

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
			J	1	4
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 10-Oct-2005	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable) Dalmado	
6. ISSUED BY USACE, CONTRACTING DIVISION ATTN: CEMVN-CT, ROOM 172 7400 LEAKE AVE. NEW ORLEANS LA 70118-3651	CODE W912P8	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. W912P8-06-R-0002	
			X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 09-Oct-2005	
				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.) The above numbered solicitation for Chalmette Area Plan Emergency Restoration, MRGO B/L Station 714+55 to 1007+91 Hurricane Protection Levee, St. Bernard Parish, LA, is hereby amended to add section 00130 Proposal Evaluation Criteria. SEE ATTACHED PAGES					
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	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		10-Oct-2005	

Section Table of Contents

SECTION 00130-PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

1.1	SCOPE	2
1.2	SOURCE SELECTION USING THE TRADE-OFF PROCESS	2
1.3	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRICE TO THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS	2
1.4.	TECHNICAL/QUALITY EVALUATION	2
1.5	NON-COST FACTORS	2
1.6	RFP SUBMITTALS	3

SECTION 00130-PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

1.1 SCOPE

This is a Request for Proposal (RFP). Proposals will be evaluated by a Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) comprised of representatives of the Corps of Engineers. Award will be made to that offeror, determined by the Government, who can accomplish the requirements set forth in the RFP in a timely manner most advantageous to the Government considering both cost and non-cost factors. The Government reserves the right to award this contract to other than the lowest price offeror after consideration of all factors.

1.2 SOURCE SELECTION USING THE TRADE-OFF PROCESS

The Government will select the offer that represents the best value to the Government by using the trade-off process described in FAR Part 15. This process permits tradeoffs between price and technical merit/quality and allows the Government to accept other than the lowest priced offer. The award decision will be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation.

1.3 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRICE TO THE TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS

All non-cost (i.e., technical) evaluation factors, when combined are approximately equal to price. The Government is concerned with striking the most advantageous balance between Technical Merit (i.e., quality) and cost to the Government (i.e., price). Where competing technical proposals are determined to be substantially equal, price could become the controlling factor.

1.4 TECHNICAL/QUALITY EVALUATION

The Government will evaluate each of the four non-cost factors and rate the proposals. Non-cost factors are not all equal in importance. The following terminology is used to describe the relative importance of each non-cost factor:

(1) MORE SIGNIFICANT. This factor is of greater value than other factors. It is approximately twice as much as the next valued factor.

(2) LESS SIGNIFICANT. This factor is approximately one-half (1/2) the value of the factor rated ahead of it.

(3) COMPARATIVELY EQUAL. The value is nearly the same as another factor; any difference is slight and unimportant.

1.5 NON-COST FACTORS

The non-cost factors are listed in descending order of relative importance. Factors 1 and 2 are comparatively equal and are more significant when compared to factor 3. Factor 4 is less significant than 3.

(1) Past Performance. Offerors will be evaluated on the quality of similar work performed in the last TEN (10) YEARS using the evidence provided by the offeror and other sources for the prime and all subcontractors. Projects that are similar in scope, complexity and magnitude will provide better proof of the Offeror's capabilities. The Government reserves the right to check any or all cited references to verify supplied information and to assess owner satisfaction. The Government may also use other tools to gather information regarding an Offeror's qualifications and past performance. The offeror should provide information on any problems encountered on the identified contracts and the corrective actions taken. Offerors with no relevant performance history will receive a neutral rating in this factor.

(2) Technical Approach. The offeror shall provide plans and methodology to be used in accomplishing the construction of the flood protection system, and the number of crews capable of working concurrently. The offeror shall provide the type and quantity of equipment that will be used to construct the flood protection system.

(3) Personnel Experience. The Contractor shall provide qualifications (to include resume, years of experience in position, list of similar projects, etc.) of key personnel for both prime and sub-contractors. The Contractor and its' subcontractors shall include to the maximum extent possible hiring of local workforce, to include names and local addresses of all such personnel.

(4) Project Management. The Offeror shall provide a detailed construction management plan to include how lost construction days will be made up to best meet the contract completion date of 15 May 06 in the face of unforeseen delays.

(5) Small/Small Disadvantage Participation

(6) Price

1.6 RFP SUBMITTALS

Offeror's submitting proposals for this project should limit submissions to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and monies will have been expended in preparing information required herein. However, in order to be effectively and equitably evaluated, the proposals must include information sufficiently detailed to clearly describe the Offeror's past performance, technical approach, personnel experience, and management capabilities to successfully complete the project.