



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
1ST SPECIAL OPERATIONS WING (AFSOC)  
HURLBURT FIELD FLORIDA**

**NWF Air Force Multiple Award Construction Contract (MACC)  
Task Order Proposal Request (TOPR)**

MEMORANDUM FOR: ALL MACC CONTRACT HOLDERS

FROM: 1<sup>st</sup> Special Operations Contracting Squadron/PKB  
350 Tully Street  
Hurlburt Field, FL 32544

SUBJECT TOPR - Project Info: (AMD 0001) FA441726R0027– Convert Classroom #3 to SCIF, Bldg. 90020

1. **Description:** Subject project calls for the Offeror to furnish all labor, materials, tools, supervision, and equipment and perform all operations necessary to accomplish all work complete in place, as shown on the Statement of Work, Specification and Drawings, specified herein, on Hurlburt Field, FL.
2. **Contract Clauses:** All clauses that are contained in the original IDIQ contract apply to this Task Order and any additional clauses will be identified in this letter.
3. **Technical Questions/ Proposal Due Date:** Technical questions must be submitted no later than Thursday, 4 June 2026 at 2:00PM, time **CENTRAL (Local Time)**. All offers must be submitted no later than Thursday, 9 July 2026 at 2:00PM **CENTRAL (Local Time)**. Offers shall be e-mailed to both of the following points of contact (POC):

Contracting Officer: SSgt Jayden Gentry	jayden.gentry@us.af.mil
Contracting Officer/Team Lead: Ms. Tina Kneip	tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil

4. **Offer Acceptance Period:** All offers submitted must be valid a minimum of 90 calendar days from submission date.
5. **Availability of Funds:** Funds are presently available for this project. The Government reserves the right to cancel this solicitation, either before or after the closing date. In the event the Government cancels this solicitation, the Government has no obligation to reimburse an Offeror for any costs.
6. **Site Visit:** A site visit will be conducted on Wednesday, 27 May 2026 at 9:00AM **CENTRAL (Local Time)**. The site visit will be held at Bldg. 90020, 100 O’Neil Avenue, Hurlburt Field, FL 32544. Offerors are urged and expected to inspect the site where the work will be performed. Base Access and Site Visit: Hurlburt Field is not an open base, and Offerors will require a CAC or Base Pass to enter. Offerors shall request base access NLT 72 HOURS PRIOR TO THE SITE VISIT by sending an email request to the Contracting Officer and/or

Contract Specialist identifying the company name and list of individuals who will attend. Please email:

Contracting Officer: SSgt Jayden Gentry	jayden.gentry@us.af.mil
Contracting Officer/Team Lead: Ms. Tina Kneip	tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil

6.1. The email should include the following information: FULL LEGAL NAME, COMPANY NAME, AND PHONE NUMBER for each individual requesting access. Requests not providing at least 48-hour notice will not be honored. If your personnel DO NOT need a base pass, RSVP NLT Tuesday, 25 May 2026 at 2:00PM CENTRAL (Local Time) with the names and phone numbers of the individuals who will attend the site visit. NOTE: VALID ID: For either the site visit or submission of proposals, all personnel requesting access to Hurlburt Field must possess a valid State or Government picture identification card. Furthermore, individuals presenting identification cards from a state that is non-compliant with the REAL ID Act will require additional documentation to gain base access. Additional documentation includes a valid U.S. or foreign government issued passport, an employment authorization document that contains a photograph, or identification cards issued by federal state or local government agencies that include a photo and biographic information. A full list of REAL ID Act compliant and non-complaint states can be found at <https://www.dhs.gov/real-id>. Personnel requesting vehicle access to Hurlburt Field must provide a valid driver's license, current vehicle registration, and valid vehicle insurance. Contractors are required to follow all Base and Safer Federal Workplace Guidelines (if applicable) when visiting the base. Information on Safer Federal Workplace Guidelines can be found at: <https://www.saferfederalworkforce.gov/faq/Contractors/>.

- 7. **Work Schedule and Duty Hours:** Normal duty hours on base are typically 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Any work outside normal duty hours must be approved by the Contracting Officer and will be at no cost to the Government.
- 8. **Planned and Unplanned Closures:** Currently, there are no anticipated closures, but minimal manning occurs during federal holidays and AFSOC directed down-days.
- 9. **Magnitude of Construction:** The magnitude of this project is: Between \$1,000,000 and \$3,000,000.

**10. Proposal Submission Information:**

- 10.1. Offerors are responsible for submitting proposals (including any revisions, and amendments) so as to reach the Government office designated in this solicitation by the time specified in this solicitation. Paper copies of proposals will not be evaluated, will be rejected, and will not be considered for award.
- 10.2. Offerors shall deliver proposals through the Solicitation Module in Procurement Integrated Environment (PIEE). Offerors are responsible for ensuring PIEE registration

and any training needed is completed prior to anticipated solicitation closing date. See links below:

Vendor Registration for PIEE Solicitation Module:  
[https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/dpc/ce/cap/docs/piee/PIEE\\_Solicitation\\_Module\\_Vendor\\_Access\\_Instructions.pdf](https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/dpc/ce/cap/docs/piee/PIEE_Solicitation_Module_Vendor_Access_Instructions.pdf)

Digital PIN and Time-Based One Time Password Setup:  
[https://piectraining.eb.mil/wbt/portal/documents/Digital\\_PIN\\_and\\_Time\\_Based\\_One\\_Time\\_Password\\_Setup.pdf](https://piectraining.eb.mil/wbt/portal/documents/Digital_PIN_and_Time_Based_One_Time_Password_Setup.pdf)

Submitting an Offer (via PIEE Solicitation Module):  
[https://piectraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting\\_Offer.pdf](https://piectraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf)

10.2.1. Any proposal, bond, modification, or revision, that is received at the designated Government office after the exact time specified for receipt of proposals will be "late" and will not be considered unless the Contracting Officer determines the criteria set forth in Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) 15.107(b) exists

**11. Proposal Preparation and Evaluation Information:** The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contracts without negotiations with Offerors in accordance with RFO 15.203, (except for clarifications as described in RFO 15.202). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best offer. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer (CO) determines it is in the best interest of the Government. Offerors must follow the instructions contained herein. The Offeror's proposal must include all information required and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. Compliance with these instructions is mandatory and failure to furnish a complete proposal, at the time of proposal submission, may result in the proposal being unacceptable to the Government and may eliminate the Offeror from further consideration for award. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure the completeness of the proposal submitted.

11.1. If an Offeror believes the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, ambiguity, or are otherwise unsound, the Offeror shall immediately notify the Contracting Officer (CO) in writing with supporting rationale as well as the remedies the Offeror is asking the CO to consider as related to the omission or error **NO LATER THAN FIVE (5) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER RELEASE of TOPR.**

11.2. Mistakes in an Offeror's proposal that are disclosed after receipt of proposals shall be processed substantially in accordance with the procedures for mistakes in bids at RFO 15.202. The Offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without negotiation. This reservation includes matters of additional or substitute pages of the initial proposal.

11.3. The Contracting Officer (CO) has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the CO will review this determination and if, in the CO's opinion, adequate price competition

exists, certification under RFO 15.403-3 will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the CO determines that adequate price competition does not exist, Offerors may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the CO to determine the reasonableness of the Cost/Price. Additionally, although adequate price competition is expected, if only one offer is received in response to this solicitation the responding Offeror will be required to provide certified cost or pricing data in accordance with Table 15-1, at RFO 15.408-2 and R-DFARS Clause 252.215-7993 (DEVIATION 2026-0048 (MAR 2026)).

- 11.4. The electronic copies of the proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by portable document format (PDF), Microsoft (MS) Office Word 97-2003, 2010, or 2016, MS Office Excel 97-2003, 2010, or 2016, and MS Office Power Point 97-2003, 2010, or 2016, as applicable. **The 50 division excel worksheet MUST be submitted in an editable format (excel), a pdf version may accompany the excel file as an addition, if desired.** Do not embed files into the proposal documents. Embedded files will not be evaluated.
- 11.5. Title of the documents should state the corresponding proposal volume/title and include the Offeror's CAGE code (i.e. "Vol 1 Technical Proposal and Offeror CAGE#XXXXX). \*Note – "XXXXX" refers to the Offeror's CAGE Code
- 11.6. Proposals will be evaluated using the Performance-Price Tradeoff (PPT) Source Selection approach in accordance with RFO 15.103-1, as supplemented by the R-DFARS, and DAF Part 15, Source Selection. The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. A Contract may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the RFO, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all slated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by this TOPR) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Contracting Officer (CO) reasonably determines that the technical and/or past performance of the higher price offeror outweighs the cost difference. The CO will base the Source Selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in this solicitation. While the Government evaluation team and the CO strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgement is implicit throughout the process. The following instructions to offeror and evaluation factors will be used in awarding subject Task Order:

THE EVALUATION WILL USE A STEPPED APPROACH:

- 11.6.1. Step 1: Proposals will be ranked from lowest Total Evaluated Price (TEP) to highest TEP. The TEP will be determined based on the total value of all CLIN(s). Once the

ranking of the TEP is established, the proposal with the lowest TEP will be submitted to the Technical Evaluation team for evaluation of Factor 1 – Technical Acceptability, which includes Subfactor 1 – Project Schedule and Subfactor 2 Management Plan and Qualifications. The TEP will only be utilized to establish the evaluation order.

11.6.2. Step 2: If the lowest TEP proposal is determined to be Acceptable under Factor 1, then that proposal will be evaluated under Factor 2 – Past Performance. If the lowest TEP proposal is found to be Unacceptable under Factor 1, the next lowest TEP proposal will be evaluated by the Technical Evaluation team under Factor 1 until the lowest TEP proposal is found to be Technically Acceptable under Factor 1 OR until all proposals have been evaluated.

11.6.3. Step 3 – The first offeror with the lowest TEP and an “Acceptable” technical rating for its Factor 1 – Technical Acceptability will be evaluated under Factor 2 – Past Performance. If the offeror receives a “Substantial Confidence” rating under Factor 2 – Past Performance, the evaluations will stop, and that offeror will be considered the potential awardee.

11.6.4. If no “Acceptable” proposal receives a “Substantial Confidence” rating for Factor 2 – Past Performance, then the lowest priced offeror with an “Acceptable” technical rating and with a “Satisfactory Confidence” rating for Factor 2 will be the potential awardee.

11.6.5. If no offeror receives a “Satisfactory Confidence” rating, then the lowest priced offeror with an “Acceptable” rating and with a “Neutral Confidence” rating for Factor 2 will be the potential awardee.

11.6.6. The Government will NOT award a contract to an offeror rated “Limited Confidence” or “No Confidence”.

11.6.7. Once the potential awardee is identified through the evaluation process described above, the offered price must be determined fair and reasonable, and the offeror must be determined responsible in accordance with RFO 9.104-1. If these determinations are made, then the CO may determine that the proposal represents the Best Value and a direct award can be made to the offeror without evaluating higher priced proposals or conducting negotiations with previously evaluated, lower priced offerors. With the evaluation process described above, the offerors are reminded that it is imperative that they provide their best offer within their initial proposal.

11.7. Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits:

11.7.1. A complete proposal consists of three (3) volumes: Volume I, Technical Proposal, Subfactor 1 and Subfactor 2; Volume II (a), Past Performance; and Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal (Executed RFP Documents)/Contractor Responsibility. Specific guidance regarding the content of each volume will be discussed further below. Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be

read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal. When Evaluation Notices (ENs) are necessary, the Government will issue them by electronic means to prospective offerors. Page limitations may be placed on responses to these ENs, and such limitations will be provided at the time the EN is issued.

11.7.2. Electronic Page Size, Format and Limit:

11.7.2.1. An electronic page is defined as each face of an 8 1/2" X 11" electronic sheet of paper containing information. Page limits apply to all electronic files whether submitted via PIEE or compact disk (CD). Pages more than the maximum page limits defined below **will not be evaluated**. For formatting, the type of font shall not be less than 12 pitch. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume.

Volume I - Technical Proposal: Subfactor 1 and Subfactor 2: 40 Page Limit

Volume II - Past Performance: 20 Page Limit

Volume III - Cost/Price Proposal and Contractor Responsibility: No Page Limit

11.7.2.2. All pages of each part shall be appropriately numbered and identified with the TOPR number. Pages more than the maximum will not be evaluated.

11.7.2.3. Cost or Pricing Related Data. All cost and/or pricing data shall ONLY be addressed in the Cost/Price Proposal Volume.

11.7.2.4. Indexing. Electronic files should be titled appropriately to easily discern each volume as outlined in paragraph 10.7.1. Each file shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that file. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections. Indexing is not included in the page limitations.

12. **Relative Importance of Factors:** The order of importance: Factor 2 – Past Performance, being most important, Factor 1 – Technical next in importance, and Factor 3 (Cost/Price) is last in importance. Within Factor 1 – Technical, Subfactor 2 – Management Plan and Qualifications is more importance than Subfactor 1 – Project Schedule. All evaluation factors, other than Cost/Price, when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

13. **Evaluation Factors:**

13.1. Volume I – Technical: The purpose of the technical factor is to assess the offeror's proposed approach, an assessment of the quality of the offeror's solution to meeting the Government requirement and assessment of the technical risk which considers the potential for disruption of schedule, degradation of performance and need for

increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

13.2. The offeror’s proposal shall be evaluated utilizing the two (2) subfactors. The offeror’s proposal must demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and scope of work required. Failure to provide a reasonable and complete proposal may reflect a lack of capability to perform the work requirements and may result in a determination that the offeror’s proposal is “Unacceptable”. Any subfactor evaluated as “Unacceptable” will render the entire proposal ineligible for award.

13.3. Technical Assessment: Each Technical subfactor will receive an “Acceptable” or “Unacceptable” rating. Any subfactor evaluated as “Unacceptable” will render the entire proposal ineligible for award. Only those proposals determined to be “Acceptable” either initially or as a result of negotiations, will be considered for award.

**Factor 1 – Technical Acceptability (Acceptable/Unacceptable)**

<b>Acceptable</b>	Proposal meets the requirements of this solicitation
<b>Unacceptable</b>	Proposal does NOT meet the requirements of this solicitation

**If Factor 1 is rated as “Unacceptable”, the proposal shall not be evaluated any further.**

13.4. Submission Instructions – Factor 1 - Technical:

13.4.1. Submit one (1) original and one (1) sanitized copy of your Technical Proposal with CAGE code only in place of Company Name. The sanitized copy shall be provided as a separate file name. (e.g., Subfactor 1 Sanitized Tech Proposal CAGE#). Sanitized copy shall include all subfactors.

13.5. Subfactor 1 - Project Schedule:

13.5.1. Using the provided specifications, the offeror must provide a project schedule using the AF Form 3064, Contract Progress Schedule (Attachment 7) and narrative supporting the schedule. The proposal shall describe procedures, processes, and methods for tracking the progress of the project and interface with the Government and contractor team from beginning to end.

13.5.2. The progress schedule and supporting narrative will be evaluated on how well the offeror captured the separate work elements of the project, the order of work elements to include project phasing, number of days for each work element, and the identification of long lead materials. Long lead materials such as major equipment, electrical equipment, pre-engineered piping, etc., must be specifically identified in the technical proposal. If there are no long lead materials, the proposal must state that there are no long lead materials.

13.5.3. The AF Form 3064, Contract Progress Schedule (Attachment 7) shall be used to reflect a 484-calendar day performance period. At a minimum, the project must include mobilization, submittals, demolition, and major work elements by specification division, final inspection, demobilization, and close-out documents. The schedule must be in the form of a progress chart of suitable scale to indicate appropriately the percentage of work scheduled for competition by any given date during the performance period.

13.5.4. The project schedule itself shall be evaluated to determine if it visually depicts and addresses each of the following elements:

- 13.5.4.1. Identification of separate work elements
- 13.5.4.2. Order of work elements to include project phasing
- 13.5.4.3. Number of days for each work element
- 13.5.4.4. Identification of work elements in the critical path
- 13.5.4.5. Identification of Long Lead Materials as defined in paragraph 13.5.2 (not in the TOPR)

13.6. Subfactor 2 – Management Plan and Qualifications:

13.6.1. Management Plan: The offeror's overall management plan/approach will be evaluated on its organization, coordination, development, monitoring, and control of the construction processes. The Government will review the Management Plan and Qualifications to determine whether sufficient information is provided to ensure an appropriate level of experience and expertise is offered for the job. The Management Plan must ensure the requirement of the specifications are met at a minimum. The submitted plan shall effectively include, but is not limited to, the following components:

- 13.6.1.1. Levels of management
- 13.6.1.2. Supervisory experience
- 13.6.1.3. Offeror's ability to furnish manpower and equipment necessary to perform and manage multiple disciplines of this requirement
- 13.6.1.4. Material purchasing system and capabilities
- 13.6.1.5. Process and procedures for warrant/maintenance support, unforeseen site conditions and design errors.

13.6.2. Qualifications: The Government will evaluate the resumes, certifications or licenses of the contractor’s proposed key personnel who will be involved in the day-to-day accomplishment of this contract including, as a minimum, personnel qualified in the areas identified below. The Government will evaluate this subfactor to determine if the qualifications of the proposed personnel meet the identified minimum requirements, certifications, and licenses required for personnel performing activities or acting in the specific capacity

13.6.2.1. Program/Project Manager (PM): The contractor’s Program/Project Manager shall have as a minimum at least five (5) years of experience in managing construction projects. The PM is the primary POC for the CO for all contractual issues with regards to project/program execution and is responsible for the overall management of this contract. The PM is to ensure that quality work is accomplished on schedule and assuring qualified personnel and subcontractors are assigned to complete performance.

13.6.2.2. Superintendent: Must have a minimum of five (5) years of experience in construction with at least two (2) of those years as a superintendent on projects similar in scope and relevancy of the required project (i.e. SCIF construction). Superintendents must demonstrate familiarity with the requirements of EM 385-1-1 and have experience in the areas of hazard identification and safety compliance, to include successful completion of the OSHA 10-hour Training Course within the past three (3) years.

13.7. Volume II – Past Performance: The Past Performance evaluation will result in an overall performance confidence assessment as defined below. This performance confidence assessment represents the Government evaluation team’s judgement of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror’s demonstrated past and present performance. The performance confidence assessments are defined as follows:

**Factor 2 – Past Performance (Performance Confidence Assessments)**

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the offeror’s performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

13.7.1. Submission Instructions – Factor 2 – Past Performance:

- 13.7.1.1. Offerors shall provide evidence of having successfully completed at least one (1) Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) project in the last six (6) years. Projects must involve the conversion of non-SCIF space to SCIF space OR new SCIF construction and cannot merely include renovation work within an existing SCIF.
- 13.7.1.2. Offerors must provide past performance information to establish Recency and Relevancy on all Federal contracts before State, local government or private contracts. The Government's evaluation of past performance information will consider past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects.
- 13.7.1.3. Offerors are required to explain what aspects of each contract are deemed relevant to complexity and magnitude as related to the requirements of this solicitation and in accordance with this TOPR. Failure to provide required relevancy description may impact the confidence rating, (i.e. aspects of previous projects should match work elements identified in the Solicitation/ specification).
- 13.7.1.4. Provide a summary of the previous contracts described above, not to exceed 1 page of past performance information per reference. The summary should explain what aspects of each contract are deemed recent and relevant as related to the requirements of this solicitation and in accordance with this TOPR. Failure to provide required relevancy description may impact the confidence rating, (i.e. aspects of previous projects should match work elements identified in the solicitation/ specification).
- 13.7.1.5. The summary should not exceed 1 page per reference (maximum total of 20 pages) and include:
  - 13.7.1.5.1. Name of project (contract number, if applicable)
  - 13.7.1.5.2. Name and address of customer or Government agency
  - 13.7.1.5.3. Name, telephone, fax number and/or email of customer contact or contracting officer
  - 13.7.1.5.4. Dollar value
  - 13.7.1.5.5. Period of performance/completion date
  - 13.7.1.5.6. Brief description of work performed, and why the effort is relevant
  - 13.7.1.5.7. Comments regarding any known performance deemed unacceptable to the customer, or not in accordance with the contract terms and conditions
- 13.7.1.6. Complete Section A, Contractor Information, Attachment 6, Past Performance Questionnaire and mail, or email the attached Past Performance

Questionnaire to all past performance references in the list you provide and instruct them to return the completed questionnaire directly to the 1 SOCONS Contracting Officers. Evaluators are only allowed to use Attachment 6, Past Performance Questionnaire. Altered or substituted questionnaires will not be evaluated. Also, Past Performance Questionnaires will only be accepted electronically by email from Project Owners or their authorized representatives. Past Performance Questionnaires will not be accepted from Prime Contractors, Subcontractors, or Manufacturers. Offerors are responsible for ensuring questionnaires are transmitted to their references, and to indicate which references the questionnaire was sent to.

- 13.7.1.7. Inform your references that they shall forward questionnaires electronically by email directly to the address below. Questionnaires must be received in the 1st Special Operations Contracting Squadron office not later than the closing date of the solicitation. Offerors are responsible for ensuring their references transmit the questionnaire to the Contracting Office. In lieu of a Past/Present Performance Questionnaire, if a project is currently available in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), the contractor should attach the evaluation to the questionnaire with the relevant solicitation number and submit directly to the 1st Special Operations Contracting Squadron office before the official closing date and time. Electronic submissions shall be sent to:

SSgt Jayden Gentry (Contracting Officer), Email: jayden.gentry@us.af.mil  
Ms. Tina Kneip (Contracting Officer/Team Lead), Email: tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil

- 13.7.1.8. Lack of any past performance will not automatically disqualify an offeror, but it is a factor that is considered in the Best Value Subjective Tradeoff Source Selection described in this TOPR.

- 13.7.1.9. If the offeror claims there is no past performance, then that status must be identified to the Contracting Officer not later than the date/time proposals are due from all offerors.

13.7.2. Evaluation Process: The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the SCIF construction and Cost/Price factors taking into consideration their relative order of importance stated in paragraph 11. In conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror's Past Performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Federal Awardee Performance

and Integrity Information System (FAPIS) or other databases; interviews with Program Managers and Contracting Officers; the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources.

13.7.2.1. Recency Assessment: An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past six (6) years from the issuance month of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

13.7.2.2. Relevancy Assessment: The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the services performed under this contract relate to SCIF construction as described in the project specifications.

13.7.2.2.1. A relevancy determination of the offeror’s past performance will be made based upon the considerations. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. The past performance questionnaires and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance.

13.7.2.2.2. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent contracts:

**Factor 2 – Past Performance (Relevancy Ratings)**

Adjectival Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires

13.7.2.3. Quality of Performance: All recent past performance that is determined to be somewhat relevant, relevant, or very relevant will be reviewed to determine the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and the usefulness of the performance. This information will be used by the evaluation team in determining the overall performance confidence assessment rating.

13.7.2.4. Assigning Ratings: As a result of the relevancy of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on

performance that is relevant to the technical factors and cost/price factor, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Offerors without a record of recent/relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor. More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or relevant effort. A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

13.8. Volume III Cost/Price: Offers shall be ranked according to price. Each offeror's price will be evaluated for completeness and reasonableness. Unrealistically low proposed costs/prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that either the offeror does not understand the requirement, or the offeror has made an unrealistic proposal. The offeror's Cost/Price proposal will be evaluated to ensure it is reasonable, pursuant to RFO 15.404, to include reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed.

13.8.1. Submission Instructions – Factor 3 – Cost/Price:

13.8.1.1. 50 Division Cost Estimate (DCE) Worksheet (Attachment 5: Offerors shall provide a price breakdown for the project utilizing the 50 Division Cost Estimate (DCE) Worksheet (Attachment 5) for each CLIN as well as a summary page. Use and submit the 50 Division Cost Estimate (DCE) Worksheet (Attachment 5) to build your proposal. The Government has provided in Attachment 5 the *anticipated* division and cost elements per division for the project. Review the proposal divisions and the cost elements within each division and if division or any cost elements need to be *added* (do not remove pre-existing entries, place additions at the bottom of the column, as needed. If the contractor feels items listed on a particular division should be moved to a different division, they should leave the item in its original location and annotate the division it is moved to.) The Contractor shall provide explanation and direct reference to applicable requirement document(s). Offerors should input the major work elements by specification division and provide pricing for those major work elements within each division sheet. The information from the division sheets may not be all inclusive. Offerors are allowed to include any missing items from each division and are allowed to fill in other divisions that are not listed in the prefilled division sheets. Offer will be complete, accurate, and sufficiently detailed to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirement including providing

sufficient details in the Division Cost Worksheet regarding quantities for material, labor, and other services. **Offerors should not utilize lump sum or total pricing when pricing each specification division. Failure to breakout major work elements within a specification division may result in an unfavorable evaluation. If utilizing lump sum or total pricing when pricing the specific division, Offerors should provide rationale on why the price cannot be broken out. The burden of proof for credibility of proposed pricing rests with the Offeror.**

13.8.1.2. Complete representations and certifications in the System for Award Management (SAM).

13.8.2. Reasonableness: This section is to assist you in submitting other than certified cost or pricing data that are required to evaluate the reasonableness of your proposed cost/price. Compliance with these requirements is mandatory and failure to comply may result in rejection of your proposal. The burden of proof for credibility of proposed costs/prices rests with the Offeror.

13.8.3. Materially Unbalanced Pricing: Materially unbalanced pricing poses an unacceptable risk to the Government and may be a reason to reject an Offeror's proposal. Materially unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEP, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. Offerors should explain significant fluctuations between offered rates/hours in the same labor categories over various years.

13.8.4. Cost/Price Information: Data beyond that required by this instruction shall not be submitted unless the Offeror considers it essential to document or support their cost/price position. All data relating to the proposed price, including all required supporting documentation, must be included in the section of the proposal designated as Volume III - Price.

13.8.5. Rounding: All calculated monetary amounts provided shall be rounded to the nearest cent.

13.8.6. The Anticipated CLIN Structure is as follows:

CLIN	Description	Unit of Issue	Unit Price	Total Amount	Anticipated PoP
0001	The contractor shall furnish all labor, materials, tools, equipment, and supervision to convert the existing classrooms CR2A, CR2B, and CR3 in Building 90020 (over 2,900 square feet) into a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility IAW Drawings and Specifications CP1139922 on Hurlburt Field, FL	Job			484 Calendar Days

13.8.7. The Offeror's Cost/Price proposal shall fully and clearly demonstrate reasonableness, balanced pricing, as well as document the Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The TEP will be the sum total of all Firm-Fixed Priced CLIN(s).

13.8.8. The evaluated price may include adjustments to offset any competitive advantage from the use of additional Government Furnished Equipment, Government Furnished Property, Government Furnished Facilities (not furnished to all Offerors), or other Government costs associated with the proposed approach. To facilitate the evaluation of proposal information in this solicitation, information may be obtained from other sources including, but not limited to, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), U.S. Department of Labor, Global Insight Indices, and any other resource available to the Government.

13.8.9. Reasonableness & Balanced Pricing: The Offeror's Cost/Price Volume of the proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in RFO 15.404 and RFO 31.201-3, in order to determine if it is reasonable and balanced. Normally, price reasonableness is established through cost and price analysis techniques as described in RFO 15.404. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. For a price to balance, the 50 Division Cost Estimating Worksheet(s) must be determined not to have any materials, labor, and other services that are significantly overstated or understated. For additional information see RFO 31.201-3.

13.8.9.1. If the Offeror's Cost/Price Volume of the proposal is not found to be reasonable and balanced, it will render the Offeror's proposal ineligible for award and that Offeror's proposal will be removed from any further consideration.

14. **NIST SP 800-171 Assessments:** Offerors shall comply with all applicable NIST SP 800-171 requirements in accordance with R-DFARS 252.240-7.

15. **Contractor Responsibility:** Once the apparent successful offeror is selected the Government will evaluate the offeror's financial capabilities and the specified criteria at RFO 9.104. A determination will be made regarding the apparent successful offeror's financial capabilities and overall contractor responsibility using the specified criteria at RFO 9.104.

16. **Solicitation Requirements, Terms and Conditions:** Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or sub factors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale.

17. **Relationship Between Instructions and Evaluation:** Your attention is directed to the functional relationship between instruction and evaluation of this TOPR. The instructions provide information for the purpose of organizing the proposal and is not intended to be all inclusive. The evaluation information describes evaluation factors for award. Since the Government evaluation of proposals will cover areas identified herein, proposals should address all such areas of evaluation.
18. **Amendment of Solicitation Prior to Closing:** The Government reserves the right to revise or amend the specifications, drawings, or the solicitation prior to the proposal closing time. Such reservations or amendments will be communicated by amendments to the TOPR and distributed in the same manner as the initial TOPR was issued. If such amendments require material changes in quantities or prices, the proposal closing date may be postponed by enough days to enable offerors to revise their proposals. In such cases, the amendment will include an announcement of the new closing date and time. Offerors **MUST** acknowledge all amendments in their proposal, either by, providing signed copies of the amendments with their proposal, or by separate letter which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers.
19. **Questions:** All questions regarding this solicitation must be submitted in writing. All questions and subsequent answers will be distributed in the same manner as the initial TOPR was issued. It is the responsibility of the contractor to continuously monitor the site for updates. To mitigate the risks associated with the cancellation of this solicitation due to untimely submission of questions, all questions must be submitted electronically to the individual(s) listed below no later than close of business 5 business days after the site visit. Any questions submitted after this period may not be answered:

SSgt Jayden Gentry (Contracting Officer), Email: [jayden.gentry@us.af.mil](mailto:jayden.gentry@us.af.mil) AND Ms. Tina Kneip (Contracting Officer/Team Lead), Email: [tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil](mailto:tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil)

**20. Task Order Specific Information:**

20.1. Wage Determination (Attachment 4): The applicable wage rate for this project is Wage Determination-FL20260217 (Building), dated 1 Jan 2026.

20.2. Contract Clauses:

20.2.1. Period of Performance: The Contractor shall be required to (a) commence work under this contract within 10 calendar days after the date the Contractor receives the notice to proceed, (b) prosecute the work diligently, and (c) complete the entire work ready for use not later than 484 calendar days. The time stated for completion shall include final cleanup of the premises. All grounds to include laydown yards or staging areas must be returned to like or better condition.

20.2.2. RFO 52.211-12, Liquidated Damages – Construction (SEP 2000) (a) If the Contractor Fails to complete the work within the time specified in the contract, the Contractor shall pay liquidated damages to the Government in the amount of \$258.34 for each calendar day of delay until the work is completed or accepted.

20.2.3. RFO 52.222-90, Addressing DEI Discrimination by Federal Contractors  
(DEVIATION APR 2026)

20.2.4. R-DFARS 252.232-7006, Wide Area Workflow Payment Instructions (JAN 2023)

Routing Data Table\*

Pay Official DoDAAC	F87700
Issue By DoDAAC	FA4417
Admin DoDAAC	FA4417
Inspect By DoDAAC	F2F323
Service Acceptor DoDAAC	<b>F2F332</b>

(1) The Contractor may obtain clarification regarding invoicing in WAWF from the following contracting activity's WAWF point of contact.

Contracting Officer: SSgt Jayden Gentry	<a href="mailto:jayden.gentry@us.af.mil">jayden.gentry@us.af.mil</a>
Contracting Officer/Team Lead: Ms. Tina Kneip	<a href="mailto:tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil">tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil</a>

iv. The Agency Task Order Ombudsman is:

Director of Contracting, AFICC/KO (OL-SOC)  
427 Cody Avenue (Bldg. 90333), Hurlburt Field, FL 32544  
Phone: (850) 884-3990  
DSN: 579-3990  
email: [AFIMSC.AFICC\\_KO.Workflow@us.af.mil](mailto:AFIMSC.AFICC_KO.Workflow@us.af.mil)

----- END OF CLAUSES-----

For any questions or information regarding this solicitation feel free to contact SSgt Jayden Gentry at [jayden.gentry@us.af.mil](mailto:jayden.gentry@us.af.mil) or Ms. Tina Kneip at [tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil](mailto:tina.kneip.1@us.af.mil).

JAYDEN T. GENTRY, SSgt, USAF  
Contracting Officer

**List of Attachments:**

1. Att 1 - Project Specifications, FA441726R0027, dated 5 Sep 25, 536 pages
2. Att 2 – Drawings, FA441726R0027, dated 5 Sep 25, 53 pages
3. Att 3 - Working Time Analysis, FA441726R0027, dated 29 Apr 26, 1 page

4. Att 4 - Wage Determination-FL20260217 (Building), dated 1 Jan 26, 4 pages
5. Att 5 - 50 Division Cost Estimating Worksheet, not dated, 50 pages
6. Att 6 – Past Performance Questionnaire, not dated, 4 pages
7. Att 7 – AF Form 3064, Contract Progress Schedule, not dated, 1 page
8. Att 8a – Bldg 90220, SCIF Construction Proposal Visit, dated 27 May 26, 58 pages
9. Att 8b - Bldg 90020 - SCIF A&E Visit, dated 17 May 24, 85 pages
10. Att 8c - Att 8c - Bldg 90020, SCIF Value Engineering Study, Oct 22, 50 pages