AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
J	1	13

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
0002	18-Jul-2006		

6. ISSUED BY	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)	CODE
NAVSEA INDIAN HEAD 101 STRAUSS AVE. BLDG. 1558 ATTN: LEVONSON (BUDDY) WHITE LEVONSON.WHITE@NAVY.MIL INDIAN HEAD MD 20640-5035	N00174	**See Item 6**	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)			
		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00174-06-R-0040
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06-Jun-2006
			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 2 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 solicitation is hereby reopened to incorporate source selection criteria which was initially omitted from the solicitation. The closing date is now 4:00 PM E.S.T., August 01, 2006.

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 18-Jul-2006

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following items are applicable to this modification:

THIS FOLLOWING AMENDMENT INCORPORATES THE FOLLOWING AND EXTENDS THE CLOSING DATE:

1.

IHD 195 - SECTION L – PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS (FEB 2000)(NAVSEA/IHD)

Instructions to Offerors for Award

THE OFFEROR SHALL PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

GENERAL INFORMATION: Each offeror must submit an offer/proposal and other written information in strict accordance with these instructions. When evaluating an offeror, the Government will consider how well the offeror complied with both the letter and spirit of these instructions. The Government will consider any failure on the part of the offeror to comply with both the letter and the spirit of these instructions to be an indication of the type of conduct it can expect during contract performance. Therefore, the Government encourages offerors to contact the contracting officer by telephone, facsimile transmission, e-mail, or mail in order to request an explanation of any aspect of these instructions.

OFFERORS SHALL ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING FACTORS: (Listed in descending order of importance) Information shall be submitted in **three separately tabbed sections** as detailed below.

Volume I – **Three copies of Technical Proposal**
Volume II – **Two copies of Past Performance**
Volume III – **Two signed copies of the amendment**

Factor 1 - **Technical Experience**
Factor 2 - **Sub-Contracting**
Factor 3 - **Price**
Factor 4 - **Past Performance (equal in value to 1thru 3 combined)**

****

Tab I - Shall address Factor 1 - **Technical Experience**, supplements as detailed below. **Not to exceed 20 single sided pages**, not less than 10 pitch (Times New Roman or similar).

Technical Experience

1. Are the sub-contractors certified to all required quality specifications?

2. Is the primary contractor certified to all required quality specifications?

3. Explain in detail how the Warhead Final Machining (EDM1-06-100) will be manufactured from start of work through final inspection.

4. Develop a time line to show the manufacturing schedule of the Warhead Final Machining (EDM1-06-100) and its components. Include critical factors in the manufacturing process such as sub-contracted tasks, component milestones and process milestones.

5. What do you expect the major problem areas will be in the manufacturing process? What impact would these problems have on delivery schedule? How would these problems be solved to avoid schedule setbacks?

6. Describe work of similar type, complexity or technical difficulty that has been completed within the last 3 years.

7. List process controls that will be used to ensure the item is in accordance with the drawing requirements.

****

Tab II - Shall address Factor 2 – **Sub-Contracting**, supplements as detailed below. **Not to exceed 20 single sided pages**, not less than 10 pitch (Times New Roman or similar).

Sub-Contracting

1. Who will perform the following? If sub-contracted, list names and addresses of sub-contractors. Describe any relevant past experience these companies have in relation to their assigned manufacturing task.

a. Machining
b. Welding
c. Plating
d. Inspection (dimensional, hydrostatic testing, Metallurgical etc.)

2. Do the primary or any sub-contractors need any additional personnel or equipment to complete contract requirements?

****

Price

Price will be evaluated by the Contracts personnel to determine fairness and reasonableness through the most appropriate method available.

****

Tab III - Shall address Factor 3 – **Past Performance**, supplements as detailed below. **Not to exceed 20 single sided pages**, not less than 10 pitch (Times New Roman or similar).

Past Performance

Offeror shall provide a **minimum of three references**. Data reference sheets shall contain the following information: (Offerors must provide the part performance information or affirmatively state in writing that it possesses no relevant past performance information. Failure to do so may result in the offer being determined **Neutral**.)

(a) Contract Number
(b) Who was the contract with (name of agency/company)
(c) Point of contract and telephone number of the contracting officer of contracting officer's representative
(d) Dollar value of the contract
(e) Detailed description of the work performed
(f) Was work completed on time with a quality product delivered without any degradation in performance or customer satisfaction
(g) Number, type, severity of quality, service, or cost problems in performing the contract, corrective action taken, if any, and the effectiveness of the corrective action.

****

Past performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror, as an organization, has during the past three (3) years: (1) satisfied its customers, and (2) complies with federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The offeror shall provide a list of references using the Past Performance Matrix, (Enclosure 1), who will be able to provide information

regarding the offeror's past performance during the past three (3) years regarding: (1) customer satisfaction; (2) timeliness; (3) technical success; (4) program management; (5) and the quality of products.

The offeror will submit the Past Performance Questionnaire to each of the references listed on the Past Performance Matrix, a minimum of three (3) is required. THE OFFEROR SHALL INSTRUCT THE **REFERENCES** TO **COMPLETE** THE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE AND **MAIL or FAX** THEM **DIRECTLY TO**:

Naval Surface Warfare Center
101 Strauss Avenue, Bldg 1558
Attn: Levonson White, Code C12G
Indian Head MD 20640-5035
Fax: 301-744-6547

The offeror's selected references must be listed on the Past Performance Matrix. Failure of the references to submit the Past Performance Questionnaire to the Contract Specialist by **CLOSE OF THE AMENDMENT** may result in the inability of the Government to rank the offeror's past performance.

****

2.

IHD 211 - SECTION M BEST VALUE EVALUATION AND BASIS FOR AWARD (FFP) (MAR 2000) (NAVSEA/IHD)

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVALUATION FACTORS: Offerors are required to follow the specific instructions in submitting their information. Failure to do so may result in the offeror's submission determined unacceptable and ineligible for award. Each offeror's submission shall be screened by the Contracting Officer or a designee upon receipt to insure compliance with the instructions contained in the RFP. Elimination of an offeror is at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer.

The following factors, listed in descending order of importance, shall be used to evaluate offers:

1. Technical Experience
2. Sub-Contracting
3. Price
4. Past Performance (Equal in value to factors 1 – 3 combined)

PRICE

Although price is not the most important evaluation factor, it will not be ignored. The degree of its importance will increase with the degree of equality of the proposals in relation to the other factors on which selection is to be based. Price will be evaluated by the Contracts Personnel to determine fair and reasonableness through the most appropriate method available.

A Technical Evaluation Team shall evaluate factors 1, 2, and 3 based on the Technical Proposal provided by the offerors in accordance with Section L clause entitled Intructions to Offerors.

Factor 3 - Past Performance shall be rated by Contracts Personnel.
Offeror shall provide a minimum of three references.

1. Data reference sheets shall contain the following information: (Offerors must provide the past performance information or affirmatively state in writing that it possesses no relevant past performance information. Failure to do so will result in the offer being determined unacceptable.)

a. Contract Number

b. Who was the contract with (name of agency/company)
c. Point of contact and telephone number of the contracting officer of contracting officer's representative
d. Dollar value of the contract
e. Detailed description of the work performed
f. Was work completed on time with a quality product delivered without any degradation in performance or customer satisfaction
g. Number, type, severity of quality, service, or cost problems in performing the contract, corrective action taken, if any, and the effectiveness of the corrective action.

2. The Government will evaluate the quality of the offeror's past performance. This may include any aspect of past performance that is related to this contract. A record of poor past performance may be considered an indication that the offeror may be lacking in areas such as reliability, quality and customer satisfaction. However, a record of average or exceptional past performance will not result in favorable assessment of an otherwise technically deficient technical proposal. In evaluating an offeror's past performance, the Government will consider information contained in the offeror's past performance references, information obtained from other sources, including past and present customers, subcontractors and any others who may have useful information, and other past performance data available to the Government. Offerors with no past performance history will receive a neutral rating.

Contracting Officers will use the following adjectival definitions as guidelines in evaluating past performance:

Excellent - The Offeror's performance was consistently superior. The contractual performance was accomplished with few minor problems, for which corrective action taken by the Offeror was highly effective.

Good - The Offeror's performance was better than average. The contractual performance was accomplished with some minor problems, for which corrective actions taken by the Offeror were effective. They would be willing to do business with the Offeror again.

Poor - The Offeror's performance was entirely unsatisfactory and that they would not do business with the Offeror again under any circumstances. The contractual performance of the element being assessed contains problems for which the Offeror corrective actions appear to be or were ineffective.

Neutral - Offerors lacking relevant past performance history will receive a neutral rating for past performance. The offeror must provide the information requested above the past performance evaluation or affirmatively state that it possesses no relevant directly related or similar past performance. An offer that fails to provide the past performance information or to assert that the company has no relevant directly related or similar past performance may be considered ineligible for award.

METHODOLOGY

The offeror's submission in response to this solicitation will be evaluated. Each factor shall be evaluated based on the merits of the information contained in the offerors' submission. A sample evaluation is provided below:

Offerors	Score*	Past Performance Rating	Price
A	88	Excellent	$320,000
B	93	Excellent	$326,000
C	0**	Good	$300,000
D	82	Excellent	$302,000
E	93	Poor	$324,000

* Not to exceed 100
** Offeror did not comply with RFP instructions - was not evaluated

Once this information is tabulated, offerors will be compared making value and price tradeoffs and award will be made to the offeror that represents the Best Value to the Government. If the offeror with the highest scores also represents the lowest price then that offeror is clearly the Best Value. If an offeror with higher scores has a higher price, then a determination must be made whether the difference in value is worth the higher price. In the example, the Government

may award to Offeror A, Offeror B(if it could be determined whether the difference in greater value is worth the difference in price when compared to Offeror A), or Offeror D. Offeror E, even though reflective of a high technical score would be eliminated based on the POOR Past Performance rating.

PAST PERFORMANCE MATRIX

References	$ Value of Contract	Work Description	Contract Completed on Time YES / NO	Contract Completed at Proposed Cost YES / NO (if no % of overrun)	Provide Explanation for NO answers

REFERENCES COLUMN SHOULD INCLUDE GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY/ COMPANY NAME, ADDRESS, POC AND TELEPHONE NUMBER.

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE COVERSHEET

FOR SOLICITATION NUMBER N00174-06-R-0040

Offeror's Name: _____

****

Name of agency/activity completing questionnaire: _____

Name and title of the person completing questionnaire:_____

_____

Length of time your agency/activity has been involved with the offeror: _____

SUBMIT PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE BY _____

TO: NAVSEA Indian Head, Surface Warfare Center Division
101 Strauss Avenue, Bldg. 1558
Indian Head, MD 20640-5035
Attn: Levonson White, Contract Specialist, Code C12G

e-mail address: LEVONSON.WHITE@NAVY.MIL **Fax: 301-744-6547**

****

RATING SCALE

Please use the following ratings to answer the questions.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Excellent - The offeror's performance was consistently superior. The contractual performance was accomplished with minor problems, to which corrective action taken by the contractor was highly effective.

Good - The offeror's performance was better than average. The contractual performance was accomplished with some minor problems, to which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective. They would be willing to do business with the offeror again.

Poor - The offeror's performance was entirely inadequate. The contractual performance of the element being assessed contains problems, to which the contractor's corrective actions appear to be or were ineffective. They would not do business with the offeror again under any circumstances.

Nuetral – Offeror lacking relevant past performance history will receive a neutral rating for past performance.

N/A – The contractual performance of the element being assessed was never a requirement, never an issue, or there is no knowledge of the element in question.

Past Performance Questionnaire Interview Sheet

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	POOR	NEUTRAL
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION				
The referenced contractor was responsive to the customer's needs.				
The contractor's personnel were qualified to meet the requirements.				
The contractor's ability to accurately estimate cost.				
TIMELINESS				
The contractor's ability to ensure, to the extent of its responsibility, that all tasks were completed within the requested time frame.				
TECHNICAL SUCCESS				
The contractor has a clear understanding of the tasks detailed in the SOW and/or delivery orders.				
The contractor's ability to complete tasks correctly the first time.				
The contractor's ability to resolve problems.				
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT				
Did the contractor successfully manage its subcontractors?				
Was the contractor's management effective in controlling cost, schedule and performance requirements?				
QUALITY OF SERVICE				
The contractor's quality and reliability of services delivered.				

PLEASE PROVIDE SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES FOR THE FOLLOWING:

1. Would you recommend this contractor for similar Government contracts? Please explain:

_____
_____
_____
_____

2. Have you experienced special or unique problems with the referenced contractor that the Government should be aware of in making our decision?

_____
_____

3.

IH-AB-06EDM1 - Adhesive Bonding Procedures and Requirements - Revision: A

1 Purpose

To provide detailed work instruction for Adhesive Bonding Procedures and Requirements.

2 Scope

This document covers the procedure and requirements for acceptance of adhesive bonded parts associated with EDM1-06-099 and EDM1-06-100.

3 Consumable Supplies

When standard materials cannot be utilized, either because an adequate material is not listed or because the performance and product characteristics of those listed are not suitable, commercial materials may be used with permission. The following list is intended to be descriptive and not restrictive. Substitute materials and processes which meet or exceed properties of those listed may be used with permission of Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head Division appointed adhesive bonding representative.

Material	Source
Primer SS4004	General Electric Co., Waterford, NY
RTV-60	General Electric Co., Waterford, NY

4 Surface Preparation

4.1 Verify bonding surfaces are clear of any loose material such as metal shavings or powder. Surfaces which will receive primer must be thoroughly cleaned.

4.2 Cleaning with solvents other than alcohol or acetone may be done at the engineer's request and the result the responsibility of the contracted manufacturer.

5 Priming

5.1 As soon as possible after surface preparation, apply a thin coat of thoroughly stirred SS4004 primer to all mating surfaces which will receive the potting compound. Cure for one hour at room temperature.

5.2 Perform sealant application within two hours after priming.

6 Sealant Application

6.1 Coat all primed, mating surface with RTV-60.

6.2 Remove excess RTV-60 from internal conduit joint surface after complete component assembly. Allow an approximate 1/16" bead of excess RTV-60 at external conduit component interface.

6.3 Cure per manufacture instructions.

4.

IH-WP-06EDM1 - Electron Beam Weld Procedures and Requirements - Revision: A

7 Purpose

To provide detailed work instruction for Electronic Beam Weld Procedures and Requirements.

8 Scope

This document covers the procedure and requirements for acceptance of electron beam welded parts associated with EDM1-06-099 and EDM1-06-100.

9 Detail Requirements

Electron beam welding shall be in accordance with AMS 2681B and the following agreed to exceptions:

9.1 Cleaning with solvents other than alcohol or acetone may be done at the engineer's request and the result the responsibility of the contracted manufacturer.

9.2 Operators shall be certified in accordance with either MIL-STD-1595 or MIL-W-46132 or the appropriate superseding specification.

9.3 Due to subsequent machining and outside processing, weldments will not be stamped unless requested by contracted manufacturer. As a minimum a job card indicating purchase order, part number and quantity shall be maintained to identify all weldments made by such personnel.

9.4 Unless otherwise requested on purchase order, one weld schedule, per part number, will be established indicating joint configurations and alloy combinations as a minimum requirement. If an identical weld schedule serves several part numbers, one schedule listing applicable part numbers is acceptable.

9.5 Any machine may be used as long as the sample meets the blueprint requirements and the qualified parameters are within 10% of those settings. Operator must be certified.

9.6 Venting of chamber less than 2 minutes after completion of welding may occur if approved by Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head Division appointed weld representative and reflected on the weld schedule.

9.7 Each weld may be traceable by time card only, as a minimum.

9.8 Post weld machining or blending shall not decrease material thickness by more that 5% of weld depth of penetration unless otherwise specified on the drawing.

9.9 Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head Division shall require transverse sectioning of weld direction only, unless otherwise indicated in the purchase order or drawing.

9.10 In addition to visual inspection at 10X magnification and when mechanically feasible, all welds shall be hydro tested at one-and-a-half times the maximum operating pressure.

9.11 Less than 0.010 inch of parent metal from each side of the joint may be necessary on designs due to thin materials or when heat input is a factor. Approval by Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head Division appointed weld representative is required prior to processing.

9.12 Contracted manufacturer is responsible for all required N.D.T. unless noted on purchase order or otherwise agreed to in writing.

Unless otherwise specified on drawing, all welds that cannot be proved through hydro-test shall be penetrant inspected as follows:

Penetrant inspect electron beam welds in accordance with MIL-STD-6866, Type I, Method D, sensitivity Level II. Penetrant material IAW MIL-I-25135. Acceptance – No cracks allowed.

9.13 One sample per required depth of penetration is acceptable for certification.

9.14 Report showing the results of tests can include transverse samples only unless previously agreed to in writing and/or included in purchase order. All other requirements of this section are applicable.

9.15 Identification of welded parts is the responsibility of contracted manufacturer.

9.16 Contracted manufacturer will provide the containers to be used for packaging of weldments.

5.

Answer to Technical Questions submitted by vendor:

1. Drawing EDMI-06-099 note #1 refers to an IH-WP-06EDMI welding spec. Can that spec. along with other IH specs. Referenced in the TDP be made available?

IH-WP-06EDM1 and IH-AB-06EDM1 (are included in this amendment.)

2. Drawing EDMI-06-104 uses a non-standard sixe extruded conduit. Is there a supply source for such a component or must the offeror get those pieces extruded from a vendor that will only supply them by purchasing a billet of aluminum?

Parts made per EDM1-06-104 are not required to be extruded. There is no known current supply source for tubing matching the dimensions on the drawing. Alternate manufacturing methods may provide a cost savings at the contracted quantities. Welding multiple components is not considered an acceptable manufacturing method for EDM1-06-104.

6.

The closing date is hereby extended to August 01, 2006, 4:00 PM, E.S.T.