

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 1
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0005	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 11/08/2022	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NPS, DSC Contracting Services Div 12795 W. Alameda Pkwy P.O. Box 25287 Denver CO 80225-0287	CODE PDS	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) DOI, NPS, DSC Contracting Services 12795 W. Alameda Pkwy P.O. Box 25287 Denver CO 80225-0287	CODE PDS
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)		(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. 140P2022R0066	
		x 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 09/15/2022	
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE		

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 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 electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 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 letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication 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 ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	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 data, 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.)

Rebuild Paramount Ranch & Rocky Oaks Administrative Area, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, Agoura Hills, CA, SAMO-303051/310132

The purpose of Amendment No. 05 is incorporate the questions and answers on a Schedule of Changes with what information the NPS has now and to extend the proposal due date to 22 November 2022, no later than 5:00 pm Mountain Time. All other questions from contractors will be answered in Amendment 6. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged unless specified herein.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9 A 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) Joelle Mascarenas
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR <i>(Signature of person authorized to sign)</i>	15C. DATE SIGNED
16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA <i>(Signature of Contracting Officer)</i>	16C. DATE SIGNED

SAMO 303051/310132
Solicitation 140P2022R0066
Amendment 5
Schedule of Changes

- a. Proposals are extended to November 22, 2022, no later than 5:00 pm Mountain Time.
- b. Question and Responses – Official Government responses to questions from potential offerors are incorporated and provided below. There are more on the current excel spreadsheet but those will be provided in the next amendment, we are aware that these are not all of the questions submitted.

114. Contractor Question: We are assuming that the on-site Superintendent can also acts as the SSHO. And that the QC Manager can have no other duties. Please confirm this, or clarify it as needed.

Government Response: There is nothing limiting the role of the Superintendent within the solicitation. Reference the specifications for the QC Manager's limitations and qualifications.

121. Contractor Question: In the solicitation (page 49 of 55, Section E Volume I, Tech Proposal, following Factor 6) there is a final category of content named "OTHER SUBMITTALS". Is there something additional we should be providing in this section, or are we to leave it blank? Is there any information we can provide here that could contribute to the Best Value Continuum Tradeoff Process mentioned in the Solicitation under Section M, Item A (Basis for Award)?

Government Response: Any "other submittals" provided will be at the offeror's discretion and can include any necessary supplemental information to the technical proposal.

122. Contractor Question: Please confirm that Factor 3 has no page limit.

Government Response: Factor 3 does not have a specific page limit.

123. Contractor Question: Please confirm that the schedule to be submitted in Factor 3 is a summary level schedule that includes major milestones and activities, i.e., not a full construction schedule to the level of detail that would be expected after award.

Government Response: This is a difficult question to provide a firm answer to. The schedule must address/comply with what is specified for Factor 3 in Sections L and M of the solicitation. The contractor will need to use their discretion in determining how much detail needs to be included.

124. Contractor Question: Rocky Oaks - Specification 33 32 00 paragraph 2.3.C states that the contractor shall provide the contracting officer a process performance warranty certifying the system meets all pretreatment criteria standards required by LA County. The manufacturer typically provides a design review letter that ensures it will perform to the water quality objectives. This letter is submitted to LA County Health Dept for approval. The AdvanTex dealer requires this approval prior quoting the project. There is no record of this project being submitting to LA County Health Department for approval. In order for the contractor to obtain pricing on this system, can you please coordinate with the engineer of record to have this project submitted to the LA County Health Dept?

Government Response: Pretreatment system must meet standard county requirements for a NOWTS

system and water quality objectives to be attained with their device can be reinforced within the design review letter. A process performance warranty is not strictly necessary and can be removed from the specifications requirements as the design review letter will confirm the treated effluent quality meets the correct standards.

As this system is on federal property, it will not be submitted to the LA County Health Department. The federal government does not seek approval of local government entities.

125. Contractor Question: Rocky Oaks - Drawing SS3.0 detail 2 shows an AdvanTex A20 2 pod mode 1A unit for the septic system. The AdvanTex dealer has performed a cursory review of the project and has expressed concern that this project will not conform with LA County Local Agency Management Plan. Does the government intend to submit this project for review to the LA County Health Department? We will be unable to obtain a quote from AdvanTex until this is complete.

Government Response: The AdvanTex dealer suggested these two design modifications that would alleviate their concerns about conforming to the LA County Local Agency Management Plan:

- Instead of using a single 2500 gal recirculation tank with two AX20 pods as shown on the plans, use one AX40RT pod and tank combo. This should be a lower capital cost than the pod/concrete tank system which should be a benefit to NPS.
- VCOM panel instead of the TCOM indicated on the plans. This provides more control and alarm capability with the proposed controller type change.

These modifications are acceptable.

- No, per response above. Other comparable products can be used.

132. Contractor Question: Please advise if the bid date can be moved back. A Monday morning bid will deter a lot of subcontractors from submitting quotes. We want to make sure we have the most competitive pricing for the NPS.

Government Response: Please refer to the latest amendment for the current proposal submission deadline.