

October 5, 2009

Maurice Baskin

Via Email

T 202-344-4823
F 202.344.8300
mbaskin@venable.com

Procurement Law Control Group
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE
441 G. St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

**Re: North Branch Construction, Inc.'s Pre-Award Protest of Solicitation
No. DOL099RB20820 (Department of Labor Job Corps Center
Construction in Manchester, New Hampshire)**

Dear Sir or Madam:

In accordance with 31 U.S.C. §§ 3551-3556 and the Bid Protest Regulations of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), 4 C.F.R. Part 21 (2006), North Branch Construction, Inc. (hereafter "North Branch" or "the Protestor"), located at 76 Old Turnpike Road, Concord, NH 03301, (603) 224-3233, through its undersigned counsel Venable LLP, timely protests the Department of Labor's (DOL's) inclusion of a requirement in its Invitation for Bids No. DOL099RB20820 (the "Solicitation"), that any successful bidder for this project agree to enter into a Project Labor Agreement (PLA). See Exhibit 1, Pertinent Excerpts from the Solicitation, including Amendment 0001.¹ As further set forth below, this requirement unduly restricts competition, is wholly unsupported, and violates the Competition in Contracting Act, Executive Order 13502, the Small Business Act, and numerous procurement regulations. DOL's Solicitation appears to be the first and only federal agency solicitation since the enactment of the Competition in Contracting Act to attempt to impose a PLA requirement as a condition of allowing successful bidders to perform work on a federal construction project. GAO should adhere to its longstanding precedent and disallow DOL's unlawful bid restriction.

¹ The Solicitation does not explain what a PLA is, but the term "PLA" has been defined elsewhere as "a pre-hire collective bargaining agreement with one or more labor organizations that establishes the terms and conditions of employment for a specific construction project" See Executive Order 13502 (Feb. 6, 2009). As commonly understood in the construction industry, a PLA requires that the successful bidder agree to recognize one or more unions as its employees' exclusive bargaining representative and to require all employees and subcontractors hired onto the project to be bound by the PLA. See Section H of the Solicitation setting forth these conditions as minimum requirements of the PLA on this project. A PLA also generally requires contractors to hire most or all employees for the project exclusively from a union hiring hall, to contribute into union fringe benefit trust funds which will not benefit the contractor's own employees, to obtain apprentices exclusively from union apprenticeship programs, and to obey costly and inefficient union work rules. As further explained below, each of these requirements discriminates against non-union contractors and effectively prevents them from bidding on the project.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 2 of 22

The Contracting Officer is Ms. Marissa G. Dela Cerna, U.S. Department of Labor/OASAM/OPS, Division of Job Corps A/E and Construction Services, Room N-4308, 200 Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210. Phone: (202) 693-7983, Fax: (202) 693-7966.

I. Interested Party Status Of The Protestor.

Under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3551 and 3552, the Protestor is an “interested party” for purposes of filing this Protest because it is a prospective bidder whose direct economic interests would be affected by the award or failure to award the contract which is the subject of the Solicitation. 4 C.F.R. § 21.0(a). The Protestor is a qualified, small business general contractor who is eligible to bid on this construction project, is fully bonded and capable of performing the work specified in an efficient and economical manner, and desires to do so. But the Protestor is placed at a significant disadvantage in bidding under the Solicitation because of DOL’s unprecedented and unjustified inclusion of the restrictive PLA bid requirement as a condition of award.

II. Timeliness Of The Protest.

This protest is timely filed in accordance with 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a), in that it is being filed prior to the time set for the receipt of bids, which the Solicitation has established as November 5, 2009. Moreover, this protest is being filed within ten days after issuance of the Solicitation on October 1, 2009.

III. Required Suspension Of Contract Award.

DOL is prohibited from awarding a contract under the Solicitation pending resolution of this protest because the protest is being filed with the Comptroller General prior to award and prior to the November 5th due date for the submission of bids. See 31 U.S.C. § 3553(c)(1); FAR 33.104(b)(1).

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 3 of 22

IV. Background

A. The Solicitation.

The Solicitation at issue seeks to procure the construction of six (6) buildings totaling approximately 160,000 gross square feet. The facility will include a Welcome Center (1,427 GSF), Administrative/Wellness Center (11,735 GSF), Student Services Center (9,658 GSF), Educational/Vocational Center (42,492 GSF), Kitchen/Cafeteria/Warehouse Facility (13,973 GSF), two 2-story Dormitory Buildings (55,282 GSF) and a Recreational/Gymnasium Facility (21,035 GSF); site development of an approximately 25-acre site including grading, utility installations, site/security, lighting, sidewalks/walkways, roadways, parking areas and landscaping, and, site clearing, rock and granite blasting services at the new Manchester Job Corps Center site, Manchester, New Hampshire. Bids are due on November 5, 2009. The Period of Performance is to begin within 14 calendar days from receipt of notice to proceed and is to be completed within 558 calendar days from receipt of Notice to Proceed (NTP), with final completion within 618 calendar days from NTP. The estimated cost range is over \$10,000,000. The project is identified as a Total Small Business Set-Aside.

In addition to the above requirements, the Solicitation includes the following additional requirement, which has not appeared in any previous known solicitation issued by a federal agency since enactment of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984:

“The US Department of Labor (DOL) is procuring services utilizing a project labor agreement (PLA)... *** Further, non-union contractors with demonstrated project labor agreement (PLA) experience are encouraged to submit a bid on this project.”

The Solicitation contains no explanation for its inclusion of the PLA requirement.²

² The sole explanation offered by DOL for imposing the PLA on the New Hampshire Job Corps Center appeared in a Notice of Request for Sources that preceded issuance of the Solicitation. In that Notice, dated August 26, 2009, the Department merely stated that the project “will require large capital outlays, and will require exacting construction and performance standards, calling for high labor skills for many operations and complex scheduling and managerial organizations.” The Department offered no explanation as to how a PLA would address any of these factors or, more importantly, how a PLA would “advance the Government’s interest in achieving economy and efficiency in Federal procurement.” The Department also made reference to Executive Order 13502 (Feb. 6, 2009), but did not explain how the Executive Order mandated or justified a PLA on this project.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 4 of 22

On October 2, 2009, DOL issued Amendment 0001 (Exhibit 1), which specifies that the PLA be executed pre-award. Specifically, Amendment 0001 states:

At the time bids are submitted, bidders must complete and submit the following form, along with a copy of an executed Project Labor Agreement conforming to the requirements described below:

[Insert name of bidding company and the name of other entities signing the Project Labor Agreement] have entered into a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) that binds my company and [insert name of other entitles signing the Project Labor Agreement], and which will become operative if and when my bid is selected for award of a contract to perform construction work covered by Solicitation No. **DOL0099RB20820**. I further certify that the PLA contains the following required provisions:

1. All of my construction employees and those of my subcontractors at every tier will be subject to the PLA;
2. The PLA will remain in existence for the entire term of the project;
3. The PLA will insure that all workers, whether or not members of a labor union, will be eligible for employment by any company performing construction on the project;
4. The PLA will contain a “no-strike/no-lock-out” provision;
5. The PLA will include grievance procedures in the event there are disputes between any of the construction employers and their employees working on this project, which will be an exclusive forum to hear and decide disputes, and to render final decisions that bind the parties;
6. The PLA will include uniform rules related to work hours (including the same start/stop times for all trades); wages; benefits; work rules; and safety rules;

In order to promote the Department of Labor’s Office of Apprenticeship’s efforts in educating and training workers in the construction trades, I agree to set-aside a certain percentage of work to apprentices in all trades represented in this construction project that have an apprenticeship program in New

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 5 of 22

Hampshire authorized by the Department of Labor's Office of Apprenticeship.

Bidders understand that failure to submit this form, along with a copy of a PLA conforming to the above-stated requirements, at the time bids are submitted will result in a finding that their bid is nonresponsive, and any such bid will NOT be evaluated for award as set forth in **SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**, and will not be eligible for award.

Exhibit 1, Amend. 0001 at 2.

The Solicitation further states that it is issued for sealed bidding, and that the project will be awarded to the low, responsive, and responsible bidder on the basis of price alone. Solicitation at § M-2. Amendment 0001 added the caution that:

In order for a bid to be considered responsive, a Bidder, among other things, must submit the form in **Section H — Special Contract Provisions — Project Labor Agreement**. Failure to submit this form, along with a copy of a PLA conforming to the requirements set forth in Section H, at the time bids are submitted will result in a finding that the bid is nonresponsive, and any such bid will not be evaluated for award **and will not be eligible for award**.

Id. at 4. The original Solicitation provided that bids were due on November 5, 2009 at 1:00 pm Eastern Standard Time. Amendment 0001 did not enlarge the time in which bidders could respond to the IFB.

B. Adverse Impact of the PLA Requirement On Competition.

The restrictive PLA requirement in the Solicitation discriminates against the Protestor, and other non-union contractors, in the following ways:³

³ Empirical evidence of the adverse impacts of PLAs on full and open competition has been documented in public comments filed by Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (ABC), and others, in an ongoing rulemaking proceeding being conducted by the FAR Council concerning proposed amendments to the FAR, further discussed below. See FAR Case 2009-005, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. ABC provided

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 6 of 22

1) Non-union contractors who enter into PLAs are likely to have to pay added and duplicative costs for various union benefit programs, while at the same time paying for many of these same benefits through their own company benefit plans. These duplicative costs may include payments for holidays, sick days, and vacation time, as well as apprenticeship training, insurance benefits, profit sharing, and company contributions into employee 401K plans. A study recently performed by Professor McGowan of St. Louis University projects that non-union contractors' labor costs will increase by 25% or more under PLA requirements, over and above the prevailing wage and fringe benefit costs that such contractors already expect to pay under the Davis-Bacon Act.⁴

2) In addition to having to pay these additional costs, non-union contractors who become subject to a PLA are typically not able to use their own employees for the PLA-covered Project. Instead, such contractors are forced to staff the project with journeymen and apprentices referred to them by the union(s), with whom they are completely unfamiliar, or else pay penalties to the union. This requirement will make the contractor, and hence the contracting federal agency, less efficient. PLAs also typically restrict the ability of non-union contractors to schedule their work crews in any manner other than that dictated by the PLA without first receiving "permission" from the designated trade union or the designated Labor Coordinator. This again makes the contractor less efficient and less able to staff the job properly.⁵

3) Another reason why non-union contractors are adversely impacted by the PLA requirement is that non-union employees working on a prevailing wage project under a PLA are penalized monetarily, compared to their earnings on the same federal project covered by the Davis-Bacon Act without a PLA. Under Davis-Bacon, without a PLA, such employees receive

a copy of its comments to DOL on behalf of its contractor members, including the Protestor herein, prior to issuance of the challenged Solicitation. A copy of the ABC comments is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

⁴ McGowan, The Discriminatory Impact of Union Fringe Benefit Requirements On Non-Union Workers Under Government-Mandated Project Labor Agreements (Aug. 2009), available at <http://abc.org/plastudies>.

⁵ Although Section H of the Solicitation states that "all workers, whether or not members of a labor union, will be eligible for employment by any company performing construction on the project," this provision does not protect employees from being required to pay dues to a union once employed on the project, as is commonly required under PLAs.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 7 of 22

“prevailing” wages and benefits which are equal to those paid to union employees.⁶ On projects subject to a PLA, however, the employees must pay dues to the union, which are deducted from their regular take home pay. Such employees also forfeit significant dollar amounts that their employer would be required to pay into union benefit funds. Because of the relatively short duration of most construction projects, those non-union employees would receive no benefits from their pension contributions.

4) Perhaps most importantly, non-union contractors who are required to sign a PLA lose the ability to hire subcontractors of their own choosing, inasmuch as all subcontractors also must adhere to the PLA. Most subcontractors of nonunion contractors are themselves non-union and are reluctant to sign a PLA for the reasons set forth above. The Protestor has already been advised by many of its usual subcontractors that these small businesses will not offer their services on the Department’s Job Corps project if a PLA is required.

5) The discriminatory adverse impact on small business, non-union contractors is compounded by the fact that Section H of the present Solicitation requires the successful bidder to negotiate and enter into a PLA with one or more unions prior to submitting its bid less than one month from now. This is an insurmountable requirement for most non-union contractors, including the Protestor, who by definition do not have established relationships with labor organizations. In addition, without knowing the actual terms of the PLA, it is impossible for non-union bidders to properly estimate their labor costs on the project, which is obviously a critical element of the bids that they are being called upon to submit.

It is well documented that PLAs have the effect of reducing the number of bidders for government procurements, for the reasons set forth above, thereby injuring competition. See ABC Comments, Exhibit 2, at 6-10. On the present project as well, in response to an initial Request for Sources published by DOL that made reference to the PLA, numerous qualified small business contractors, including the Protestor, informed DOL that they objected to imposition of the PLA on this project and would be discouraged from bidding if it were imposed. Of equal importance, the Protestor has been informed that numerous subcontractors on whom the company normally relies to perform similar work will be discouraged from bidding on this project if a PLA is imposed.

⁶ See 40 U.S.C. § 3141, et seq.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 8 of 22

C. The Lack Of Demonstrated Need For A PLA On This Solicitation.

The Solicitation does not contain any proof of need for a restrictive PLA requirement. Certainly, there is nothing particularly complex or unique about the planned construction project described in the Department's Solicitation. Indeed, many projects similar in size and scope to this project have been built in New Hampshire without any restrictive bid requirements forcing bidders to enter into agreements with any labor organizations. Numerous contractors, including the Protestor, informed the Department prior to issuance of the Solicitation that they had successfully constructed projects of similar size and complexity in New Hampshire, without any project labor agreements being required. In addition, more than 90% of the construction workers in New Hampshire do not belong to any labor organization and work for contractors who are not signatory to any union agreements.

It must also be observed that many more projects of equal or *much greater* size and complexity have been built by the federal government all over the country over the past decade, again without any need for restrictive PLA bid requirements. According to the official government database published at <http://usaspending.gov>, the government has contracted for construction of hundreds of projects over the past decade whose cost exceeded \$10 million, including several Job Corps Centers constructed by the Department, all without any PLA in the solicitations for bids.⁷ There was clearly no need for a PLA on any of those previous federal projects, and the DOL has offered no explanation as to why a PLA is needed on the current Solicitation.

As noted above, the sole explanation offered by DOL for imposing the PLA on the New Hampshire Job Corps Center appeared in a Notice of Request for Sources that preceded issuance of the Solicitation. In that Notice, the Department merely stated that the project "will require

⁷ In February 2001, President Bush signed Executive Order 13202, as amended in EO 13208, prohibiting all federal agencies from requiring offerors for federally funded construction projects to enter into project labor agreements as a condition of performing work on such projects. Since that time (and actually for previous years as well), it can be stated with certainty that no federal agency has issued a solicitation for bids that contained restrictive PLA requirements of the sort now being imposed by the Department here. A recent study of construction projects built by the federal government during this period, based upon agency responses to FOIA requests and independent data, confirms that there were no significant labor problems reported on *any* of the large federal construction projects that were built during the past decade, demonstrating conclusively the lack of any federal agency's need for a government-mandated project labor agreement. See Tuerck, Glassman and Bachmann, Union-Only Project Labor Agreements On Federal Construction Projects: A Costly Solution In Search Of A Problem (August 2009), available at <http://abc.org/plastudies>.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 9 of 22

large capital outlays, and will require exacting construction and performance standards, calling for high labor skills for many operations and complex scheduling and managerial organizations.” The Department offered no explanation as to how a PLA would address any of these factors or, more importantly, how a PLA would “advance the Government’s interest in achieving economy and efficiency in Federal procurement.” The Department made reference to Executive Order 13502 (Feb. 6, 2009), but did not explain how the Executive Order mandated or justified a PLA on this project. As will next be discussed, Executive Order 13502 has no application to this project.

D. Executive Order 13502 And The Ongoing FAR Council Rulemaking.

President Obama issued Executive Order 13502 on February 6, 2009. This Executive Order purports to authorize federal agencies to impose PLAs on “large-scale construction projects,” defined as costing \$25 million or more, provided that such agencies *first* determine whether a PLA will:

- (i) advance the Federal Government’s interest in achieving economy and efficiency in Federal procurement, producing labor-management stability, and ensuring compliance with laws and regulations governing safety and health, equal employment opportunity, labor and employment standards, and other matters, and
- (ii) be consistent with law.

Nothing in the Executive Order authorizes an agency to impose a PLA in violation of the Competition in Contracting Act, nor would the President be authorized to issue such an order. In addition, Section 5 of the Executive Order expressly states that the Order does not require any agency to use a PLA on any construction project. Section 6 of the Order commands the FAR Councils to amend the FAR to implement the terms of the Executive Order. Section 11 states that the Executive Order shall apply only to those solicitations issued on or after the effective date of the FAR Councils’ amendment of the FAR. No such amendment has yet taken place.

On July 14, 2009, the FAR Councils issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in order to amend the FAR to implement the Executive Order. 74 Fed. Reg. 33953 (July 14, 2009). Hundreds of comments were filed in response to the Notice, many of which were highly critical of the Proposed Rule. See, e.g., Exhibit 2, Comments of ABC. On August 23, 2009, the FAR Councils extended the comment period to September 23, 2009. Though the comment period has now

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 10 of 22

closed, the FAR Council has not yet amended the FAR to permit any federal agency to impose a restrictive PLA bid specification.

DOL's Solicitation appears to be the first and only federal agency solicitation since the issuance of the Executive Order to attempt to impose a PLA requirement as a condition of allowing successful bidders to perform work on a federal construction project. DOL has offered no explanation as to why it is seeking to impose a PLA on the current project without waiting for the proposed amendments to the FAR to become final (i.e., contrary to the instructions of the Executive Order).

GROUNDS OF PROTEST

GROUND 1: THE SOLICITATION'S PLA REQUIREMENT UNNECESSARILY RESTRICTS COMPETITION IN VIOLATION OF THE COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT.

The Competition in Contracting Act of 1984 ("CICA") and Part 6 of the FAR establish that Federal procurements shall employ "full and open competition." 41 U.S.C. § 253(a)(1); 48 C.F.R. § 6.000-6.102. An agency such as the DOL has an affirmative obligation to draft specifications or requirements so as to promote competition to the maximum extent practicable. 41 U.S.C. § 253 (a)(1)(A), (C); The Kohler Company, B-257162, Sept. 2, 1994, 94-2 CPD ¶ 88 at 2; CardioMetrix, B-259736, April 28, 1995, 95-1 CPD ¶ 223; University Research Corporation, B-216461, Feb. 19, 1985, 85-1 CPD ¶ 210.

"A procuring agency is required to specify its needs in a manner designed to promote full and open competition, and may only include restrictive provisions in a solicitation to the extent necessary to meet the agency's minimum needs." Omega World Travel, B-258374, Jan. 13, 1995, 95-1 CPD ¶ 20 at 1 (protest sustained where the agency's established requirements unjustifiably limited competition). By imposing requirements that effectively restrict competition to only a few potential bidders, the government's obligation to achieve "full and open competition" among small businesses is defeated.⁸

⁸ "[W]here a small business set-aside is called for, the law generally provides for full and open competition among eligible small business concerns." Department of the Army—Request for Modification of Recommendation, B-290682.2, Jan. 9, 2003, 2003 CPD ¶ 23 at 4. Other than the total small business set-aside nature of the Solicitation, none of the FAR Part 6 exceptions to CICA exist to justify DOL's further restriction of competition by imposing a preference for unionized contractors (e.g., only one responsible source, unusual and

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 11 of 22

1. The PLA Requirement Unduly Restricts Competition.

In the present case, as shown above, DOL's PLA requirement plainly does not promote full and open competition among small businesses, but instead discriminates in favor of a select few unionized contractors at the expense of the majority of contractors and subcontractors in New Hampshire who are not unionized. Non-union contractors are discriminated against and discouraged from bidding, *inter alia*, because their costs of complying with the PLA are significantly greater than those of union contractors, and because they will be unable to utilize their own employees and subcontractors on the project, and because those employees who they do hire will have to pay dues to a union and will lose compensation in the form of payments made to union benefit plans which will not benefit the employees.

The GAO has long recognized that agency-imposed requirements to comply with project labor agreements not supported by statute are unduly restrictive of competition. See To the Secretary of Defense, 42 Comp. Gen. 1, B-148930, Jul. 2, 1962, 1962 CPD ¶ 41. In 42 Comp. Gen. 1, the Department of Defense and NASA sought to incorporate the wage terms of Project Labor Agreements into a contract clause in construction solicitations. The agencies argued that imposition of the terms of the PLA "will result directly in lower construction costs, will permit economies arising from the standardization of shifts, holidays and overtime arrangements, and will facilitate construction operations by providing more uniform conditions on a project of extended duration." *Id.* The GAO rejected this argument, finding that "inclusion of such terms and conditions in government contracts normally tends to restrict competition and increase costs." *Id.* The GAO held:

The inclusion in missile construction contracts of a clause providing employee wage, hour and fringe benefits resulting from a labor-management agreement, which benefits are not authorized by statute, would restrict competition and increase the cost to the government; therefore, such a labor clause as a condition precedent would be contrary to the laws of government contracting.

Id. at 1. In holding that imposition of terms and conditions from the PLA was unduly restrictive of competition and violated procurement statutes, the GAO relied on prior decisions, which embodied "the proposition that where the Congress has specifically authorized the inclusion in

compelling urgency, industrial mobilization, precluded by international agreement, 8(a) or HUBZone sole source awards, national security, or public interest).

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 12 of 22

government contracts of conditions or restrictions of the same general character, the administrative agencies are not authorized to impose further or additional requirements.” Id.

Similarly, in Comptroller General Warren to the Architect of the Capitol, B-109270, May 2, 1952, 31 Comp. Gen. 561 (1952), the GAO sustained a protest where the agency had rejected a bid from an awardee who did not employ union labor because “no statute requires the employment of union labor by government contractors, and generally there would be no legal justification for the rejection of the lowest bid received solely because of the fact that the low bidder may not employ union labor.”

These holdings have been given even greater force by the enactment of the Competition in Contracting Act. Under CICA, in Navajo Nation Oil & Gas Co., B-261329, Sept. 14, 1995, 95-2 CPD ¶ 133, GAO sustained a protest challenging a clause contained in the solicitation as unduly restrictive of competition because it imposed unjustified experience requirements on offerors to qualify for award. See also Prisoner Transportation Servs., LLC; V1 Aviation, LLC; AAR Aircraft Servs., B-292179, June 27, 2003, 2003 CPD ¶ 121.

The GAO has also consistently rejected requirements for memberships in certain organizations as unduly restrictive of competition. See James LaMantia, B-245287, Dec. 23, 1991, 91-2 CPD ¶ 574 (“[T]he absence of an endorsement by a particular private organization should not automatically exclude offers that might otherwise equally meet a procuring agency’s needs.”); SMS Data Products, Inc., B-205360, Apr. 27, 1982, 82-1 CPD ¶ 390; Precision Piping, Inc.; M&S Mechanical Corp., B- 204024, B- 204024.2(1), Mar. 9, 1982, 82-1 CPD ¶ 215 (“Our decisions hold that requirements for approval or certification by specific organizations without recognizing equivalents are unduly restrictive.”). For this reason as well, the imposition of a PLA containing the requirement that the successful bidder agree to force its employees to become union members, must be rejected.

2. DOL Cannot Meet Its Burden Of Proving Need For The Restrictive PLA Requirement.

Once a restrictive procurement is challenged, the burden shifts to the agency to demonstrate that the restriction is reasonably necessary to meet the agency’s needs. Pipeliners Sys., Inc., B-254481, Dec. 21, 1993, 94-2 CPD ¶ 204 at 3; see also American Material Handling, B-250936, Mar. 1, 1993, 93-1 CPD ¶ 183 at 3 (when a protestor challenges a specification as unduly restrictive of competition, it is the procuring agency’s responsibility to establish that the specifications are reasonably necessary to meet its minimum needs). Here, the DOL has not

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 13 of 22

demonstrated that a PLA is necessary to meet the Department's minimum needs for construction of the New Hampshire Job Corps Center.

Indeed, the DOL cannot possibly make a showing of need in light of the fact that the DOL has successfully built similar Job Corps Centers around the country over the past decade without any need for a PLA, and in light of the further fact that the federal government as a whole has contracted for hundreds of construction projects of similar and greater size and complexity over the past decade, again without any need for PLAs. Moreover, even if the DOL could show that PLAs might be somehow needed in some parts of the country where unions control the skilled work force performing a significant share of the construction work, no such showing can be made in the present Solicitation, because the Job Corps Center at issue is located in a part of the country, Manchester New Hampshire, where construction unions represent fewer than 10% of the area's workers.

Far from furthering the alleged need to employ highly skilled workers on this project, the PLA restriction, by discouraging bids from 90% of the work force employers who are non-union, will significantly *narrow* the pool of such skilled workers. Likewise, the PLA will do nothing to improve scheduling or managerial operations or capital outlays on this project. The Protestor and other non-union contractors have all the capital, scheduling, and managerial skill necessary to construct this project without a PLA, as they have proven by their experience on similar sized projects.

Decisional law also makes clear that it is not sufficient for the DOL to assert that more than one offeror could meet the restrictive specification so that "some" competition between offerors would remain despite a restrictive solicitation term. Instead, full and open competition prohibits restriction beyond the agency's minimum needs. Kohler Co., B-257162, Sept. 2, 1994, 94-2 CPD ¶ 88 (requirement of 4-cycle diesel generator exceeded minimum needs, which could also be met by 2-cycle diesel generators, even though at least two offerors could compete by offering 4-cycle generators). Numerous published studies have shown, and the agency record in this case will confirm, that a government-mandated PLA injures competition by discriminating against and discouraging significant numbers of non-union contractors from bidding on government construction projects. For this reason as well, the GAO should find that the Department's solicitation violates CICA.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 14 of 22

For each of these reasons, the Solicitation plainly violates CICA's full and open competition requirement.⁹ There is simply no logical or rational basis for DOL to mandate that qualified small businesses utilize a union workforce to construct DOL's Job Corps Center in New Hampshire. DOL has not and cannot explain why directing the required construction work to union shops instead of non-union workers is related at all (much less reasonably related) to DOL's need to construct the Job Center. It is plain that the PLA requirement is nothing but a political payback to labor organizations who campaigned to elect the current administration and to whom the new Secretary of Labor has made numerous expressions of intended favoritism. This is not a permissible basis for infringing on the Congressional mandate of full and open competition.

3. The Requirement That a PLA Be Entered Into Prior To Submission of Bids Further Unduly Restricts Competition.

The requirement that the PLA between the union and offeror be executed prior to bid submission effectively precludes competition from any offeror, such as the Protestor, who does not already have established relationships with unions and has not already executed PLAs with them. Absent such relationships and experience, 34 days is simply insufficient time in which to negotiate and execute an agreement with a union who is a stranger to the contractor's business and its employees. Moreover, the PLA must flow down to subcontractors at all tiers. Since many subcontractors will refuse to work under a PLA, non-union prime contractors will have to locate and obtain quotes from union subcontractors willing to sign a PLA. Again, none of this is necessary to build the Job Corps Center. The Protestor and its non-union subcontractors are fully capable of completing the project economically and efficiently, and there is no basis for discriminating against them on the basis of their lack of union experience, which should have no basis on DOL's responsibility determination.

⁹ It should also be noted that DOL's original reliance on assertions of project complexity and need for skill and "exacting construction and performance standards" have been rendered moot by the agency's decision to compete this as a technically acceptable, "low bid wins" procurement.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 15 of 22

GROUND TWO: THE SOLICITATION VIOLATES EXECUTIVE ORDER 13502, THE FAR, AND THE APA; ALTERNATIVELY, EXECUTIVE ORDER 13502 ITSELF VIOLATES CICA.

As noted above, the DOL has made reference to Executive Order 13502 in attempting to justify imposition of the restrictive PLA in the challenged Solicitation. See DOL's Request for Sources dated August 26, 2009. However, Executive Order 13502 has no application to the present Solicitation because the Executive Order states that it covers only projects whose solicitations issue after implementing amendments are made to the FAR. See EO Section 11.¹⁰ Nothing in the Executive Order requires or authorizes DOL to impose a PLA in the current Solicitation before allowing the FAR Councils to amend the FAR in accordance with the Executive Order. The fact that hundreds of comments were received by the FAR Council, many of them critical of the Notice of Proposed Rule (see Exhibit 2), further shows that the FAR Council should be allowed to complete its work and presumably arrive at a Final Rule that will amend the FAR in harmony with CICA, unlike DOL's rash action in the present case.

Even if the Executive Order did apply, however, the Solicitation would violate its terms. The Executive Order requires the agency to make a determination, prior to imposing a PLA on a large construction project, that such a requirement will "advance the Federal Government's interest in achieving economy and efficiency in Federal procurement, producing labor-management stability, and ensuring compliance with laws and regulations governing safety and health, equal employment opportunity, labor and employment standards, and other matters, and ...be consistent with law." The DOL has made no such findings in this case. Nor is it possible for DOL to make any such findings in light of the fact that the PLA is being imposed on a type of project and in an area of the country where a union-only restriction is unheard of due to the dearth of union contractors and union workers. Reducing the number of non-union bidders will only serve to increase the costs of the project and reduce the efficiency of the construction, in direct contradiction to the terms of the Executive Order and the Federal Administrative Property and Procurement Act.

By rushing to become the first federal agency to impose a PLA on a construction project, without waiting for amendments to the FAR and without complying with the Executive Order, DOL has violated the Administrative Procedure Act by creating a new ad hoc policy of its own, without notice or comment. For this reason as well, the Solicitation must be rejected.

¹⁰ The Executive Order also applies only to projects whose costs exceed \$25 million, whereas the current Solicitation states that the project only exceeds \$10 million.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 16 of 22

Finally, even if the Solicitation were authorized by the Executive Order, which it is not, it would be necessary to find that the Executive Order itself violates the Competition in Contracting Act by authorizing agencies to restrict competition in violation of the governing statute. The President does not have authority by Executive Order to override the expressed will of Congress. Indeed, the Executive Order declares its intent to comply with all applicable laws. Therefore, at a minimum, the Executive Order must be harmonized with CICA's mandate of full and open competition, something that DOL has manifestly failed to do. For each of these reasons, the Executive Order offers no support for the DOL's unlawful imposition of a PLA in the current Solicitation.

GROUND THREE: THE REQUIREMENT TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENT WITH A UNION RESULTS IN AN UNJUSTIFIED SOLE SOURCE, GOVERNMENT DESIGNATED SUBCONTRACT.

A PLA effectively requires the awardee to subcontract the representation of its employees to a particular entity, which constitutes an unjustified sole source contract. The Protestor in this case is prejudiced by this sole source requirement, because, as described in Ground One, *infra.*, it causes the Protestor to subcontract a function that is normally performed in-house. Moreover, the PLA will likely require the Protestor to pay added and duplicative costs directly to the union or to union trust funds for various "benefits and fringes," while at the same time paying for many of these same benefits through the Protestor's own company benefit plans. Interposing a government-mandated subcontractor between the contractor and its employees impermissibly interferes with the employer and employee relationship and imposes restrictions on the flexibility of Protestor to ask their employees to adjust their work to suit the needs of the contract. DOL has not justified an award to the union of the right to represent North Branch's employees.

Where the agency has directed that a prime contractor enter into a contractual relationship with a specified subcontractor, such as here, it must justify such a mandate as it would any other sole source arrangement. See *Nat'l Data Corp.*, B-202953, 61 Comp. Gen. 328, 82-1 CPD ¶ 313; See also *Ms. Margaret A. Willis, FAR Secretariat, General Services Administration*, B-236742, B-236743, Jan. 23, 1990, 1990 WL 277693 (Comp. Gen.) ("We believe that an agency should be required to justify directing the use of a particular subcontractor.").

DOL cannot justify the PLA requirement that the Protestor contract with a union on a sole source basis. The Protestor is as capable of dealing directly with its own employees as is any union; indeed, the Protestor is *more* capable since its employees have chosen to work on a non-union

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 17 of 22

basis. As further noted above, New Hampshire workers are more than 90% non-union (i.e., they have no interest in union representation). DOL has not justified a sole source award to a union, nor can it.

GROUND FOUR: THE SOLICITATION FAILS TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION ABOUT THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A PLA TO ALLOW BIDDERS TO COMPETE INTELLIGENTLY ON A COMMON BASIS.

As noted above, the Solicitation fails to provide sufficient information about the nature of the PLA to elicit a meaningful response from bidders. Consequently, the Solicitation's requirement of a PLA is inherently ambiguous and will not allow bidders to compete intelligently.

The GAO has recognized that "[a]s a general rule, a procuring agency must give sufficient detailed information in its IFB to enable bidders to compete intelligently and on a relatively equal basis. Harris Sys. Int'l, Inc., B-224230, Jan. 9, 1987, 87-1 CPD ¶ 41 at 2. In Harris, the IFB stated that a performance requirements summary, which reflected the method of inspection and deductions for nonperformance, would be incorporated into the contract after award at no increase in price. The GAO sustained a protest that the agency should have included more detailed information.

There are different versions of PLAs which could be imposed on the project. All PLAs which force bidders to enter into union agreements discriminate against non-union contractors and increase their costs; but some PLAs are clearly more expensive than others. It is impossible to tell from the Solicitation exactly how high the additional costs will be on this project that are likely to be imposed on the Protestor, due to the lack of sufficient information regarding the restrictive nature of the bid specification. For this reason as well, the Solicitation should be disallowed.

GROUND FIVE: THE PLA REQUIREMENT UNREASONABLY RESTRICTS SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION.

The Solicitation's requirement that bidders enter into a PLA and utilize a union workforce interferes with the Congressional mandate that federal agencies should encourage and give preference to small and disadvantaged businesses in the procurement of government contracts. The requirement is also inconsistent with the spirit of the total small business set aside nature of

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 18 of 22

the instant Solicitation, which is set aside for the purpose of increasing federal contracting opportunities to qualified small businesses.

GAO will sustain a protest where the agency imposes unreasonably restrictive terms in a solicitation set aside for small businesses. For example, in TFab Mfg., LLC, B-401190, June 18, 2009, 2009 CPD ¶ 127, the challenged solicitation required small businesses to comply with both the Limitation on Subcontracting Clause's minimum percentages for costs incurred for personnel and the costs incurred for manufacturing the supplies. In sustaining the protest, GAO noted that the subcontracting terms "will have the practical effect of restricting competition" because "small business firms that can only perform either a majority of the services work or a majority of the supply work will not be able to compete" and that the "pool of potential competitors will be limited to small businesses that can satisfy [both] requirements . . ." TFab at 4. Thus, GAO will sustain a protest challenging the terms of a small business set aside solicitation where the pool of potential small business competitors is unreasonably and irrationally limited or restricted.

Here, DOL's requirement that small business offerors utilize PLAs will unreasonably limit the pool of potential competitors on the Job Corps Centers project. The PLA requirement obligates otherwise qualified non-union small businesses to fundamentally adjust their business models to accommodate costly, restrictive and inefficient union work rules. Non-union small businesses, like the Protestor, are reluctant to participate in the competition because the PLA would require, among other things, that they recognize unions as the representatives of their employees on that job, use the union hiring hall to obtain workers, obtain apprentices exclusively from union apprenticeship programs, and pay into union benefit plans. Such burdensome, unnecessary, and unjustified requirements discourage broad small business participation and limit the pool of potential small business competitors to the much smaller number of union businesses.

The PLA requirement also discriminates against minority-owned and women-owned small businesses who are supposed to be given preferences in contracting and subcontracting. The vast majority of such businesses are non-union and will be discouraged from bidding for this project due to the PLA. The long history of union discrimination against minorities and women also serves to discourage minority and women-owned contractors and their employees from seeking to perform work under a PLA. See ABC Comments, Exhibit 2.

Thus, the adverse economic impact of PLAs on small businesses in the construction industry directly contravenes Congress's expressed intent to promote and encourage federal procurement to small businesses under the Small Business Act. Despite the fact that the Solicitation is set

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 19 of 22

aside for small businesses, the Solicitation's PLA requirement actually discourages broad small business participation by both prospective prime offerors and potential subcontractors. Accordingly, the Solicitation's PLA requirement is inherently unreasonable.

REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS

In accordance with 4 C.F.R. §§ 21.1(d) and 21.3, the Protestor requests that DOL produce the following documents. All of the requested documents are relevant to the Protestor's grounds of protest as they relate directly to DOL's actions or inactions in this procurement. Counsel for the Protestor requests that these documents be produced at the earliest practicable time. To the extent that the documents contain proprietary, or source selection information, counsel for the Protestor requests the issuance of an appropriate Protective Order restricting release of such information and under which counsel for the Protestor is prepared to submit applications for access to such information.

The requested documents include the following:

1. Any and all documents relating to the DOL's purported justification for soliciting a contract without full and open competition.
2. Any and all documents relating to the DOL's consideration of whether it may exercise any authority to award a contract without full and open competition.
3. Any and all documents relating to any communications between the DOL and any labor organization or other third party relating to the DOL's determination to impose a PLA as part of the Solicitation.
4. Any and all documents relating to the DOL's consideration of whether its actions relating to this procurement complied with law, including the Federal Acquisition Regulation.
5. Any and all documents relating to the DOL's determination that a PLA was needed to meet the Department's minimum requirements for this project.
6. Any and all market research conducted by DOL prior to issuance of the Solicitation.
7. All documents indicating the DOL's advanced planning in issuing the Solicitation.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 20 of 22

8. Any and all documents indicating that DOL made a determination that a PLA was needed to advance the federal government's interest in achieving economy and efficiency in Federal procurement, producing labor-management stability, and ensuring compliance with laws and regulations governing safety and health, equal employment opportunity, labor and employment standards, and other matters, and that a PLA is consistent with law.
9. Any and all documents relating to DOL's determination regarding the expected cost of the project.
10. Any and all documents relating to the DOL's determination that a sufficient number of small businesses were likely to submit qualifying offers subject to the PLA requirement in response to the Solicitation so as to justify a Total Small Business Set-Aside.
11. Any and all documents identifying any DOL projects since 2001 with costs exceeding \$10 million on which costs and/or delays in construction were significantly increased due to the absence of a PLA on the project.
12. Any and all documents explaining the manner in which a PLA would assist construction contractors in making large capital outlays, and meeting exacting construction and performance standards, calling for high labor skills for many operations and complex scheduling and managerial organizations.
13. Any and all documents identifying any DOL projects since 2001 with costs exceeding \$10 million on which costs and/or delays in construction were significantly increased due to labor disputes, problems in labor coordination, or the absence of labor dispute mechanisms.
14. All computer files, records and iterations (drafts) regarding the information sought in the requests set forth above, including electronic mail communications.
15. E-mails reflecting or relating to all of the above.
16. All objections to the PLA received by DOL, including objections to PLAs received in response to the sources sought synopsis, the pre-solicitation notice, and this Solicitation.

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 21 of 22

17. All protests, whether at the agency, the GAO, or the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, filed as a result of the imposition of the requirement for PLAs and DOL's response thereto.
18. All documents that reflect a listing of any hardcopy and/or electronic files relevant in any way to this procurement that have been destroyed or deleted since July 31, 2009.
19. All documents generated by or within DOL reflecting or influencing the issues raised in this Protest not elsewhere specified in this request.

**RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO
REQUEST A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Protestor reserves its right to request that a protective order be issued in this protest. We do not believe that the instant filing contains information that should be protected, nor do we believe that the government's rationale for requiring the use of PLAs should be protected. However, in the event that DOL's record contains relevant documents that should be included in the Agency Report, and these documents are deemed to contain confidential source selection information, Protestor will request that a protective order be issued.

CONCLUSION AND REQUEST FOR RELIEF


As set forth above, the Department's Solicitation on its face and as applied violates CICA. The Solicitation also violates Executive Order 13502 by imposing a PLA on a project costing less than \$25 million and by failing to meet the criteria established by the Executive Order for imposing a PLA. The Solicitation also violates the Executive Order and the as yet unamended FAR by imposing a PLA without waiting for the FAR Councils to amend the FAR. Consequently, the Protestor requests the following action:

- (a) A ruling sustaining this protest, as contemplated by FAR § 33.103(d)(2)(v);
- (b) Removal by the DOL of any PLA requirement from the Solicitation;
- (c) Suspension of the deadline for submission of bids until a minimum of 45 days after resolution of this protest;
- (d) That the Protestor be reimbursed for the costs of filing and pursuing this protest, including attorneys' fees;

Office of the General Counsel
October 5, 2009
Page 22 of 22

- (e) The production of documents by the government; and
- (f) Such other and further relief as is deemed just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



Maurice Baskin
Rebecca E. Pearson
James Y. Boland
Venable LLP
575 7th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.344.4823
Regular Facsimile: 202.344.8300
Protected Facsimile: 202.344.8343
Email: mbaskin@venable.com;
repearson@venable.com;
jyboland@venable.com
Firm Website: www.venable.com

Counsel for North Branch Construction, Inc.

Enclosures

cc (via overnight mail):

Mrs. Marissa G. Dela Cerna
Contracting Officer/Division Chief
U.S. Department of Labor/OASAM/OPS
Division of Job Corps A/E and Construction Services — N-4308
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Telephone: (202) 693-7983, Fax: (202) 693-7966

cc (via email):

Olivia Thorpe, Contract Specialist
(thorpe.olivia@dol.gov)

Exhibit 1

NOTICE: Total SET-ASIDE

SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD (Construction, Alteration, or Repair)		1. SOLICITATION NO. DOL099RB20820	2. TYPE OF SOLICITATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEALED BID (IFB) <input type="checkbox"/> NEGOTIATED (RFP)	3. DATE ISSUED 10-01-2009	PAGE OF PAGES 1
IMPORTANT - The "offer" section on the reverse must be fully completed by offeror.					
4. CONTRACT NO.		5. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUEST NO 94-0991-1352/347356		6. PROJECT NO.	
CODE		Thorpe			
7. ISSUED BY U.S. Department of Labor/OASAM/OPS Division of Job Corps A/E and Construction Services - N-4308 200 Constitution Ave., NW Washington DC 20210			8. ADDRESS OFFER TO U.S. Department of Labor/OASAM/OPS Miller, Dyer and Spears/A/E Attn: Olivia J. Thorpe, DOL CS 99 Chauncy Street Boston MA 02111		
9. FOR INFORMATION CALL:		A. NAME Ms. Olivia J. Thorpe	B. TELEPHONE NO. (include area code) (NO COLLECT CALLS) (202) 693-7983		
SOLICITATION					
NOTE: In sealed bid solicitations "offer" and "offeror" mean "bid" and "bidder".					
10. THE GOVERNMENT REQUIRES PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK DESCRIBED IN THESE DOCUMENTS (Title, Identifying no., date):					

Project Title: "New Job Corps Center", Manchester, New Hampshire

Estimated Cost: Over \$10,000,000

Drawings and Specifications are available at: <http://www.solicitationattachments.com/newhampshire>

The US Department of Labor (DOL) is procuring services utilizing a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) for the construction of six (6) building totaling approximately 160,000 gross square feet. The facility will include a Welcome Center (1,427 GSF), Administrative/Wellness Center (11,735 GSF), Student Services Center (9,658 GSF), Educational/Vocational Center (42,492 GSF), Kitchen/Cafeteria/Warehouse Facility (21,035 GSF); site development of an approximately 25-acre site including grading, utility installations, site/security, lighting, sidewalks/walkways, roadways, parking areas and landscaping, and site clearing, rock and granite blasting services.

Further, non-union contractors with demonstrated Project Labor Agreement (PLA) experience are encouraged to submit a bid on this project.

A pre-bid walk-thru is scheduled for October 15, 2009, at 11:00 am. Questions resulting from the pre-bid walk-through, or explanation, or interpretation of the solicitation, drawings, specifications, etc., must request it in writing no later than October 21, 2009, COB. This is necessary to allow a reply to reach all prospective bidders before the submission of bids. Bidders unable to comply by October 21, 2009 should bid the contract according to your best interpretation of the plans, specifications, and amendments. All comments should be mailed to: thorpe.olivia@dol.gov.

The US Department of Labor/OASAM/OPS will not accept questions after 10/21/09, COB. The Bid Opening is 11/5/09, 1:00 pm, at Miller Dyer Spears, A/E, 99 Chauncy Street, Boston, MA 02111.

All mailed bids should be in the offices of Miller Dyer Spears by 10:00 am on 11/5/09.

All hand-carried bids should be in the offices of Miller Dyer Spears by 1:00 pm on 11/5/09.

11. The Contractor shall begin performance within 14 calendar days and complete it within 618 calendar days after receiving award, notice to proceed. This performance period is mandatory, negotiable. (See 52.211-10.)

12A. THE CONTRACTOR MUST FURNISH ANY REQUIRED PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS? (If "YES," indicate within how many calendar days after award in Item 12B.)

YES NO

12B. CALENDAR DAYS

10

13. ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS:

- A. Sealed offers in original and 2*** copies to perform the work required are due at the place specified in Item 8 by 1:00 pm (hour) local time 11-05-2009 (date). If this is a sealed bid solicitation, offers must be publicly opened at that time. Sealed envelopes containing offers shall be marked to show the offeror's name and address, the solicitation number, the date and time offers are due
- B. An offer guarantee is, is not required.
- C. All offers are subject to the (1) work requirements, and (2) other provisions and clauses incorporated in the solicitation in full text or by reference
- D. Offers providing less than 60 calendar days for Government acceptance after the date offers are due will not be considered and will be rejected.

OFFER(Must be fully completed by offeror)

14. NAME AND ADDRESS OF OFFEROR (Include ZIP Code)

15. TELEPHONE NO. (Include area code)

16. REMITTANCE ADDRESS (Include only if different than Item 14)

CODE FACILITY CODE

17. The offeror agrees to perform the work required at the prices specified below in strict accordance with the terms of the solicitation, if this offer is accepted by the Government in writing within _____ calendar days after the date offers are due. (Insert any number equal to or greater than the minimum requirement stated in Item 13D. Failure to insert any number means the offeror accepts the minimum in Item 13D.)

AMOUNTS

18. The offeror agrees to furnish any required performance and payment bonds.

19. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF AMENDMENTS

(The offeror acknowledges receipt of amendments to the solicitation - give number and date of each)

AMENDMENT NO.										
DATE										

20A. NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO SIGN OFFER (Type or print)

20B. SIGNATURE

20C. OFFER DATE

AWARD (To be completed by Government)

21. ITEMS ACCEPTED:

22. AMOUNT

23. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA

24. SUBMIT INVOICES TO ADDRESS SHOWN IN (4 copies unless otherwise specified)

ITEM

25. OTHER THAN FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION PURSUANT TO

10 U.S.C. 2304(c) () 41 U.S.C. 253(c) ()

26. ADMINISTERED BY

CODE

27. PAYMENT WILL BE MADE BY

U.S. Department of Labor/OASAM/OPS
Division of Job Corps A/E and
Construction Services - N- 4308
200 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington DC 20210

OASAM BRANCH OF INVOICE PAYMENTS
RM: S-5526
US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
200 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20210

CONTRACTING OFFICER WILL COMPLETE ITEM 28 OR 29 AS APPLICABLE

28. NEGOTIATED AGREEMENT (Contractor is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to issuing office.) Contractor agrees to furnish and deliver all items or perform all work, requisitions identified on this form and any continuation sheets for the consideration stated in this contract. The rights and obligations of the parties to this contract shall be governed by (a) this contract award, (b) the solicitation, and (c) the clauses, representations, certifications, and specifications incorporated by reference in or attached to this contract.

29. AWARD (Contractor is not required to sign this document.) Your offer on this solicitation, is hereby accepted as to the items listed. This award consummates the contract, which consists of (a) the Government solicitation and your offer, and (b) this contract award. No further contractual document is necessary.

30A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTOR OR PERSON AUTHORIZED TO SIGN (Type or print)

31A. NAME OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)

MARISSA G. DELA CERNA
Contracting Officer

30B. SIGNATURE

30C. DATE

31B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BY

Table of Contents

PART I - THE SCHEDULE A-1

SECTION A - SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM A-1

 SF 1442 SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD (Construction, Alteration, or Repair)A-1

PART I - THE SCHEDULEB-1

SECTION B - SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE/COSTS.....B-1

SECTION C - DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/STATEMENT OF WORK C-1

 [For this Solicitation, there are NO clauses in this Section]..... C-1

SECTION D - PACKAGING AND MARKING D-1

 [For this Solicitation, there are NO clauses in this Section].....D-1

SECTION E - INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCEE-1

 E.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE E-1

 E.2 52.246-12 INSPECTION OF CONSTRUCTION (AUG 1996)..... E-1

SECTION F - DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE F-1

 F.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE F-1

 F.2 52.211-10 COMMENCEMENT, PROSECUTION, AND COMPLETION OF WORK (APR 1984)
 ALTERNATE I (APR 1984)..... F-1

 F.3 52.211-12 LIQUIDATED DAMAGES--CONSTRUCTION (SEPT 2000) ,
 F-1

 F.4 52.211-13 TIME EXTENSIONS (SEPT 2000) F-2

SECTION G - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA G-1

 G.1 PRECONSTRUCTION CONFERENCEG-1

 G.2 PERIODIC PROJECT MEETINGS.....G-1

 G.3 SUBCONTRACTS.....G-1

 G.4 SHOP DRAWINGSG-1

 G.5 OPERATIONS, STORAGE AREAS, AND SECURITY.....G-1

 G.6 PROJECT SAFETYG-2

 G.7 DISPOSAL OF REFUSEG-3

 G.8 SCHEDULE OF PROGRESSG-3

 G.9 PAYMENTS TO CONTRACTORG-3

 G.10 FURNISHING INFORMATION AND RECORDSG-4

 G.11 WORKER'S COMPENSATION LAWSG-5

 G.12 REQUIRED INSURANCEG-5

 G.13 EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENTSG-6

 G.14 TEST RESULTSG-8

 G.15 AS-BUILT RECORD OF MATERIALS AND INSTALLATIONG-8

 G.16 SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETIONG-9

 G.17 CONTRACT CLOSEOUTG-9

 G.18 PRECEDENCE OF PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND CLAUSES.....G-11

SECTION H - SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS..... H-1

 H.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE.....H-1

 H.2 52.236-21 SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS FOR CONSTRUCTION (APR 1984)
 ALTERNATE I (APR 1984).....H-1

PART II - CONTRACT CLAUSES.....	I-1
SECTION I - CONTRACT CLAUSES	I-1
I.1 NOTICE LISTING CONTRACT CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE	I-1
I.2 52.219-28 POST-AWARD SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM REREPRESENTATION (JUNE 2007).....	I-3
I.3 52.222-39 NOTIFICATION OF EMPLOYEE RIGHTS CONCERNING PAYMENT OF UNION DUES OR FEES (DEC 2004)	I-4
I.4 52.223-2 AFFIRMATIVE PROCUREMENT OF BIOBASED PRODUCTS UNDER SERVICE AND CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (DEC 2007)	I-6
I.5 52.228-1 BID GUARANTEE (SEP 1996).....	I-7
I.6 52.228-15 PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS--CONSTRUCTION (NOV 2006).....	I-7
I.7 52.232-27 PROMPT PAYMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS (OCT 2008)	I-8
I.8 52.236-21 SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS FOR CONSTRUCTION (FEB 1997) ALTERNATE I (APR 1984).....	I-14
I.9 52.246-21 WARRANTY OF CONSTRUCTION (MAR 1994).....	I-15
I.10 52.252-2 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998).....	I-16
PART III - LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS	J-1
SECTION J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.....	J-1
PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS	K-1
SECTION K - REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS.....	K-1
K.1 52.204-8 ANNUAL REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS (FEB 2009).....	K-1
K.2 SIGNATURE BLOCK.....	K-5
SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS	L-1
L.1 NOTICE LISTING SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE	L-1
L.2 52.216-1 TYPE OF CONTRACT (APR 1984)	L-1
L.3 52.222-23 NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO ENSURE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSTRUCTION (FEB 1999)	L-1
L.4 52.236-4 PHYSICAL DATA (APR 1984)	L-2
L.5 52.233-2 SERVICE OF PROTEST (SEP 2006).....	L-3
L.6 52.236-5 MATERIAL AND WORKMANSHIP (APR 1984).....	L-4
L.7 52.236-27 SITE VISIT (CONSTRUCTION) (FEB 1995) ALTERNATE I (FEB 1995).....	L-4
L.8 52.243-7 NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES (APR 1984).....	L-4
L.9 52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)....	L-6
SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD	M-1

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Section M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1. Base Bid.

The Government intends to award a contract to the low, responsive and responsible bidder for the base price provided on Block 17, Standard Form (SF-1442) SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD (Construction, Alteration or Repair) and in accordance with the Option(s) indicated below

M.2 Alternates.

- A) The low bidder for purposes of award shall be the responsive, responsible bidder offering the low aggregate amount for the base bid plus the Alternate(s) listed in the order of priority in Section 012300 of the Project Specification within the funds determined by the Government to be available before the bids are opened.
- B) If addition of a bid alternate item would make the award exceed available funds bid by all bidders, it shall be skipped, and the next subsequent alternate bid item in a lower amount shall be added if award thereof can be made within such funds.
- C) In any case, all bids shall be evaluated on the basis of the same bid items, determined as provided above.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 10/02/2009	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. 94-0991-1352/347356	5. PROJECT NO. (if applicable)
6. ISSUED BY OASAM Office of Procurement Services U. S. Department of Labor RM N4308 200 Constitution Ave., NW Washington DC 20210		7. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than Item 6) OLIVIA THORPE		

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No. street, county, State and ZIP Code) To all Offerors/Bidders	(X) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DOL099RB20820
	X 9B DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 10/01/2009
	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
	10B DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

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 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.

(X) 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 two (2) copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible):
 a. Solicitation No. DOL099RB20820, titled "NEW JOB CORPS CENTER", Manchester, New Hampshire is amended to incorporate the following into the IFB documents:
 1) REVISED: Standard Form (SF) 1442 BACK
 2) SECTION - H = Special Contract Provisions - Project Labor Agreement
 3) SECTION - M = EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

In addition the Pre-Bid walk-through will be held on October 15, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (local time) at MILLER DYER SPEARS(A/E), Dunbarton Road and Lianne Street, Manchester, New Hampshire 03102

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) MARISSA G. DELA CERNA Division Chief, Contracting Officer	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) MARISSA G. DELA CERNA Division Chief, Contracting Officer
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY <u>Marissa G. dela Cerna</u> (Signature of Contracting Officer)
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED OCT - 2 2009

Section H – Special Contract Provisions – Project Labor Agreement

At the time bids are submitted, bidders must complete and submit the following form, along with a copy of an executed Project Labor Agreement conforming to the requirements described below:

[Insert name of bidding company and the name of other entities signing the Project Labor Agreement] have entered into a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) that binds my company and [insert name of other entities signing the Project Labor Agreement], and which will become operative if and when my bid is selected for award of a contract to perform construction work covered by Solicitation No. **DOL0099RB20820**. I further certify that the PLA contains the following required provisions:

1. All of my construction employees and those of my subcontractors at every tier will be subject to the PLA;
2. The PLA will remain in existence for the entire term of the project;
3. The PLA will insure that all workers, whether or not members of a labor union, will be eligible for employment by any company performing construction on the project;
4. The PLA will contain a “no-strike/no-lock-out” provision;
5. The PLA will include grievance procedures in the event there are disputes between any of the construction employers and their employees working on this project, which will be an exclusive forum to hear and decide disputes, and to render final decisions that bind the parties;
6. The PLA will include uniform rules related to work hours (including the same start/stop times for all trades); wages; benefits; work rules; and safety rules;
7. In order to promote the Department of Labor’s Office of Apprenticeship’s efforts in educating and training workers in the construction trades, I agree to set-aside a certain percentage of work to apprentices in all trades represented in this construction project that have an apprenticeship program in New Hampshire authorized by the Department of Labor’s Office of Apprenticeship.

Date:

[Insert name of Corporate Officer]

Bidders understand that failure to submit this form, along with a copy of a PLA conforming to the above-stated requirements, at the time bids are submitted will result in a finding that their bid is nonresponsive, and any such bid will NOT be evaluated for award as set forth in **SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**, and **will** not be eligible for award. The Department of Labor will select the next lowest responsive and responsible bidder as set forth in **SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1. Base Bid.

The Government intends to award a contract to the lowest-price, responsive and responsible bidder with the amount noted on Block 17, Standard Form (SF- 1442) SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD (Construction, Alteration or Repair) and in accordance with Section M.2 Responsiveness determination.

M.2 Responsiveness determination

In order for a bid to be considered responsive, a Bidder, among other things, must submit the form in **Section H – Special Contract Provisions – Project Labor Agreement**. Failure to submit this form, along with a copy of a PLA conforming to the requirements set forth in Section H, at the time bids are submitted will result in a finding that the bid is nonresponsive, and any such bid will not be evaluated for award **and will not be eligible for award**.

Exhibit 2

