AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
	1 | 9

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
0003	18-Jun-2012		

6. ISSUED BY	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)	CODE
AFGHANISTAN DISTRICT SOUTH (AES) US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS APO AE 09355	W5J9LE	**See Item 6**	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		
	X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W5J9LE-12-R-0036
	X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 24-May-2012
		10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE / FACILITY CODE		

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer [X] is extended, [ ] 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 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

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

[ ] A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

[ ] B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).

[ ] C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

[ ] D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

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

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

The purpose of this amendment is to:
Answer questions to prospective offerors for informational purposes only
Add photos from Site Visit
Revise and reissue section 01 33 16
Insert Bid Guarantee Language and update Bid Guarantee submittal procedures
Revise schedule notes

The POC for this action is Nicholas Emanuel Nicholas.P.Emanuel@usace.army.mil

The Proposal due date has been hereby extended to 21 July 2012 at 4:00 P.M. Kandahar Time.

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-Jul-2012

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION 00010 - SOLICITATION CONTRACT FORM
The required response date/time has changed from 07-Jul-2012 04:00 PM to 21-Jul-2012 04:00 PM.

The following have been added by full text:
AMENDMENT 0003
This solicitation requires the offerors furnish a bid guarantee in accordance with FAR 52.228-1 (which is included in this solicitation). The bid guarantee must be supported by appropriate security, as described in FAR 52.228-1(b). If an offeror elects to furnish a bid guarantee supported by a corporate surety, that corporate surety must appear on Treasury Department Circular 570. If the corporate surety does not appear on Treasury Department Circular 570, the bid may be rejected in accordance with FAR 52.228-1(a). Offerors are advised that the circumstances in which the Contracting Officer may waive the solicitation's bid guarantee requirements are both extremely limited and discretionary (see FAR 28.101-4(c)) and therefore, a bidder should assume that a non-compliant bid guarantee will result in rejection of its proposal.

Scheduel Notes:

Delete 7. “Funds are not presently available for Schedule D (Spillway Investigations) for this

acquisition. No contract award will be made for Schedule D until appropriated

funds are made available”

Replace Instead With: “Funding for Schedule D (Spillway Investigations) may not be available. If funds are not available for Schedule D:

a. Pricing for Schedule D will not be included in evaluation for overall lowest price evaluation.

b. Spillway Investigation will not be used for “acceptability” determination.

Questions and Answers:

1. Section 00113 Section IV, “Evaluation Factors for Award”, Item “Factor 2 – Personnel: Submission Requirements”, includes a Senior Geotechnical Engineer or Geologist but does not appear to include requirements as it does for the other six positions. Please provide.

   ANSWER: Section 014500 Contractor Quality Control, p.2.5.3 CQC Specialist, contains an experience matrix that includes requirements for a geologist and a geotechnical engineer.

2. CLINS 0004, 0007AA, 0008AA, 0009AA, 0010AA and the existing ROTO Valves all require some fashion of repair and/or rehabilitation. The specifications note that for the most part that the extent of the repairs will not be known until after the inspection has been completed. The COE has provided the contractor with a baseline of repairs for CLINS 0007AA, 0008AA and 0009AA but has not for the remainder. Since it is very difficult to assume repair cost for unknown conditions could we be

provided the same baseline for the ROTO Valves, 0004 and 0010AA so as to establish a common scope for bidding purposes?

ANSWER: It behooves the bidder to determine which items need to be repaired or replaced if not otherwise specified. The Government has provided all the specifications that it can for bidding purposes at this time. The Government has also stated all assumed conditions in Appendix D, e.g. Mechanical Design Considerations of the irrigation Tunnel. There is a lot of information in Appendix D. The Government presumes, that after a thorough review of the documentation provided, and given significant judgment for engineering/construction/operations, that a reasonable bid may be developed within the price ceiling specified.

3. Points 1.2.3.9 and 1.2.4.3 in Section 01 01 50 mentions local controls and not using solid-state devices unless electro-mechanical devices are not available but in Section 01 64 00 there is mention of a System Integrator. For rotovalves, jet valves, sump pumps and dam safety instrumentation, does the USACE want local monitoring and control of equipment or remote monitoring and control? If the answer is remote monitoring and control, what location do they want to do the monitoring and control to take place?

ANSWER: The duties of the System Integrator as stated in Section 01 64 00 Start Up Testing and Commissioning are over stated for this project. The current system of operation on the valves has some problems that require integration, otherwise the integration problems should be rudimentary. Appendix C – Inspection of Mechanical Features by Gonzales explains some of the control problems in more detail. The controls should all be local. The existing piezometers are not part of this contract and no attempt should be made to integrate them. The point of using solid state devises is to keep all controls as simple as possible.

4. Point 3.5.3.c in Section 01 33 16 states that the Interm Review Conference will be held for each design submittal at the installation. May an alternate location be proposed for this conference?

ANSWER: Updated to location determined by the COR

5. The project specification section 01 33 15-32, Paragraph 1.3.3.2 “Structural Elements of Intake Structure” states the following:

“Contractor shall inspect the structural elements of the intake structure and prepare a reinforcement design if necessary to account for the rehabilitated Bridge Crane. A government review of the history of operations and the original design drawings indicates the proposed loads for the rehabilitated Bridge Crane will not exceed the original designs. Contractor’s engineer shall verify the loading by performing an independent review designs and operational history of the intake structure.”

This statement suggests that the government reviewers saw documentation that substantiated the original intake tower design. Our review of the documents provided along with the RFP have not uncovered adequate documentation of the tower so that the original capacity of the tower structure can be established. To evaluate the capacity of the intake structure's ability to support a higher capacity crane the following information is needed:

1. Structural drawings indicating

a. Column dimensions

b. Plan dimensions

c. Foundation dimensions

d. Beam dimensions

e. Reinforcing steel arrangement and size including placing dimensions in

i. Columns

ii. Beams

iii. Slabs

iv. Foundations

2. Specifications for

a. Concrete design strength

b. Reinforcing steel used and design strength

3. Design Load Criteria for

a. Wind (speed based on 3 second gust not fastest mile)

i. Importance Factor

b. Seismic data

i. Site soil classification

ii. Short period and long period site spectral acceleration values based on earthquake return probabilities.

iii. Importance Factor

Is this data available and if not what data did the government use in concluding that increasing the crane load rating loads would not exceed the original tower design capacity?

ANSWER: All available data is in the Appendices. The Government Review in Appendix D also includes a document titled Alternative MS-1-2-5. That alternative was the result of a VE study that *deduced* the probable structural capacity in the following text "The 195,000 lbs loading is a normal operating load for the hoist and it exceeds the hoist rating of 75 tons. The VE team feels that if the hoist trolley can be replaced with one capable of lifting 100 tons, the normal operation will be within the rating of the crane." You should look for the lift diagrams in the drawings. Further, anecdotal information suggests that mechanical design of that time period included much higher overload on cranes than today, thus it is more likely that the necessary structural capacity was incorporated into the design. All that being said, the Contractor must verify according to the contract requirements.

6. Due to the complex nature of the project and short amount of time following the site walk, it is requested that USACE provide a two week extension of the due date to allow for a quality proposal.

   ANSWER: Proposal Due date has been extended to 21 July 2012.

7. Response to Question 10 provided via Amendment 02 indicates that the additional documentation required for Factor 2 – Personnel is not excluded from the sixty (60) page limitation. However, the requirements for the sections included in the page count could require a minimum of seventy-two pages.

8. Factor 1 Experience: Submission Requirements requires the inclusion of the following which could require up to twenty-one (21) pages:

   - Up to seven (7) projects each including Form A-1, "Contractor Experience Form" which is three (3) pages.

   Factor 2 – Personnel: Submission Requirements requires the inclusion of the following which could require up to thirty (30) pages:

   - Personnel Resume/Experience, which is a two page form, for all seven personnel (14 pages)
   - Professional Engineer certificate or other documentation for four personnel (4 pages)
   - College transcript or other documentation for five personnel (5 pages)
   - Documentation of employment other documentation for all seven personnel (7 pages)

   Factor 3 – Past Performance: Submission Requirements requires the inclusion of the following which could require up to twenty-one (21) pages:

   - Up to seven (7) projects past performance information on Form PPQ-0, "Past Performance Questionnaire" which is a three page form.

   Please increase the page limit to allow for a quality proposal to be provided.

   ANSWER: Updated Volume I shall be limited to no more than **eighty (80) pages** in length

9. Section 01 01 50, "Technical Requirements", Part 1.1.8.4, "Intake Structure", which was added via Amendment 02, subpart d states "The O&M manual specifies that the gates must not be closed

unless one of the downstream valves is still open." An excerpt of the O&M manual included in Appendix D document "Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5" (Appendix D_Alternative_MS-1-2-5.pdf sheet 4) seems to indicate that the Wheel Gate is not to be closed until all hollow-jet valves are closed. Please clarify.

ANSWER: The Government concurs there is an apparent contradiction between the Paragraph 1.1.8.4 (d) and Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5 documents. Paragraph 1.1.8.4 (d) is mis-stated and should read "Under normal operations all jet valves must be closed prior to closing the bulkheads on the tower. Given emergency closure operation the bulk head gates must not be closed if more than one jet valve is open".

Further to guidance on O&M of the tunnel, this amendment includes the "Instructions for Operation and Maintenance – Kajaki, Arghandab Dam, International Engineering Company, November 1955. Further documentation of practical operations experience is provided in Appendix C – Inspection of Mechanical Features, USBR 1964. The Contractor must evaluate these documents in detail to determine the appropriate operations of the tunnel during construction, understanding that valves and gates are in a state of disrepair.

10. Section 01 01 50, "Technical Requirements", Part 1.1.8.4, "Intake Structure", which was added via Amendment 02, subpart f states "The government has performed a review of the design documents and O&M manual to facilitate developing this request for proposal. A copy of this government review is attached – See Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5.". Appendix D document "Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5" (Appendix D_Alternative_MS-1-2-5.pdf) does not appear to be a complete copy with the last sheet labeled "PAGE NO: 6 OF 9" and a statement on the bottom of PDF sheet 6 "A sketch of such a design is included in the drawings section" which does not appear to be included. Please provide a complete copy of Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5.

    ANSWER: The document titled "Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5" was originally published as part of a value engineering exercise and it included sensitive cost information on pages 7, 8, and 9. The original document was re-purposed for this RFP and the cost information has been removed as required.

    a. Section 01 01 50, "Technical Requirements", Part 1.1.8.5, "Piezometers and Instrumentation Installation", which was added via Amendment 02, states "The reservoir pool is currently limited to a lower elevation than originally designed, due to the incomplete service and emergency spillways. The current reservoir has never been impounded to a level higher than about Elevation 1037m. All new designs and equipment shall be based on the potential maximum pool at Elevation 1050m as if these spillways were complete." However, Appendix C document "Final Design Report on Kajaki Dam, and Boghra Canal Projects" (1956_Final_Design_Report.pdf) Section III, Part 3.01.a.1 states "The dam was designed as an earth and rockfill embankment with a maximum height of 98 meters above original streambed. The top at El 1,050 meters was 10 meters wide and 270 meters long" and Section III, Part 3.01.a.2 states "An open channel spillway was located adjacent to the right abutment of the dam. It was to include a 101 meter long uncontrolled concrete section with crest at El 1,035.25 meters, a downstream apron, and training walls. It was designed with provisions for the future installation of crest gates to

raise the maximum reservoir level to El 1,045 meters." Should the new designs and equipment be based on the potential maximum pool at Elevation 1,045 meter in lieu of 1050m?

ANSWER: The Contractor should use 1050m for design purposes in this contract. The Government concurs – the original 1956 design for the service spillway used 1045m at the top of gate. Subsequently, there was a desire to operate the pool at 1048m to increase conservation storage. In fact, the 1977 design drawings for the partially completed spillway included a top of gate at 1048m. Subsequent to that, there have been concerns over sedimentation in the reservoir and a 2m raise of the dam was considered. Completion of the gates is not a part of this contract and the design raise issues are not resolved at the time and also not a part of this contract. The final outcome for design pool elevation of 1048m or 1050m is assumed to be inconsequential to the work to be performed under this contract.

11. Please confirm that contractor's scope is to replace the current irrigation intake structure's 75 ton capacity hoist to one with a 100 ton capacity, and that any intake structure evaluations and/or upgrades are currently outside of our scope and would be provided under a contract modification if required.

ANSWER: The Contractor shall inspect the structural elements of the intake structure per original solicitation. Contractor's engineer shall verify the loading by performing an independent review of available designs and operational history of the intake structure per original solicitation.

The Government does not have the benefit of a site inspection by a qualified structural engineer at this time, nor does it have detailed as built drawings because they do not exist. The Government understands this creates uncertainty in the contract. Therefore, further clarification on the structural aspects of the intake tower are provided as follows:

a. The Contractor's structural engineer shall perform an assessment of the structural elements of the intake tower as they pertain to the bridge crane and hoist. The assessment shall be based on the information provided by the government, the results of the visual inspection (above water), and engineering judgment. The assessment shall verify the Governments assumption that the structural elements supporting the proposed 100 ton Crane and Hoist are in sound condition and can support the proposed crane and hoist, along with the various aspects described in "Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5" provided. The results of the visual inspection (above water) and structural engineers assessment shall be provided in the same report.

b. The structural evaluation is intended to be for static loading conditions during normal operations only. In spite of the static loading condition specified here guidance on the evaluation of older structures is available from seismic publications, i.e. FEMA 356 (2000) titled "Pre-standard and Commentary for the Seismic Rehabilitation of buildings" offers guidance on selecting parameters.

c. The Government engineers and authors of Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5 used simple deduction and review of tower operations to infer the structural capacity of the tower. These inferences must be validated by the Design Engineer of Record.

d. If the inspection results in the discovery of a defect, design flaw, or the assumptions made in Engineering Alternative MS1-2-5 prove to be false, that will constitute a change of conditions and the Contracting Officer shall initiate a contract modification. The scope of that modification may include but not be limited to performing additional structural analysis, design, and construction of reinforcement to structural members to support the 100ton bridge crane and hoist.

12. The given sites for drawings are not fully accessible; one site takes you to the other and vise-versa, we wonder if there is a unique way to get these drawings

ANSWER: All drawings can be downloaded at http://www.aed.usace.army.mil/

13. Reference to SF 1442 - Item 13A is asking for sealed offer (Original and a copy) but in contrary section 0013 is instructing to send by Email, could you please instruct.

ANSWER: This is not a sealed bid therefore please send volume I and volume II of your proposal

via email to Nicholas.P.Emanuel@usace.army.mil and Edward.A.Boddie@usace.army.mil with a courtesy copy to tas.contracting@usace.army.mil. Please see section 00010 bonding instructions of this amendment for bid bond submittal instructions.

The following have been modified:

BONDING INSTRUCTIONS

Bid guarantee in accordance with FAR 52.228-1 are required for this project. A bid guarantee shall be submitted via hard copy only and received no later than 21 July 2012 at 4:00 P.M. but may be received earlier as a separate package from the proposal. All Bid Guarantees shall be received by Edward Boddie. Bid Guarantees may be sent by mail or hand carried to:

Edward Boddie
USACE-AES
APO-AE 09355

Please see clause 52.228-1

(End of Summary of Changes)