

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE Sep 4, 2008	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NASA Office of Procurement/ DA10 John C. Stennis Space Center Stennis Space Center, MS 39529-6000 Carol West, (228) 688-3529		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) Same as block #6		
TO ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNS082257880R	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) August 13, 2008	
			10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			

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 _____ 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 one (1) copy 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 DATA 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 data specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

N/A

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 3 copies to the issuing office.

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

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2 OF 2.

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)	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____	_____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)
		16C. DATE SIGNED	

1. The purpose of this amendment is to revise Section M, EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD TO OFFERORS and to contractor questions.

2. The following question was submitted and response is hereby provided as follows:

Q. With the issuance of Amendment No. 1 changing the solicitation language from a Single Award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract to a Multiple Award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract; does NASA intend to award two (2) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Contracts each with an estimated value of \$15,000,000.00 million dollars using the first task order identified in the solicitation for evaluation and establishment of the subsequent contracts?

Response. Yes.

3. Section M is hereby revised in its entirety. The attached Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award to Offers, replaces Pages 43 – 47 of the original solicitation.

4. The bid closing date and time remains unchanged. Bid due date remains 3:00 p.m. local time September 15, 2008.

5. All other terms and conditions remain the same.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD TO OFFERORS

M1. This procurement is being conducted utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS), which seeks to select an offer based on the best combination of price and qualitative merit (including past performance, small business utilization and relevant experience) of the offers submitted and reduce the administrative burden on the Offerors and the Government. BVS predefines the value characteristics that will serve as the discriminators among offers and is based on the premise that, if all offers are of approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest evaluated price (fixed-price contracts). However, the Government will consider awarding to an Offeror with higher qualitative merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value. Conversely, the Government will consider making award to an Offeror whose offer has lower qualitative merit if the price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- a. The award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal is responsive, and offers the best value to the government. Best value will be determined based on an integrated assessment of each proposal in terms of past performance, relevant experience, small business utilization and price. Therefore, subjective judgment by the government is implicit in the evaluation process. **Past performance and relevant experience are significantly more important than Small Business Utilization. Combined these three factors (Past Performance, relevant experience and Small Business Utilization) are more important than price.** However, if an offeror does not have relevant past performance history, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and will be given a neutral rating as detailed in this plan. In addition, award may be made to the other than low priced offer and may be made without conducting discussions.
- b. Once all responses have been gathered, offerors will be quantitatively evaluated by team members using the value characteristics listed below for past performance and experience. These value characteristics are performance based and permit selection of the offer which provides better results for a reasonable marginal increase in price. All offers will be judged against these value characteristics.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The Government will evaluate offers in two general steps:

Step One -- An initial evaluation will be performed to determine if all required information (See Section L) has been provided and the Offeror has made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable offer. Offerors may be contacted only for clarification purposes during the initial evaluation. Offerors determined not to be acceptable shall be notified of their rejection and the reasons therefore and excluded from further consideration.

Step Two -- All acceptable offers will be evaluated against the specifications/statement of work identified in this solicitation and the value characteristics identified below. Based on this evaluation, the Government has the option, depending on the specific circumstances of the offers received, to utilize one of the following methods: **(1) Make selection and award without discussions, (preferred method); or (2) after discussions with all finalists, afford each Offeror an**

opportunity to revise its offer, and then make selection. You are cautioned that omissions or an inaccurate or inadequate response to these evaluation factors may have a negative effect on your overall evaluation.

Other references, aside from those provided by the Offeror, may be contacted and their comments considered during the source selection process. The information submitted may be verified by the Government through discussions with the references provided. While the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of providing relevant references that the Government can readily contact rests with the Offeror.

Listed below are the value characteristics that we will utilize in the evaluation of each offer. Each value characteristic is further defined to explain the rating that each offeror will receive.

- a) Past performance
- b) Relevant experience
- c) Small Business Utilization
- d) Price

a) PAST PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

An offeror's past performance on similar projects will be evaluated to determine the quality of work previously provided and to assess the relative capability of the offeror to effectively accomplish the requirements of this contract. Past performance information will be used to assess the extent to which contract objectives (including technical, management, safety/quality control, cost, and small business subcontracting) have been achieved on related projects. The evaluation of past performance will also assess the overall safety program of the offeror during the performance of previous contracts utilizing the evaluation of the offerors safety plan (as outlined in the RFP and specifications), EMR, TRIR and DART rates submitted by the offeror.

For newly formed businesses having little or no company experience, the past performance of a predecessor firm, the company's principal owner(s) or corporate officer(s) may be considered. The lack of a performance record may result in an unknown performance risk assessment which will neither be used to the advantage or disadvantage of the Offeror. The evaluation will be based on information obtained from references provided by the Offeror of relevant past contracts performed in the past three years (Attachment G), as well as other past performance information obtained from other sources known by the Government (i.e., SF 1420, Performance Evaluation - Construction Contracts) or any other source that may have useful and relevant information.

The Past Performance Form (Attachment G) and the Evaluation Form (Attachment H) included on page 54 and 55 of this solicitation shall be used to collect and record information concerning your firm's past performance and any subcontractor and/or teaming partner. Using Attachment G, submit the names of customers, preferably the Government, where you have performed as a prime contractor and/or a subcontractor within the past three years. Offerors shall include in their proposal, the written consent of its proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractor's past performance evaluation with the Offeror during the discussion phase of this procurement. This information **must be** provided with your offer, no later than the proposal due date.

The evaluation team will assign one of the following adjective ratings for each past performance form/survey received:

RATING	DEFINITION	STANDARD
Outstanding	Substantially exceeds requirements. Entirely favorable past performance. No Major Breach of Safety within the past three years	A significant majority of sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance was superior and that they would unhesitatingly do business with the offeror again. Complaints are negligible, or unfounded. The offeror has no record of criminal conduct, civil fraud, or negligence, or the record is old and the offeror has demonstrated by more than recent performance that corrective action has made the likelihood of such conduct in the future highly improbable. A major breach of safety is an act or omission of the contractor that consists of an accident, incident or exposure resulting in a fatality or mission failure; or in damage to equipment or property equal to or greater than \$1 million dollars or any "willful" or "repeat" violation cited by OSHA or a state agency operating by under an OSHA approved plan within the past three years.
Above Average	Somewhat exceeds requirements. More favorable than unfavorable past performance	Most sources of information state that the offeror's performance was good, better than average and that they would willingly do business with the offeror again. Complaints, though perhaps well founded, are few and relatively minor. The offeror has no record of criminal conduct, civil fraud, or negligence, or the record is old and the offeror has demonstrated by more recent performance that corrective action has made the likelihood of such conduct in the future highly improbable.
Neutral	No record exists or the contractor has no past performance to report.	
Satisfactory	Meets requirements. Inconclusive past performance record.	Sources of information are roughly divided over the quality of the offeror's performance. While some state that they would do business with the offeror again, others are doubtful or would not. Complaints are balanced by reports of good work. The offeror has no record of criminal conduct, civil fraud, or negligence, or the record is old.
Marginal	Barely meets requirements. More unfavorable than favorable past performance	Many sources of information make unfavorable reports about the offeror's performance and either express serious doubts about doing business with the offeror again or states that they would refuse to do so. However, there are some favorable reports, and some sources of information indicate that they would do business with the offeror again. There are many significant, serious, and well-founded complaints, but there are some reports of good performance. The offeror may have been indicted, pled guilty, or may have been found guilty on matters of criminal conduct, but issues are unresolved, relatively minor, or do not reflect a company wide or managerial pattern of wrongdoing. The offeror may have lost civil suits for fraud or negligence, but there is no company wide or managerial pattern of fraudulent, negligent, or criminal conduct.
Unsatisfactory	Does not meet requirements. Entirely unfavorable past performance	A significant majority of sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance was entirely unsatisfactory and that they would not do business with the offeror again under any circumstances. Customer complaints are substantial or numerous and are well founded. Or, although not debarred or suspended, the offeror is under indictment or has been convicted of criminal conduct, or has been found liable for fraud or negligence. The offeror either has presented no persuasive evidence of having taken appropriate corrective action that will guard against such conduct in the foreseeable future, or it appears unlikely that the corrective action will be effective.

b) RELEVANT EXPERIENCE (As a risk Factor)

Relevant experience is the accomplishment of work that is comparable or related to the technical work required by this solicitation, and is of similar scope, size and complexity. The evaluation team will assign one of the following ratings for the relevant experience characteristic:

RATING	DEFINITION	STANDARD
Low Risk	Little doubt exists, based on the offeror's experience; that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work.	Extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope, complexity.
Moderate Risk	Some doubt exists, based on the offeror's experience, that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work.	Limited experience in projects of similar size and scope or extensive experience as the primary subcontractor for projects similar in size and scope.
High Risk	Significant doubt exists, based on the offeror's experience, that the offeror can satisfactorily perform this kind of work.	Very little experience in projects of this kind.

C) . SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION FACTOR

Small Business Utilization will be evaluated to determine the extent of utilization of Small Business Concerns. Any Subcontracting Plan, Subcontracting Goals, and SDB Participation Contract Targets submitted with the proposal will be used to evaluate this area. The following table identifies required submittals. For example: Only Large Business is required to submit the Subcontracting Plan with their proposal.

Requirement	Required for Large Business	Required for Small Business	Required for Small Disadvantaged Businesses that have waived the Price Evaluation Adjustment Factor at 52.219-23	Required for Small Disadvantaged Businesses that have not waived the Price Evaluation Adjustment Factor at 52.219-23
Subcontracting Plan	X			
Subcontracting Goals (Example in L.16 Exhibit A)	X	X	X	
SDB Participation Contract Targets H.7, in Section H.	X	X	X	

The evaluation team will assign one of the following ratings for the Small Business Utilization Factor. A higher level of utilization will result in a "High" rating which is more favorable

RATING	DEFINITION	STANDARD
HIGH	Proposal identifies a high level of Utilization of Small Business Concerns.	Provided information in their proposal which indicates High Utilization of Small Business Concerns. Utilization of Small Businesses is reasonable and sound. Includes plans for increased participation during performance.
MEDIUM	Proposal identifies moderate level of Utilization of Small Business Concerns.	Provided information in their proposal which indicates moderate Utilization of Small Business Concerns. Utilization of Small Businesses is reasonable. Adequate rational was provided.
LOW	Proposal identifies minimal or no Utilization of Small Business Concerns.	Provided little or no information in their proposal to indicate a reasonable approach for Utilization of Small Business Concerns. Poor or no rational to support the minimal Utilization of Small Business concerns.
UNRATED	SDB Offerors who have not waived the price evaluation factor.	Offeror will not be rated for the Small Business Utilization Factor

c) PRICE

Offeror must include a price for each item contained in Section B of the solicitation. Failure to include a price for all items will render the offer as nonresponsive and exclude them from further consideration for award. Any offer may be rejected if it is unreasonable as to price. Unreasonableness of price includes not only the total price, but the price of individual line items as applicable.

[END OF SECTION]