

MISSION SUPPORT AND TEST SERVICES, LLC

UNDER PRIME CONTRACT DE-NA0003624 WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ACTING THROUGH
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
POST OFFICE BOX 98521
LAS VEGAS, NV 89193-8521

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

DATE OF AMENDMENT: 7/20/2026

NUMBER: RFP-0037941-26-VC

IMPORTANT: PROPOSALS WILL BE RECEIVED UNTIL August 6, 2026, at 12:00PM PST LOCAL TIME. PROPOSALS ARE TO BE PROVIDED AS DETAILED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL.

INQUIRIES SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO: Vanessa Clark, MISSION SUPPORT AND TEST SERVICES, LLC, NORTH LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, TELEPHONE NUMBER (702) 907-3312, Email; ClarkVL@nv.doe.gov. IF SUCH INQUIRIES ARE OF A COMPLEX NATURE OR SCOPE, THEY SHOULD BE IN WRITING.

AMENDMENT NO. 03

SUBJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL No. 0039741-26-VC, DATED: 5/27/2026 FOR the purchase of NNSS General Construction Design Build IS HEREBY AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Proposal due date is hereby extended until August 6, 2026 at 12:00 PM PST.*
- 2. Part A – SOLICITATION, Section 2.0. Proposal Submittal and Deadline has been extended to August 6, 2026 at 12:00 PM PST.*
- 3. Part A – SOLICITATION, Section 3.1. Mandatory Minimum Requirements has been revised to clarify Mandatory Minimum Qualification Requirements 2, 3 and 4 to align with the permitted Direct, Joint Venture, and Subcontracting/Teaming Structures established in Amendment 01.*
- 4. Part A – SOLICITATION, Section 3.2. Tradeoff Selection Process has been revised to includes notes for Criterion 01 and Criterion 02.*
- 5. Part B – SOLICITATION FORMS, Form 005 Past Performance Questionnaire has been revised to reflect August 6, 2026 at 12:00 PM PST.*
- 6. Part C – DRAFT BLANKET MASTER AGREEMENT, List of Attachments, Attachment No. 1 has been updated to the most current version.*
- 7. Attachment 01 has been replaced in its entirety.*
- 8. To include the following Questions and Answers:*

Question No.	Question	MSTS Response
1	Section 3.1 requires the Offeror to be a licensed Nevada engineering firm. Our firm is a general contractor and would intend to propose as the prime Offeror, teaming with a licensed Nevada engineering firm as our design subcontractor to fulfill the engineering and design requirements of the SOW. Would MSTS consider this teaming structure responsive to the mandatory minimum qualification requirements in Section 3.1?	Yes, this teaming structure is acceptable. MSTS will consider a proposal responsive where a general contractor acts as the Prime Offeror, and partners with a licensed engineering firm subcontractor authorized to practice in the State of Nevada, to fulfill the requirements of the solicitation. MSTS has issued Amendment 01 to the solicitation, modifying Section 3.1 to allow this qualification to be met by either the Offeror, Joint Venture or its designated design subcontractor.
2	On the pricing sheets quite a few areas have Black-out / blocked line items. Example (Just to reference 1) on 08 Compensation Schedule AMD-1 SOV Tab - Bond / Badging / Training / MOB / De-Mob. These line items are all Blacked out and are cost of overall Pricing.	The detailed pricing fields have been intentionally restricted, as cost element breakdown for these lines is not required. Offerors shall provide a single lump-sum amount in the subtotal cell for these line items.
3	For Task 2 (Restroom Up grades) not seeing any Drawings / plans / Demo schedules / New equipment / Tile / Fixture requirements. Since the site visit is limited to just 3 participants we will need much more to provide a detailed / precise bid.	Drawings and Displays (photographs) for Task Order 2 are available and can be provided once an agreement to the Click-Wrap Non Disclosure Agreement (NDA) has been provided. A separate email outlining the Click-Wrap NDA has been provided to each firm in attendance at the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference held on June 23, 2026. The detailed requirements are listed in TO-2 Exhibit B, and MSTS expects offerors to propose creative solutions. This project utilizes a phased approach encompassing discovery, planning, development, conceptual design, and construction execution.
4	Please provide the anticipated aggregate ceiling value of the BMA and, if available, historical annual spend for comparable design-build construction services procured under similar agreements.	Although a definitive ceiling amount cannot be determined at this time, a contract ceiling range of approximately \$50M to \$75M is anticipated for this BMA. While MSTS is not providing historical spend data at this stage, the BMA is designed to provide maximum flexibility in addressing our ongoing and evolving general construction needs. Funding and project execution under this agreement will be determined on a task-by-task basis, subject to agency requirements and funding availability. Individual Task Orders will detail the specific scope and estimated project magnitude.

5	<i>Please provide the anticipated range, frequency, and average value of task orders expected to be issued under this BMA.</i>	<i>Individual Task Orders are anticipated to vary in scope, but will fall within the general construction scope established in Exhibit B of the BMA. Because the frequency and specific timing of these projects are entirely dependent on agency requirements and funding availability, MSTS cannot provide an estimated average annual frequency or a definitive average task order value at this time. Detailed requirements, scopes of work, and performance schedules will be provided individually with each Task Order solicitation as funding is secured.</i>
6	<i>Please describe the anticipated design review and approval process for future BMA task orders, including MSTS, NNSA, DOE, STR, and third-party review responsibilities and expected review durations.</i>	<i>The anticipated turnaround time for design reviews is approximately two (2) to three (3) weeks; however, actual response times will vary depending on the complexity and level of effort (LOE) required for each specific Task Order. All design reviews will be conducted internally by MSTS only, and will not require external review or approval.</i>
7	<i>Will environmental permitting, NEPA documentation, cultural resource reviews, utility clearances, and similar owner-furnished approvals be provided by MSTS, or will those services be required under future task orders?</i>	<i>These approvals and clearances will be provided by MSTS and are not the responsibility of the Subcontractor under future Task Orders. These processes are managed through MSTS Forms FRM-901 and FRM-909. The MSTS Project Manager will submit these forms on behalf of the Subcontractor, coordinating with the Subcontractor to gather any necessary technical or design inputs.</i>
8	<i>Please confirm whether all construction task orders issued under the BMA will be subject to the NNSA Project Labor Agreement (PLA) dated October 1, 2025, and identify any anticipated exceptions.</i>	<i>MSTS confirms that the NNSA Project Labor Agreement (PLA) dated October 1, 2025, is fully incorporated into the Blanket Master Agreement (BMA). Consequently, all construction Task Orders issued under this BMA will be subject to the terms and conditions of the PLA. There are no anticipated exceptions at this time.</i>
9	<i>What is the current average processing time for issuance of PIV credentials and site access badges for uncleared contractor personnel?</i>	<i>The average turnaround time for the issuance of site access badges and PIV credentials is approximately two (2) weeks. This timeline begins only after all required background checks, badging documentation, and mandatory site-specific training have been fully completed and verified.</i>

10	<i>Will Davis-Bacon wage determinations be incorporated at the BMA level or established separately for each task order?</i>	<i>MSTS confirms that Davis-Bacon wage determinations are fully incorporated into the Blanket Master Agreement (BMA), they will not be established separately for each task order.</i>
11	<i>Please provide the anticipated percentage distribution of work among design/engineering services, construction management services, and construction execution services.</i>	<i>A predetermined percentage distribution of work among design, construction management, and construction execution cannot be provided at this time.</i> <i>Individual Task Orders issued under this BMA may include any combination or number of these phases (e.g., design-only, construction-only, or full design-build), and MSTs reserves the sole option to structure the scope of each Task Order based on project-specific requirements.</i> <i>Subcontractors must maintain the capability and flexibility to execute any or all of these phases as described in Exhibit B of the BMA. However, the general, primary focus of the projects issued under this BMA is anticipated to be design-build general construction.</i>
12	<i>The BMA solicitation requires submission of eight Key Personnel resumes, while TO-1 and TO-2 identify specific personnel required for task-order execution. Please confirm whether MSTs expects the same proposed Key Personnel to support both TO-1 and TO-2 concurrently, or whether separate personnel may be proposed for each task order provided all BMA Key Personnel requirements are satisfied.</i>	<i>MSTS has no specific expectation regarding staffing approach for Key Personnel; it is the Subcontractor's determination whether to propose the same or separate personnel for TO-1 and TO-2. Both approaches are acceptable provided all BMA requirements are met. However, if an Offeror elects to propose the same individuals for both Task Orders, they must account for the following critical exception: if both Task Orders are in the active construction phase concurrently, the same individual cannot be utilized for both projects.</i> <i>During active construction, specific Key Personnel require a dedicated, full-time, on-site presence to ensure compliance and life safety while physical work is being performed. Therefore, if the construction execution schedules for TO-1 and TO-2 overlap (at proposal submission or during post-award performance), the same individual cannot be utilized for on-site oversight positions to ensure safety and regulatory compliance. This applies to all future Task Orders issued under this BMA.</i>

13	<i>Please identify the anticipated facilities and geographic locations expected to utilize this BMA, including whether task orders may be issued for work at locations outside Nevada, and provide historical task-order distribution by location if available.</i>	<i>All physical project work and on-site performance under this BMA and all subsequent Task Orders will be conducted at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS).</i>
14	<i>The RFP appears to have some ambiguity about the requirements and what goes where. For instance, KP resumes are Criterion 6, but also listed as a separate bullet. QA/QC Program is the fourth bullet, but also listed separately as Form 16. Safety Plan is the fifth bullet, but also the Form 13. Are Offeror expected to address these requirements under multiple headings?</i>	<i>Offerors do not need to provide redundant narratives under multiple headings. To clarify:</i> <i><u>Key Personnel:</u> Please note that Key Personnel resumes are evaluated under Criterion 5 (rather than Criterion 6). Resumes should be included in the technical proposal as specified under that evaluation criterion.</i> <i><u>Required Forms:</u> Completing and submitting the requested forms (e.g., Form 13 for the Safety Plan and Form 16 for the QA/QC Program) satisfies the evaluation requirement for those specific items.</i> <i>The bulleted list in Section 4.4.1 of the solicitation is intended as a general checklist of all essential information that must be included in the overall technical proposal.</i> <i>Offerors should ensure all requested information is completed and submitted, but duplicate narratives across different sections of the proposal are not required.</i>
15	<i>Do we submit the table under 13. Key Personnel and, if so, where?</i>	<i>No, the table included in Section 13 will be completed at time of award, based on the Key Personnel resumes included and evaluated under Criterion 5 of the solicitation.</i>
16	<i>The PPQ Form is listed as part of the Technical Volume, but the form itself says the person completing the form must email it directly to MSTs. Are we to provide a list of the individuals submitting the PPQs where the Section 4.4.1 indicates to place the form within the Technical Volume?</i>	<i>No, Offerors do not need to provide a list of individuals submitting the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) within the Technical Volume. The completed PPQ forms sent directly by the evaluating references to the designated Procurement Specialist will satisfy this requirement. Incoming PPQs will be tracked and matched to the corresponding Offeror's proposal upon receipt.</i>

17	<i>The Workplace Substance Abuse Program is a subbullet requirement for the Technical Volume, yet the Form 012 – Certification Regarding Substance Abuse at DOE Sites is required in the Volume II – Business and Price Proposal. Please confirm that these are to be addressed in the separate volumes.</i>	<i>Confirmed. The narrative or plan describing the Offeror's Workplace Substance Abuse Program should be submitted within Volume I – Technical Proposal, while the signed Form 012 (Certification Regarding Substance Abuse at DOE Sites) must be submitted within Volume II – Business and Price Proposal. Please ensure both elements are placed in their respective volumes as indicated.</i>
18	<i>Should offerors provide separate organizational charts and staffing assignments for TO-1 and TO-2, or will MSTS evaluate staffing based solely on the BMA organizational structure and Key Personnel submissions?</i>	<i>Offerors are required to submit separate, dedicated organizational charts and staffing plans for both TO-1 and TO-2.</i> <i>While the same individuals may be proposed on both Task Order charts (subject to the concurrent active construction on-site limitations previously clarified in response to Question 12), a distinct organizational chart must be provided for each Task Order to demonstrate the project-specific roles, responsibilities, and reporting hierarchy. MSTS will evaluate staffing at both the BMA program level and the individual Task Order execution level.</i>
19	<i>Please clarify how TO-1 and TO-2 proposals will be evaluated in relation to the BMA award. Specifically, will task-order technical approaches and pricing be separately evaluated and scored, or will they be considered as demonstrations of the offeror's capability under the BMA evaluation criteria?</i>	<i>To clarify the evaluation structure:</i> <i><u>Pricing Evaluation:</u> Because the BMA solicitation does not contain pricing, price evaluations will be conducted exclusively at the Task Order level. Although the pricing for TO-1 and TO-2 will be evaluated separately in accordance with their respective solicitations, the overall combined price of both TO-1 and TO-2 will be used to determine the final award.</i> <i><u>Technical Evaluation:</u> The overall capability of the Offeror will be evaluated holistically. Offerors will be evaluated on their capability through their ability to meet the comprehensive requirements of the BMA solicitation and both concurrent Task Order solicitations (TO-1 and TO-2) as a whole.</i>

20	<i>TO-1 includes Discovery, Planning, Design, Construction, Risk Register, WBS, and formal design review requirements. Should offerors assume future task orders issued under the BMA will generally follow this same phase-gated project delivery model?</i>	<i>Yes, the phase-gated model in TO-1 represents a standard full-lifecycle project format under this BMA.</i> <i>However, MSTS reserves the sole option to customize the scope of future Task Orders based on project-specific needs. Depending on engineering and operational requirements, future Task Orders may encompass this entire phased lifecycle (from discovery through construction) or consist of only a subset of these phases (e.g., design-only, construction-only) as described in Exhibit B of the BMA. Offerors must maintain the operational flexibility to adapt to varying Task Order structures.</i>
21	<i>For Criterion 6, will Key Personnel be evaluated based solely on the qualifications of the individuals proposed, or will MSTS also evaluate the extent to which the proposed personnel have previously worked together as an integrated team?</i>	<i>Clarification: Key Personnel are evaluated under Criterion 5 of the solicitation (rather than Criterion 6).</i> <i>Key Personnel will be evaluated based on the individual qualifications of each proposed candidate, specifically focusing on citizenship, education, professional training, certifications, professional license(s), and the state(s) the license(s) is/are held, years of relevant experience and longevity with the Offeror.</i> <i>There is no requirement or evaluation preference regarding whether the proposed individuals have previously worked together as an integrated team. However, individual candidates who exceed the stated minimum qualifications may be evaluated more favorably.</i>
22	<i>For Mandatory Minimum Requirements 2, 3, and 4, may the Offeror satisfy these requirements through a formally identified teaming arrangement and proposed lower-tier subcontractors, or must these qualifications be held by the Prime Offeror itself?</i>	<i>Yes. In alignment with the flexible licensing structures established in Amendment No. 01, the qualifications for Mandatory Minimum Requirements 2, 3, and 4 may be satisfied collectively by the proposing team (including Joint Venture members and/or designated design subcontractors), based on the specific scope of work each entity is proposed to perform.</i> <i>To ensure procurement integrity and formalize this structure, MSTS has issued Amendment No. 03 to modify the text of these Mandatory Minimum Requirements.</i>

23	<i>Please clarify whether the proposed key personnel are required to be onsite for the duration of the contract, or if remote or hybrid support will be permitted.</i>	<i>Key Personnel are required to be onsite full-time during the construction phase of the Task Order. However, remote or hybrid work arrangements are permissible for other project phases, such as design phase, provided that all performance requirements and project schedules continue to be met.</i>
24	<i>State of Nevada requires that companies performing Architectural services in the State have at least (2) Board Members as licensed Architects.</i> <i>Since NNSS is a Government-owned facility, does this requirement hold or is having Architects licensed in Nevada acceptable for this procurement (like Professional Engineers having registrations in Nevada)?</i>	<i>MSTS establishes its own subcontract technical and qualification requirements. Subcontractors are responsible for consulting their own legal counsel to verify compliance with all applicable state and federal licensing regulations. While certain exemptions may apply to work performed by the Subcontractor on federally owned property, Subcontractors must ensure they do not hold themselves out to the public or advertise as licensed architects or corporate architectural entities in the State of Nevada unless they fully comply with state licensing requirements.</i>
25	<i>Could you provide any drawings for the bathrooms and Bunker? If drawings are not available, dimensions and SF for work. (i.e. wall tile, floor tile, painting)</i>	<i>Drawings are not available for TO-1.</i> <i>For TO-2, please refer to the response for Question 3.</i>
26	<i>Can you provide model numbers of the items needed to be replaced or updated in the bunker? Are there temperatures to be maintained?</i>	<i>The model numbers for the equipment to be replaced or updated are as follows:</i> <i>Cooling Tower: Baltimore Aircoil Co – Model # VFL-02432J7D</i> <i>Vertical Heat Pumps (Qty: 2): Carrier – Model # 50PSV070LCC60130</i> <i>5-Ton Heat Pump (Qty: 1): Carrier – Model # 50RVR060LCC60130</i> <i>HVAC Unit: Liebert – Model # DME027EP</i> <i>Temperature Requirements: The HVAC system must be capable of achieving and maintaining standard commercial indoor comfort temperatures. There are no specialized or high-tolerance environmental temperature control requirements beyond standard commercial comfort heating and cooling standards.</i>

27	<i>It was mentioned that certain items were to be salvaged within the bathrooms. Can you let us know what items are to be salvaged?</i>	<i>The items designated for salvage within the restrooms for TO-2 are the toilet partitions and stall doors. MSTS has revised Exhibit B to formally incorporate this specific salvage requirement into the Statement of Work, in Amendment No. 03.</i>
28	<i>Can you clarify what the disposal procedures are for all projects? It sounded like all disposal will be the responsibility of MSTS. (i.e. MSTS to provide us dumpsters)</i>	<i>MSTS will be responsible for providing the dumpsters and designating the disposal locations for both TO-1 and TO- 2 executed under the BMA. These disposal areas and dumpsters will be located on-site at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) in close proximity to the active work area for each respective Task Order.</i> <i>The subcontractor will be responsible for safely transporting all demolition debris and waste from the immediate work area, loading it into the MSTS-provided dumpsters and/or disposal site, and strictly adhering to NNSS waste segregation guidelines.</i>
29	<i>Bonding capacity is a 10M aggregate limit. Can this be lessened to allow for local small businesses to participate?</i>	<i>MSTS will not reduce the aggregate bonding capacity requirement below \$10,000,000.</i> <i>Because this BMA is structured to support the concurrent execution of multiple active projects, MSTS must ensure that the selected Offeror possesses the financial baseline and surety backing to sustain an aggregate workload of up to \$10,000,000 at any given point during peak performance. While actual performance and payment bonds will be issued on an individual basis at 100% of each awarded Task Order's specific value, the \$10,000,000 aggregate capacity is a mandatory qualification to mitigate overall program risk.</i>

30	<i>We respectfully request approval to substitute LG Electronics in lieu of Mitsubishi Electric as the manufacturer for the specified HVAC equipment on the above-referenced project.</i> <i>We certify that the proposed LG equipment is fully compatible with the intended application and will not adversely affect system performance, operation, or the project warranty. Any design modifications required as a result of this substitution will be identified and coordinated during the A/E review phase of the project.</i> <i>Our firm provides comprehensive support for LG products through our dedicated Las Vegas-based service team, which includes an LG product specialist and multiple factory-certified technicians. This local expertise ensures responsive startup, warranty service, technical support, throughout the life of the installation.</i>	<i>The request to substitute LG Electronics in lieu of the specified Mitsubishi Electric equipment is declined.</i> <i>To ensure long-term operational efficiency and minimize lifecycle costs across the facility portfolio, MSTS mandates equipment standardization for this system. Because MSTS assumes full responsibility for the maintenance and repair of the HVAC systems immediately following the expiration of the Subcontractor's warranty period, all installed equipment must align with established in-house maintenance programs. This includes utilizing components that are compatible with existing spare-parts inventories and can be serviced by MSTS technicians who are already factory-trained and certified specifically on the specified Mitsubishi Electric systems.</i>
31	<i>The RFP Section 3.1.1.c states the following: "Subcontracting/Teaming Structure: The Prime Offeror is a licensed contractor (e.g. General Contractor) and has teamed with a subcontractor that is a licensed engineering firm authorized to practice in the State of Nevada." Amendment 1 Q&A 1 states: "MSTS has issued Amendment No. 01 to the solicitation, modifying Section 3.1 to allow this qualification to be met by either the Offeror, Joint Venture or its designated design subcontractor." If a Prime Offeror's designated design subcontractor's application to become a licensed Nevada engineering firm is pending at time of proposal submission, will MSTS consider the Offeror's proposal to be compliant with this Section 3.1.1.c?</i>	<i>No. To be deemed responsive, the designated engineering subcontractor must hold an active Nevada license at the time of proposal submission. A pending application does not meet this mandatory minimum qualification.</i>

32	<i>If a Prime Offeror submits a proposal with a team that includes a designated design subcontractor, is the design subcontractor considered to be a lower-tier subcontractor and, therefore, required to submit the following three forms: (1) Form 003 Proposed Lower-Tier Subcontractors; (2) Form 004 Lower-Tier Subcontractor Experience Statement; and (3) Form 015 Lower-Tier Subcontractor Safety and Health History?</i>	<i>Yes, in the scenario presented the designated design subcontractor is considered to be a lower-tier subcontractor and required to submit the Lower-Tier Subcontractor forms.</i> <i>To assist prospective bidders in preparing compliant proposals, MSTS provides the following crucial clarification regarding the contractual relationships, roles, and definitions applicable to this solicitation:</i> <i><u>The Contractor:</u> Refers strictly to MSTS.</i> <i><u>The Offeror:</u> Refers strictly to the single legal entity, a formally established Joint Venture, or the Prime Offeror in a subcontracting/teaming structure.</i> <i><u>Lower-Tier Subcontractor:</u> Refers to any teaming partner, subcontractor, or design/engineering firm proposed under the Offeror/Prime Offeror.</i>
33	<i>Will MSTS consider extending the deadline for PPQs to align with the deadline for proposals to be submitted on July 30, 2026?</i>	<i>Amendment 03, has extended the deadline for PPQ submission to August 6, 2026.</i>

34	<i>Will MSTS please clarify the definition of an "Offeror" under the requirements of the solicitation; specifically, whether a design subcontractor relied upon to meet the 3.1.1 licensing requirement is also to be considered an "Offeror" under the terms of the solicitation? For example, does MSTS require experience and past performance information from the Design Subcontractor in addition to the General Contractor "Prime Offeror"?</i>	<i>See response to Question 32 for clarification on the definition of "Offeror" applicable to this solicitation.</i> <i>To ensure consistency with the teaming and Joint Venture structures permitted under Amendment No. 01 and Amendment No. 03, MSTS will evaluate the past performance of the proposed team collectively.</i> <i>Offerors are permitted to rely on the experience and past performance of their proposed design subcontractor to meet the design and engineering portions of both Criterion 01 & 02. If design subcontractor experience and/or past performance is submitted, the Offeror must submit a signed Teaming Agreement, executed Letter of Commitment, or formal subcontract agreement between the Prime Offeror and the design subcontractor with their proposal. This agreement must confirm that the design subcontractor is committed to performing the design work under the resulting BMA and any subsequent task order issued thereunder. Failure to submit this executed agreement will result in the design subcontractor's experience and/or past performance being excluded from evaluation.</i> <i>Amendment No. 03 formally updated the language of Criterion 01 and Criterion 02 to reflect this collective team evaluation.</i>
35	<i>Will MSTS please clarify the definition of an "Offeror" under the requirements of the solicitation; specifically, whether a design subcontractor relied upon to meet the 3.1.1 licensing requirement is also to be considered an "Offeror" under the terms of the solicitation? For example, may a Design Subcontractor's experience be relied upon by a General Contractor to meet the requirements of 3.1.2?</i>	<i>See response to Question 32 and Question 34.</i>

36	<i>May a design subcontractor's experience and past performance information be relied upon, in part, to satisfy the Evaluation Criteria 1 and 2 requirement of the Offeror?</i>	<i>Yes. See response to Question 34.</i> <i>However, to rely on a subcontractor's qualifications for evaluation scoring, the proposed team must clearly delineate in their proposal which entity performed the referenced projects and how that experience and /or past performance directly relates to their assigned scope of work. If awarded, the Prime Offeror will be contractually obligated to utilize the designated design subcontractor for any SOW design scope under the resulting BMA and any subsequent task order issued thereunder. Substituting the design subcontractor post-award without written approval from the MSTS Procurement Representative may be grounds for termination.</i>
37	<i>How many bathrooms will NNSS allow to be taken down at one time?</i>	<i>Per RFP-0036697-26-VC, Attachment 01, Section 3.4.1, only two restrooms may be out of service concurrently (one men's and one women's). The project must be phased to allow MSTS staff continued restroom access. Construction will begin with Room 194 and Room 195. The SUBCONTRACTOR may only commence work on the remaining two restrooms, Room 110 and Room 112, upon the successful completion and acceptance of the first two restrooms by the CONTRACTOR.</i>
38	<i>Will NNSS allow a roll off in the parking lot during bathroom demo?</i>	<i>See response to Question 28.</i>
39	<i>The requirement to have a full time safety, superintendent if both projects are working at the same time can we use the same ones or are they required to be on one site at a time?</i>	<i>See response to Question 12.</i>

40	<i>Please clarify whether Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) are required for proposed subcontractors, or if they are only required for the prime contractor past performance.</i>	<i>Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) are required for the Offeror (i.e., the single legal entity, formally established Joint Venture, or Prime Offeror). As a general rule, PPQs are not required for lower-tier subcontractors or teaming partners. In accordance with Criterion 02, the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance will include an assessment of their capability to effectively coordinate and manage lower-tier subcontractors.</i> <i>However, if an Offeror elects to rely on the past performance of its proposed design subcontractor to meet the design and engineering requirements, a PPQ must be submitted for the design subcontractor's referenced project(s). If the design subcontractor's past performance is not being leveraged to meet this requirement, a PPQ is not required.</i>
41	<i>The BOA solicitation does not identify any SOW milestone dates. Please confirm that the requirement to provide a preliminary Subcontract Work Plan and Schedule in Critical Path Method (CPM) format applies only to the Task Order(s), rather than to the BOA.</i>	<i>Clarification: This solicitation is for a Blanket Master Agreement (BMA) (rather than a BOA).</i> <i>Confirmed. The requirement to provide a preliminary Subcontract Work Plan and Schedule in Critical Path Method (CPM) format applies only to the Task Orders.</i>
42	<i>Does each seed project require (3) separate individuals to act as Superintendent, QCM & SSHO or can one person perform dual-hat responsibilities?</i>	<i>No, three (3) separate individuals are not required for each task order. The roles of Quality Control Manager (QCM) and Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO) may be performed by a single, dual-hatted individual, if approved by MSTs. However, the Project Superintendent must be a dedicated role and is strictly prohibited from serving as either the QCM or the SSHO.</i>

43	<i>Are any existing hazardous material reports available for both Restrooms and HVAC projects?</i>	<i>Hazardous material assessments have been conducted. Detailed information regarding site conditions and known hazards can be found in Exhibit B, under the following sections:</i> <i>Task Order 1:</i> <i>Section 3.9, Site Conditions and Known Hazards (Facility Specific)</i> <i>Task Order 2:</i> <i>Section 3.6, Site Conditions and Known Hazards (Facility Specific)</i> <i>Separate hazardous material reports will not be issued, as all relevant findings and requirements are documented in Exhibit B, as stated above.</i>
44	<i>Can any existing as-built drawings be provided for both task orders?</i>	<i>See response to Question 3 and Question 25.</i>
45	<i>Will temporary cooling be required for the BEEF Bunker project once the existing cooling system is removed?</i>	<i>No.</i>
46	<i>If temp cooling is not required, will temporary air blowers be required in the BEEF Bunker while workers are present once the existing cooling is removed?</i>	<i>No.</i>
47	<i>Are there any personnel limits inside the BEEF Bunker for workers?</i>	<i>No.</i>
48	<i>On the BEEF Bunker task order, can an equivalent manufacturer be used in lieu of Mitsubishi mini-splits?</i>	<i>See response to Question 30.</i>
49	<i>For bidding purposes, are we to assume all existing duct work be utilized for the new HVAC system at the BEEF Bunker?</i>	<i>Yes. For bidding purposes, the Offeror shall assume that all existing ductwork is in acceptable condition and will be utilized for the new HVAC system at the BEEF Bunker. If any differing or unforeseen site conditions are identified during post-award inspection or discovery, they will be evaluated and addressed by the Contractor (MSTS).</i>

50	<i>Please confirm if a full design will be required for the restroom renovations</i>	<i>No, a full design is not required. In accordance with Section 3.2.2.1, Universal Conceptual Design, the SUBCONTRACTOR is only required to produce and deliver a conceptual design (approximately a 15% design level, including floor plans and elevations) to replace and install all equipment and furnishings in the four (4) restrooms.</i>
51	<i>Please confirm the Government will provide temporary restrooms while the existing restrooms are out of service during renovations.</i>	<i>Confirmed. MSTs will provide temporary restrooms during renovations.</i>
52	<i>For bidding purposes, please confirm restroom flooring shall be epoxy since there is no alternate option pricing listed.</i>	<i>Epoxy is the baseline requirement for proposal purposes. Per SOW Section 3.3.1.1.2, SUBCONTRACTOR shall supply and install resilient, durable coatings like Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic (FRP) for the walls and cover the existing floor tile with epoxy. SUBCONTRACTOR is encouraged to propose alternate durable coatings and flooring solutions.</i> <i>While epoxy represents the minimum baseline, Offerors are encouraged to propose alternate durable flooring solutions (such as high-grade tile or other resilient coatings). Please clearly delineate any such alternatives and their associated pricing in your proposal.</i>
53	<i>For bidding purposes, please confirm new restroom walls shall be full-height FRP Paneling.</i>	<i>No, full-height FRP is not required. The paneling should extend to the height of the top of the toilet partitions.</i>
54	<i>For both task orders, will the Government be providing all recycling waste containers for existing equipment to be removed and disposed of?</i>	<i>See response to Question 28.</i>
55	<i>Can any photographs be provided of the (4) restrooms required to be remodeled?</i>	<i>See response to Question 3.</i>
56	<i>For Task Order 2, Will we need to do a full design submittal with an FPE stamp?</i>	<i>See response to Question 50.</i>

57	<i>For Task Order 2, the heads, are the current ones concealed or semi recessed and do they want new heads installed?</i>	<i>The existing fire suppression system is not being modified under TO-2. No changes to, or replacements of, the sprinkler heads are required as they are outside the scope of this project.</i>
58	<i>For Task Order 2, Will we need to provide for 3rd party inspections?</i>	<i>No, third-party inspections are outside the scope of this project and are not required to be provided by the SUBCONTRACTOR. The SUBCONTRACTOR is responsible for submitting and executing a project-specific Quality Control Plan. The CONTRACTOR (MSTS) will provide Quality Assurance (QA) oversight to verify compliance with the approved plan.</i>
59	<i>For Task Order 2, Safe off of existing system?</i>	<i>See response to Question 57.</i>
60	<i>For Task Order 2, if the heads are hard piped, can we swap out for a flex head if they are moving?</i>	<i>See response to Question 57.</i>
61	<i>For Task Order 2, Are they currently hard lids & are they going back with hard lids or T-bar? There was no RCP plans in the package.</i>	<i>See response to Question 57.</i>
62	<i>Our design team asked us this morning if any photos can be requested to better see the objectives to come up with a design fee is this possible?</i>	<i>See response to Question 3 and 25.</i>
63	<i>Can MSTS provide as-built drawings for the Beef Bunker 04-300 and 06-900 Restrooms 110, 112, 194 & 195?</i>	<i>See response to Question 3 and Question 25.</i>

64	<i>In preparation of this bid, we've discovered that the specified Mitsubishi City Multi R-32 VRF Cooling System is only rated for a maximum of 109.4 degrees, and since Mercury regularly exceeds 109 degrees during the summer, we're concerned about system failure.</i> <i>This VRF System is unreliable in high-temperature environments, and failure of a single unit can bring down the entire system. The CCSD recently received emergency funding and is currently removing these VRF systems and replacing them with more conventional, reliable equipment. Please advise if we should consider an alternate cooling system.</i>	<i>MSTS acknowledges the operating temperature concerns regarding the previously specified VRF system at the Mercury site. Following further research, MSTS has revised Exhibit B of Task Order 2 to replace the system with a Mitsubishi R-32 Mini Split system.</i> <i>As detailed in the revised Exhibit B, the newly specified system must meet both of the following criteria:</i> <i>1. Thermal and operating requirements to ensure reliable performance during peak summer temperatures.</i> <i>2. Vibration, blast, and piping requirements.</i> <i>Please refer to the revised Exhibit B of TO-2, issued via Amendment 03, for the updated specifications and requirements.</i>
65	<i>In lieu of PPQs, given the government officials are no longer employed, is a contractor allowed to submit CPAR evaluations to show the performance of the project.</i>	<i>Yes. If government points of contact are no longer available to complete a PPQ, MSTS will accept finalized Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluations in lieu of a PPQ.</i> <i>The Offeror must submit the CPARS evaluation reports directly to the assigned Procurement Specialist via email by the established PPQ submission deadline.</i> <i>Please note the following conditions for CPARS submissions: Only finalized CPARS evaluations (completed and signed by both the Assessing Official and the Contractor) will be accepted. Draft, interim, or un-finalized CPARS evaluations will not be evaluated.</i>

9. *All else remains unchanged.*

When submitting your proposal, please acknowledge receipt of this amendment by indicating on the Offeror's Proposal Letter the number of amendments.