho/Sherry Gaylor
United States Army Corps of Engineers
Afghanistan Engineer District (TAC House)
APO, AE 09356

The option for electronic submission is available in Adobe Acrobat format only. There is no guarantee that the network will be operating the day proposals are due. The government will not accept responsibility for computer network failures or a busy network. Electronic submissions can be sent to Sherry.F.Gaylor@tac01.usace.army.mil and AED-Contracting@tac01.usace.army.mil. If the network is down for 24 hours or more immediately prior to the deadline for submittal, the Government will extend the deadline to allow for submissions. The date and time received will be determined by the clock and calendar on the Government's computer.