Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

1. BASIS FOR AWARD

A. Basis for Subcontract Award

This solicitation is a best-value tradeoff source selection conducted in accordance with evaluation methodology described in this document. SLAC will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of all the technical factors and subfactors to include Price.

The subcontract may be awarded to the Offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to SLAC.

SLAC seeks to award to the Offeror who gives SLAC the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or overall business approach of the higher price Offeror outweighs the cost difference. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below).

While SLAC's source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the sources election process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

B. Number of Subcontracts to be Awarded
SLAC intends to award one firm-fixed price subcontract under this RFP.

C. Rejection of Unrealistic Offers
SLAC may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, subcontract terms and conditions, or unrealistically low in cost when compared to SLAC's estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

D. Correction Potential of Proposals
SLAC will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or uncertainty. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of SLAC. If an aspect of an Offeror's proposal does not meet SLAC's requirements and is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated.

DRAFT

2. EVALUATION FACTORS

A. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

1. The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal. Award will be made to the Offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to SLAC based upon the evaluation factors and subfactors described below. Refer to Subcontract Section L for full description of evaluation factors.

VOLUME 1 - TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Technical Factor 1 – Technical Approach

Sub-factor 1.1 Key personnel resumes of the Project Manager, Superintendent, and Project Engineer (if applicable) will be evaluated for individual and team experience on comparable projects (size, scope, and complexity) within the past 5 years. The past experience of key personnel will also be evaluated based on demonstrated familiarity with DOE projects, SLAC procedures, and LCLS infrastructure.

Sub-factor 1.2 Offerors will be evaluated on whether assumptions and clarifications affect the Offeror's proposal in terms of meeting all the technical requirements in accordance with the Statement of Work, specifications, and drawings.

Sub-factor 1.3 Offerors will be evaluated on the actionability and effectiveness on the proposed approach to resolving differing field conditions and owner design requirement changes.

Technical Factor 2 – Safety

Sub-factor 2.1 Offeror's ES&H program will be evaluated for how well it meets the requirements outlined in SLAC terms and conditions, Article 17, "Safety, Environmental Protection, and Health – Codes and Standards.

Sub-factor 2.2 Information provided by Offeror (requested in Section L Factor 2 – Safety, bullet 2) will be validated and checked for non-compliance and/or criminal or civil enforcement activity.

Sub-factor 2.3 Offeror will be required to submit and obtain SLAC's approval for Offeror's completed Subcontractor Construction Safety Qualification Form (SQF) or approved ISN grade of A, B or approved variance grade:

Sub-factor 2.3 Work Planning Control (WPC) plan will be evaluated based on the clarity, actionability, thoroughness and relevance of safety documents. (Lock-Out/Tag-Out, Control of Hazardous Energy, Job Safety Analysis).

DRAFT

Technical Factor 3 – Schedule

Sub-factor 3.1 Offeror's proposed project schedule for submittal, long lead material procurement, construction, and commissioning activities support will be evaluated based on the following:

- Inclusion of logic to the schedule and identification of the critical path
- Effectively demonstrates a logical work sequence that optimizes workflow and minimizes delays. Coordination of trade activities to ensure efficient scheduling and avoid resource conflicts. Prioritization of long-lead material procurement activities to support the critical path.
- Clearly demonstrate a thorough understanding of SLAC specific preconstruction activities and durations - by including Project Notice-To-Proceed (NTP), Safety Submittals Approvals, Site Mobilization, Construction Invasive (LOTO, COHE) Activities Start, LOTO/System Outages, Testing and Commissioning, Inspections and Acceptance.
- Assumptions and clarifications will be evaluated based on their relevance to the project scope as defined in the SLAC Statement of Work and construction documents.

DRAFT

Volume 2 - BUSINESS PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Clearly stamp all company financial documents as “Business Sensitive” or equivalent language, if applicable, on any included documents.

Business Factor 1 – Financial Standing

Sub-factor 1.1 Bonding
Bonding ability will be evaluated for the project and Offeror’s overall bonding capacity letter from the primary’s Surety.

Sub-factor 1.2 The Dun and Bradstreet report will be reviewed for risk and evaluated as meeting the criteria with a D&B Supplier Evaluation Risk Rating of 6 or below. Offeror will be graded on reporting that either “Meet Requirements” or “Does Not Meet Requirements.”

For Bidders with a Dun and Bradstreet SER score greater than 6, or offerors who choose not to participate, audited Financial Statements will be reviewed for risk using three financial ratios – Current Ratio (Working Capital), Debt to Equity Ratio, and General and Administrative (G&A) Expense to Revenue Ratio.

Business Factor 2 - Price Proposal and Subcontract Documentation

Sub-factor 2.1: RFP Section A (Subcontract Form) Submitted RFP Section A will be reviewed for completeness and inclusion of all signed amendments.

Sub-factor 2.2: RFP Section B (Supplier or Service Prices)

- Submitted RFP Section B will be reviewed for completeness.
- Submitted preliminary schedule of values and preliminary expenditure profile will be reviewed for completeness.
- Submitted Price Breakdown Format (refer to Section L - FEH Optics Lab Bid_Breakdown_Form) will be reviewed for completeness.
- Submitted company’s labor rate sheet is thorough and valid through end of the period of performance

Sub-Factor 2.3: Additional Required Subcontract Documentation (Sections A-K) to be completed as indicated below. Additional Documents required of this solicitation will be reviewed for completeness.

- RFP Section H (Special Terms and Conditions) Complete with Key Personnel names and titles
- RFP Section J (List of Attachments) Complete list below:
    - Injury and Illness Prevention Program Acknowledgement Form (Attachment 3)
    - Subcontractor Safety Qualification Form (Attachment 7) or statement that approved SQF is valid through January 2026.
- RFP Section K (Representations & Certifications) Complete and sign

DRAFT

Sub-factor 2.4 Offeror's written statement will be reviewed to ensure:

- Offeror's contractor's license has not been revoked within the past five (5) years;
- Offeror's company has not been debarred within the past five (5) years from working on any U.S. government contracts/subcontracts
- Neither the Offeror's firm, nor any of its owners or officers have been convicted of a crime involving the awarding of the contract of a government (U.S. Federal, State, and City) construction project, or the bidding or performance of a government contract
- Offeror has an established local office for a minimum of 2 years in the San Francisco Bay Area. The San Francisco Bay Area is defined as the following 10 counties: Santa Clara, San Mateo, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Solano, and Santa Cruz Counties
- Offeror has not had any U.S projects within the past five (5) years terminated for default.
- Offeror has previous experience working at Department of Energy (DOE) and/or Department of Defense (DOD) Facilities.

Business Factor 3 – Terms and Conditions Acceptance and/or Exceptions

Acceptance and/or Exceptions to SLAC Terms and Conditions, including all attachments, and documents incorporated by reference will be reviewed for completeness. This includes all SLAC Terms and Conditions, Technical Specifications, Drawings, Statement of Work, and requirements within the forms listed above under Business Factor 2.

Note that all exceptions to the SLAC Terms and Conditions will require SLAC Legal approval.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Although price is important, it will not be used for the sole basis for award. A qualitative assessment of the proposal will take place. The focus of the proposal evaluation and selection process will be to identify the individual proposal strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies.

All technical proposals shall be evaluated utilizing an adjectival technical rating based on "Exceeds, Meets, or Does Not Meet" the technical requirements:

Exceeds Requirements	Outstanding Overall Proposal. The proposal satisfies all of the University's requirements with extensive detail to indicate feasibility of the approach and shows a thorough understanding of the problems and offers numerous significant strengths, which are not offset by weakness, with an overall low degree of risk in meeting the University's requirements.
Meets Requirements	Acceptable Overall Proposal. The proposal satisfies all of the University's requirements with adequate detail to indicate feasibility of the approach and shows an understanding of the problems and offers some significant strength or numerous minor strengths,

DRAFT

	which are not offset by weakness, with an overall moderate degree of risk in meeting the University's requirements.
Does Not Meet Requirements	Unacceptable Overall Proposal. The proposal contains minimum detail to indicate feasibility of approach, shows minimal understanding of the project, contains major error(s), omission(s) or deficiency(ies) or involves a moderate to high risk.

The Offeror's Business proposal will be evaluated utilizing a business rating based on "Meets" or "Does Not Meet" the business requirements.

The Offeror will be evaluated on their bonding capacity, Dun and Bradstreet reporting, and financial statements based on "Meet or Does Not Meet" requirements outlined below. Sub-factors under Factor 1, Financial Standing, will be rated as either "Meets Requirements" or "Does Not Meet Requirements."

Meets Requirements	Acceptable Overall Proposal. The proposal meets the University's requirements for submission of complete and correct documentation, and shows a satisfactory level of financial health.
Does Not Meet Requirements	Unacceptable Overall Proposal. The proposal does not meet the University's requirements for submission of complete and correct documentation, and/or shows an unsatisfactory level of financial health.

Pricing of the highest ranked technical offeror will be evaluated based on completeness, realism, and reasonableness per the below table.

Completeness	Price will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror provided sufficient data as required by the solicitation and/or SLAC during the evaluation.
Realism	Prices will be evaluated to determine if they are unrealistically high or low in comparison to the Independent SLAC Cost Estimate and/or other offers received.
Reasonableness	Prices reasonableness will be determine using acceptable price and/or cost analyses technique.

4. DEBRIEFINGS

Debriefings may be requested in writing within 3 days upon notification of non-award. Debriefings should occur within 5 days of a written request. The discussion shall not include comparisons with the other proposals. An explanation of the evaluation of significant elements in the Offeror's proposal, summary of the rationale for eliminating the Offeror from the competition and assure the Offeror that its proposal was treated fairly, impartially, and objectively. The Sr. Subcontracts Administrator will conduct debriefing(s).

DRAFT