



NAVFACSW Procurement Forum-- Improving Capital Improvements Contract Vehicles and Execution

Panel: Mr. John Coon
Ms. Robin L. Green
Mr. Paul Fugoso
Mr. William Moreno
Mrs. Stephanie Asenbauer

Disclaimer



- **All information in this presentation is general. The terms of each RFP are controlling and the information in this presentation is not meant to be specifically relied upon by an offeror in submitting a proposal for a specific procurement.**
- **The views presented are those of the speaker or author and do not necessarily represent the views of DoD or its Components.**

Objective



- **Share Navy's Procurement Main Objectives**
- **Share Historical Capital Improvement (C.I.) Contract Vehicles**
 - A-E IDIQ Contracts
 - Multiple Award Construction Contracts (MACCs)
 - Limited/No Design Construction Contract Vehicles
- **Share general trends, timelines, and future plans**
- **Share What we are doing to improve our processes**
- **Share Solicitation/Pre-Award Lessons Learned and Tips**
- **Share Post-Award Execution Concerns**
- **Answer Audience Questions**

Navy's Procurement Main Objectives



- Increase the number and likelihood of successful contractors who can compete to provide the services as specified in the solicitation, at a fair and reasonable price. **COMPETITION!**
- Hire the best value contractor(s).
- Be fair to our industry partners while following all of procurement requirements that include the FAR, DFAR, NMCARS, NFAS.
- Ensure we are systematic, consistent and thorough in our selection process to get it right the first time and reduce chance of protests.

Existing Regional Contracts AE IDIQ's



SBA	Firm (# Option Years)	Discipline	Capacity	Min \$	Max \$	Remaining	Awarded	Expires	
UR	BergerABAM, Inc. (4)	Civil	\$30 M	\$500 K	\$3.5 M	\$1.6 M	10 Sep 14	10 Sep 19	
8(a)	PacRim Engineering (4)	Civil	\$7.5M	\$5 K	\$500 K	\$0.8 M	13 Jun 14	12 Jun 19	
UR	GHD-Gerwick JV (4)	Waterfront Facilities	\$7.5 M	\$5 K	\$1.5 M	\$2.7 M	26 Sep 13	25 Sep 18	
UR	Engineering Partners, Inc.	MEP/FP	\$30 M	\$500 K	\$2.5 M	\$26.9 M	17 Jul 17	16 Jul 22	
SB	SC Engineers (4)	MEP	\$30 M	\$200 K	\$2.5 M	\$10.4 M	16 Dec 14	15 Dec 19	
8(a)	Hunter Pacific Group (4)	M&P	\$7.5 M	\$5 K	\$500 K	\$1.2 M	18 Nov 13	17 Nov 18	
SB	Reid Middleton, Inc. (4)	Structural	\$10 M	\$5 K	\$3.5 M	\$1.3 M	9 Feb 15	8 Feb 20	
SB	Joseph Chow & Assoc (4)	Architect (Multi-Disc)	\$30 M	\$300 K	\$5 M	\$22.2 M	3 Aug 15	2 Aug 20	
SB	Austin Brockenbrough & Assoc., LLP (4)	POL	\$20 M	\$5 K	\$3.5 M	\$12.6 M	29 Oct 14	28 Oct 19	
UR	HDR Architecture, Inc. (4)	Architect (Multi-Disc) MILCON only	\$43 M	\$300 K	\$5 M	\$3.6 M	15 Mar 16	14 Mar 21	
UR	Jacobs Ewingcole JV	Architect (Multi-Disc) MILCON only	\$99 M	\$300 K	\$10 M	\$92.4 M	21 Nov 17	22 Nov 22	
8a	AGS, Inc. (4)	Architect (Multi-Disc)	\$10 M	\$5 K	\$300 K	\$6.4 M	10 May 16	9 May 20	
SB	Schmidt Design Group, Inc.	Landscape	\$5 M	\$5 K	\$500 K	\$4.6 M	8 Mar 17	7 Mar 22	
UR	Tetra Tech, Inc. NAICS 541370	Surveying and Mapping	\$7.5 M	\$5 K	\$1 M	\$6.0 M	16 Mar 17	15 Mar 22	

Existing Regional Contracts AE IDIQ's



SBA	Firm (# Option Years)	Discipline	Capacity	Min \$	Max \$	Remaining	Awarded	Expires	
SB	The Onyx Urban Collaborative, JV LLC (4)	Facilities Planning	\$30 M	\$150 K	\$1.5 M	\$28.0 M	22 Aug 16	21 Aug 20	
SB	KTU+A (4)	Facilities Planning	\$15 M	\$10 K	\$1.5 M	\$9.3 M	24 Jun 14	23 Jun 19	
UR	CARDNO GS, Inc.	Encroachment	\$30M	\$5 K	\$1.5 M	\$25.7 M	14 Feb 17	13 Feb 22	
SB	Makers Architecture & Urban Design LLP	Facility Planning	\$15M	\$10 k	\$750 K	\$15 M	28 Feb 18	27 Feb 23	
SB	Hasenbeck Interior Design, Inc.	Interior Design	\$5 M	\$5 K	\$400 K	\$5 M	2 Apr 18	1 Apr 19	
8(a)	Del Mar Environmental & Construction Services, Inc.	Geotech	\$4.5 M	\$2 K	\$500 K	\$3.6 M	27 Apr 17	26 Apr 22	

Solicited Regional AE IDIQ Contracts

Range	SBA	Discipline	Planned Capacity	Planned Award	Status
\$5K - \$3.5 M	SB	Structural	\$30 M	3 rd Qtr 2018	Solicited
\$5K - \$500K	8a	Civil	\$15 M	3 rd Qtr 2018	Solicited
\$300K - \$5 M	UR	Civil	\$99 M	4 th QTR 2018	Solicited

A-E IDIQ Trends



- Vehicles support Socio-economic Programs (8(a) & Small Business) + Unrestricted
- A-E Specific and Multi-Discipline Coverage
- 9-12 Months Procurement Action Lead Time
- Goal to ensure no gaps in coverage
- Have run out of capacity sooner than planned
- Now planning for contingency capacity
- Occasionally award specific A-E contracts for a large specific program (e.g. SPECWAR)

Existing Regional Contracts

Building / Gen'l Construction – Vertical MACC's



Range	SBA	NAICS	Desc'n (Opt Yrs) [GRP]	Cont'rs	Capacity	Remaining	Awarded	Expires	
\$500 K - \$4 M	SA	236220	8(a) (4) [73]	3	\$99 M	\$6.0 M	5 May 15	4 May 20	
\$3 M - \$9 M	SA	236220	HUBZone/SDVOSB (4) [67]	5	\$106 M	\$6.0 M	8 Apr 14	7 Apr 19	
\$3 M - \$9 M	SA	236220	HUBZone/SDVOSB (4) [79]	7	\$240 M	\$116.2 M	25 Oct 17	24 Oct 22	
\$8 M - \$15 M	SA	236220	Small Business (4) [69]	6	\$99 M	(\$2.6 M)	27 Mar 15	26 Mar 19	
\$8 M - \$15 M	SA	236220	Small Business (4) [85]	5	\$240 M	\$47.8M	7 Dec 16	6 Dec 21	
\$10 M - \$20 M	SA	236220	Small Business (4) [82]	5	\$99 M	\$54.9 M	18 Apr 17	17 Apr 22	
\$15 M - \$50 M	UR	236220	Commercial & Industrial (4) [68]	8	\$240 M	\$2.6 M	13 May 15	12 May 19	
\$15 M - \$50 M	UR	236220	Commercial & Industrial (4) [81]	7	\$240 M	\$2.8 M	29 Aug 16	28 Aug 20	
\$15 M - \$50 M	UR	236220	Commercial & Industrial (4)[89]	7	\$750 M	\$412.6 M	18 Apr 18	17 Apr 23	

Existing Regional Contracts

Heavy Construction – Horizontal MACC's



Range	SBA	NAICS	Desc'n (Opt Yrs) [GRP]	Cont'rs	Capacity	Remaining	Awarded	Expires	
\$500 K - \$25 M	UR		POL (3)	9	\$800 M Agg	*	25 Feb 15	24 Feb 19	
\$300 K - \$20 M	SB	237110	Wet Utilities (4) [75]	5	\$99 M Agg	\$11.5 M	27 Mar 15	26 Mar 20	
\$300 K - \$20 M	SB	237130	Dry Utilities (4) [77]	5	\$99 M Agg	\$.4 M	2 Mar 16	1 Mar 21	
\$50 K - \$20 M	UR (2) reserve	237990	Waterfront (4) [74]	5	\$240 M Agg	\$128.8 M	21 Oct 15	20 Oct 20	
\$500 K - \$30 M	UR (2) reserve	237990	Heavy Horizontal (4) [71]	5	\$99 M Agg	\$.3 M	1 Aug 14	31 Jul 19	
\$500 K - \$20 M	UR (1) reserve	237310	Airfield Paving (4)[66]	6	\$109 M Agg	\$5.6 M	15 Apr 14	14 Apr 19	
\$500 K - \$20 M	UR	237310	Airfield Paving (4)[80]	5	\$240 M Agg	\$24.4 M	17 Sep 15	16 Sep 20	

*

Existing Regional Contracts (Cont.)



Special Trades MACC's

Range	SBA	NAICS	Desc'n (Opt Yrs) [GRP]	Cont'rs	Capacity	Remaining	Awarded	Expires	Renew
\$50 K - \$5 M	SB	238220	HVAC (4) [72]	5	\$99 M Agg	(\$.4 M)	10 Sep 14	9 Sep 19	Matt Acuff Michele Sanders
\$2 K - \$7 M	SA	238220	Fire Protection (4) [76]	6	\$50 M Agg	\$.3 M	5 May 16	4 May 20	Matt Acuff Lisa Crawford
\$100 K - \$5 M	SA	237310	Paving(4)[78]	5	\$99 M	\$40.1 M	3 May 16	2 May 20	Tony Lopez
\$50 K - \$5 M	UR	237120	Fuels – POL & Gas (4) [88]	3	\$150M	\$131.8 M	23 Jan 18	22 Jan 23	Matt Acuff Lisa Crawford
\$100 K - \$4 M	UR	238910	Demo (4) [90]	6	\$100 M	\$77.2 M	8 Sep 17	7 Sep 22	Tony Lopez Chad Slade

MACC Trends



- Vehicles support Socio-economic Programs (8(a), Hubzone/SDVO, & Small Business) + Unrestricted
- 15-18 Months Procurement Action Lead Time,
- Goal to ensure no gaps in coverage
- In past, ran out of capacity QUICK!
- Now planning for higher \$ capacity for surge
- Occasionally award MACC for a large specific program (e.g. Coastal Campus; Medical, etc.) or Stand-alone Construction Contract >\$50M
- CRA impacts have held up TO/MACC awards

Limited/No-Design Construction Contracts



- FOCAS Team standing up in July 2018
- Centrally awarded contracts to support NAVFAC SW field offices
 - Ventura; Lemoore; China Lake; Seal Beach; El Centro; Fallon; Barstow; 29 Palms; Monterey; Travis; Camp Pendleton; San Diego Metro
- Sources Sought Synopses being issued:
 - Mini-MACCs - \$100M Aggregate Value
 - JOCs - General; Specialty; High Voltage/Electrical; Civil; Mechanical/HVAC/Plumbing
 - Pre-Priced IDIQs - Airfield/Road Paving; Roofing; Fencing; Flooring; Painting; HVE w/Emergency Calls
 - Please Respond...Indicate Work Location Interest

What we are doing to improve the process



- **Industry Days**
- **NAVFAC-wide Initiatives**
 - Templates
 - POAMs
 - Training
- **To DASN: "Bureaucracy Busting Ideas"**
 - Expectation NAVFAC has of ASN: push down authority and accountability, reduce unnecessary burden, accelerate the acquisition timeline
 - NAVFAC presented 18 ideas (to begin with)
- **Other Changes**
 - All designed to reduce Acq timelines & busy work with negligible risk
 - Chief of Contracting Office (CCO) "wishlists"
 - NEED INDUSTRY INPUT

LESSONS LEARNED AND TIPS

Lesson Learned & Tips

Solicitation/Pre-Award Phase



- Do not include assumptions in proposals
- If contractor finds ambiguities in solicitation or other issues needing clarification:
 - For Construction Solicitations: Ask Questions and Submit Requests for Information (RFIs) before the due date
 - For A-E Solicitations: Request scope clarification meeting; Submit Cost Proposals in format prescribed by Government (if you don't get a template, ask for one).

Typical Non-Price Factors Evaluations – Basic Tips



- **Follow directions**
 - Page limitations
 - Font size
 - Page size
 - Deadlines, last day and time to submit proposal
 - For Construction, fill in Bonding Capacity
 - Answer the requirements!!
- **Quality check your proposal**
 - Watch for “cut and paste” mistakes
 - Make sure all sections are consistent, such as the text, schedule and costs
 - If the proposal is not consistent, it makes the facts invalid
- **Don’t assume discussions will be conducted**
 - You may only have one chance

Non-Price Factors Evaluation: Experience



- Only use past projects that fit the RFP language
 - Examples of RFP requirements for a project to be considered:
 - Must have been completed within the past five years from the solicitation closing date
 - Must be at least 80% complete as of the solicitation closing date
 - Meets the scope and complexity of the work under the contract
 - Self-performed experience is required
- Ensure consistency of Project Information (dates, project costs, type of contract, description of work) between Project Data Sheet for Experience & Past Performance Questionnaire
- Provide as much detail as possible on the project, the work performed, and the relevancy to the RFP requirements. No need for Client testimonials or descriptions of new weapons systems/aircraft and how they are important to the Navy – Focus on the facility that you are building or designing!

Non-Price Factors Evaluation: Past Performance



- Past Performance is a mandatory factor. According to current guidance, IT EQUALS ALL THE OTHER NON-PRICE FACTORS COMBINED.
- Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPARs) are mandatory and preferred.
 - If the offeror is not satisfied with their evaluation, it is important that they provide comments in the CPARs evaluation AT THE TIME OF THE EVALUATION so the reviewer can understand BOTH sides.
 - Make sure the past performance is for contracts that are submitted for corporate experience (check RFP on this point).
- **If CPARS are not available, only then can a Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) be used.**
 - These must be signed and include the client name phone number.
 - PPQs are written by the offeror and can be inflated. Be careful, the offeror will lose credibility if the Navy calls the client and verifies that the PPQ is not truthful or may be disqualified. And we do often call.
- **Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)** is also be used to look up past performance on other contracts within the system.

Non-Price Factors Evaluation: Safety



- Safety evaluation should be straight forward with the following:
 - Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
 - Compares the company's annual loses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over three year period
 - Lower EMRs are generally given greater weight in evaluations
 - Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART)
 - Lower DART rates are generally given greater weight in evaluations
 - Safety Narrative
 - Some mishaps can be explained away with the narrative, especially if the mishap was immediately corrected
 - Should explain any upward or downward trends in EMR and DART
 - Should describe the management and implementation of safety procedures and any innovative practices
 - Make sure to follow RFP requirements regarding the safety narrative
- Safety is a mandatory factor
- Carefully follow RFP instructions

Non-Price Factors Evaluation: Commitment to Socioeconomic Programs



- This evaluation is mandatory if the contract is sent out as a unrestricted contract with no set-asides.
- Socioeconomic programs currently include:
 - Small Business (SB)
 - Veteran-Owned Business (VOSB)
 - Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)
 - Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HubZone) SB
 - Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
 - Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
- Be sure to answer/provide all Small Business Utilization & Participation Information – Ensure information is complete and that math is correct.
- The more detail the better, such as names of the companies and type of relationship.

Typical Evaluations on Price Factor



- Understand how the price/cost is used.
 - Low Price Technically Acceptable
 - Lowest Price
 - Best Value Trade Off
- We generally use pricing on the seed project (representative of work to be ordered in the future) to award our basic contracts. Careful on lowballing—it can hurt you particularly during BVTO (check RFP on this point). In BVTO, we generally reserve the right to award to other than the lowest priced offeror.
- Sample Project can be used instead of a seed project.
- Our guidance right now provides that non-price factors other than past performance are all equal to one another, past performance is equal to the other non-price factors combined, and ALL non-price factors combined are approximately equal to price. This is the general weighting, though it can vary. Check individual RFP.

Lesson Learned & Tips

Post-Award Execution



- Partnering between Government and Contractor is important
 - Include the Project Manager and Design Manager on correspondence related to proposed changes and submittals (design submittals, RFIs, etc.)
- Keeping Construction Schedule on Track is important
 - The Contractor and Designer of Record need to own their schedule.
 - Submit a Time Impact Analysis for each cost/time proposal for proposed change.
Include:
 1. Narrative defining the scope and conditions of the change, how it originated, and its impact on the schedule.
 2. Fragnet—a schedule extract that consists of the activities that constitute the scope of the changed condition(s) and the logic that connects the activities with each other and the activities in the existing schedule.
 3. A current project schedule that has been updated to the point in time when the impact occurred and “run” to generate a project completion date.
 4. Item 3 with the fragment from Item 2 inserted and the schedule “run” so that the new completion date is determined.
 5. Disk with the native files for Items 2, 3, and 4.

PANEL: AUDIENCE QUESTIONS?



NAVFAC SOUTHWEST CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PANEL:

- **Mr. John Coon, Chief Engineer**
- **Ms. Robin L. Green, Director, Capital Improvements Acquisition Core**
- **Mr. Paul Fugoso, Project Manager, Technical Discipline Coordinator**
- **Mr. William Moreno, Senior Project Manager**
- **Mrs. Stephanie Asenbauer, Project Manager**