PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL OF OFFERS AND PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. **Overview.**

1.1 The intent of this solicitation is to select one contractor for the construction of a microgrid system at Anniston Army Depot (ANAD), Anniston, AL. The requirement will be competed as a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) set-aside.

The basis of award is the Best Value Trade-Off process. The Government will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the criteria described herein. The Contracting Officer will award a firm fixed price contract to the responsible Offeror whom the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable, and offers the best overall value to the Government, all factors considered. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers. **NOTE:** ALL EVALUATION FACTORS, OTHER THAN PRICE, WHEN COMBINED ARE CONSIDERED APPROXIMATELY EQUAL TO PRICE.

1.2 The microgrid system at ANAD will have full islanding capability energy resiliency by providing an on-site, automated energy control / generation storage management system. The microgrid will integrate the new and existing generation assets with the Nichols, Demil, and Eulaton 46kV / 12.47kV substations to enable islanding for all critical loads. During a grid outage, the automated switching and microgrid controls will enable direct routing of electricity generated by the onsite assets to mission critical loads and load shedding of large blocks of non-critical loads. The microgrid will be designed in accordance Unified Facility Criteria 4-010-06 Cybersecurity of Facility Related Control Systems, or policy current at time of design, as well as with emerging distribution system operator requirements.

1.3 The target ceiling for contract award is $46,000,000.00. The Government may not be able to award a contract in excess of this ceiling. Offerors are under no obligation to approach this ceiling.

2. **Submittal of offers**.

2.1 Offerors submitting proposals for this project should limit submissions to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and monies will have been expended in preparing information required herein. However, in order to be effectively and equitably evaluated, the proposals must include information sufficiently detailed to clearly describe the Offeror's capability for successfully completing the solicited project. Requirements stated in this Request for Proposal (RFP) are minimums. Proposals should follow in the order of sequence set forth in the RFP.

2.2 Offerors shall submit their proposals electronically to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers through the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) – https://piee.eb.mil/. Proposals are not to be submitted any later than the time and date specified in Block 13 of Standard From 1442. The proposal submission process may be found in paragraph 2.6. Proposal submissions will be marked for the attention of MAJ Lesa Sylve. NOTE: The Louisville District is in the Eastern Time Zone.

2.3 Offerors are required to submit a proposal consisting of the information identified in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 below. All proposal materials shall be submitted with a table of contents. The sections should parallel the submission requirements identified below. Volumes I and II shall be submitted electronically. Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab (factor or sub-factor) may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information.

*NOTE: Provide the complete Volume I proposal submittal including text, renderings, drawings, photographs, etc. in electronic format. Provide the complete Volume II proposal submittal electronically with the final price breakout schedule.

2.4 Volume I – Past Performance and Technical Approach, shall be submitted electronically and include the following information:

- Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance
- Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach
  - Element A: Management Plan
  - Element B: Schedule Narrative

2.5 Volume II – Price and Proforma Information, shall be submitted electronically and shall include the following information:

- Volume II – Tab A: Standard Form 1442 and Price Breakout Schedule
- Volume II – Tab B: Joint Venture Agreements
- Volume II – Tab C: Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability
- Volume II – Tab D: Pre-Award Information
- Volume II – Tab E: Cybersecurity Maturity Model (CMMC) Level Certification

2.6 Proposals: ALL SUBMISSIONS SHALL BE SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY. No paper copies, CD-ROMs or facsimile submissions will be accepted. Electronic Proposal Submission is required through the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation Module at https://wawf.eb.mil/.

Instructions on how to create a vendor account will be posted to sam.gov and can be located at:

https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/dpc/ce/cap/docs/piee/PIEE_Solicitation_Module_Vendor_Access_Instructions.pdf

Instructions on how to submit an offer will be posted to sam.gov and can be located at:

https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf

NOTE: Do NOT enter Privacy Act Data (Personal Identification Information (PII)) in the File Description.)

Electronic Files: Submission shall be in a searchable Adobe PDF format.

File Naming Convention: To ensure your submission is received and processed appropriately, it is important that interested parties CAREFULLY ensure their electronic files adhere to the following naming convention:

- W912QR26RA033-FIRMNAME -VOLUME I
- W912QR26RA033-FIRMNAME -VOLUME II

Each file name shall begin with the solicitation number followed by the firm's name and a brief file description. Please see examples above.

File Organization: Although hard copies are not accepted, each file shall be clearly indexed, and logically assembled. Font size shall be 11 or larger. Pages shall be letter sized (larger page sizes (such as 11x17 foldouts, etc.) will be counted as two pages. Proposals shall be in a narrative

format, organized and titled so that each section of the proposal follows the order and format of the factors. Information presented should be organized so as to pertain to only the evaluation factor in the section that the information is presented. Information pertaining to more than one evaluation factor should be repeated in each section for each factor.

Upload Completion & Deadline: Interested parties shall submit responses no later than the date specified on the solicitation document. The time & date of proposal receipt will be the upload completion / delivery time & date recorded within PIEE. Do not assume that electronic submission will occur instantaneously. Large files (*e.g.*, 10MB or more) will take some time to upload. Offerors should time their upload effort with prudence by not waiting until the last few minutes—this will allow for unexpected delays in the transmittal process. Offerors are encouraged to keep a copy of the upload confirmation for their record. As noted above, Offerors will not receive a confirmation email but instead will receive upload confirmation in the browser following successful upload. Submissions after the deadline will be considered late and will be processed in accordance with FAR 15.208.

Electronic Files: Files shall be in a searchable Adobe PDF format. Text and graphics portfolios of the electronic copies shall be in a format readable by Microsoft Office or Adobe applications. Data submitted in a spreadsheet format shall be readable by MS Excel (all cells and formulas should be unlocked).

Any information, presented in a proposal that the Offeror wants safeguarded from disclosure to other parties must be identified and labeled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition (2026-02)," subparagraph (e), which is found in Section 00 21 00 of the RFP. The Government will endeavor to honor the restrictions against release requested by Offerors, to the extent permitted under United States law and regulations.

3. **Proposal Evaluation Process**

3.1 A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) comprised of representatives of the U.S Army Corps of Engineers, User/Customer, and other required personnel will evaluate the proposals. Offerors are advised that the technical evaluation and rating of proposals will be conducted in strict confidence. Technical proposals (Volume I) will be reviewed and rated without knowledge of the price offered. The number and identities of Offerors are not revealed to anyone who is not involved in the evaluation and award process or to other Offerors. Proposals will be evaluated based on the factors described herein, and the basis of award is Best Value Trade-Off, as stated in paragraph 1.1 above.

3.2 The evaluation process essentially consists of four parts: proposal compliance review and responsibility determination, technical evaluation, price evaluation, and price/technical trade-off analysis.

3.2.1 Proposal Compliance Review: This is an initial review to ensure that all required forms and certifications are complete and that both a technical and price proposal were received, and that the Offeror is financially capable of sustaining performance under the contract and is able to obtain the required level of performance and payment bonds from an acceptable surety.

3.2.2 Technical Evaluation: The SSEB will evaluate and rate the Volume I proposals against the RFP requirements. Factor I – Past Performance will be rated using Tables 1 and 2 below. The rating will be based on overall confidence in performance, with the final confidence assessment rating based on the extent of recent, relevant past experience and the quality of the Offeror's performance. Factor II – Technical Approach will be rated using Table 3 below.

3.2.3 Price Evaluation: The SSEB and Contracting Officer/SSA will evaluate price proposals independent of the technical evaluation. The SSEB will not have access to price information until completion of the technical evaluation.

3.2.4 Technical Trade-off Analysis: After all of the above evaluations are complete, the Contracting Officer/SSA will compare the relative advantages and disadvantages of technical proposals and compare prices. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will then consider all factors to select the proposal offering the best value to the Government.

4. Proposal Information and Related Evaluation Factors

4.1 Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the factors below, listed in relative order of importance. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

4.2 Volume I – Factor I – Past Performance — 1st

4.3 Volume I - Factor II – Technical Approach — 2nd

Element A – Management Plan — *Equally as Important as Element B*

Element B – Schedule Narrative — *Equally as Important as Element A*

4.4 Volume II - Price and Pro Forma Information

Tab A: Standard Form 1442 and Price Breakout Schedule	Not Rated
Tab B: Joint Venture Agreements	Not Rated
Tab C: Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability	Not Rated
Tab D: Pre-Award Information	Not Rated
Tab E: Cybersecurity Maturity Model (CMMC) Level Certification	Eligible/Ineligible

4.5 Ratings

Evaluators will apply the adjectival rating for the definition that most closely matches the evaluation.

Table 1

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Table 2

Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	**Description**
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of Past Performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Table 3

Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

4.6 Definitions

1. Deficiency. A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

2. Strength. An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

3. Significant Strength. An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

4. Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

5. Significant Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

6. Uncertainty. Any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the Offeror is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission, or mistake).

7. Clarification. Limited exchanges between the Government and Offerors that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated. See FAR 15.306(a)(1).

8. Adverse Past Performance. Past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation. Adverse past performance that must be addressed with Offerors includes unfavorable comments received from sources such as those received from respondents from past performance questionnaires or interviews that have not been finalized within a formal rating system.

9. Performance Confidence Assessment. Evaluation of the likelihood (or Government's confidence) that the Offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements; the evaluation is based upon past performance information.

10. Recency. As it pertains to past performance information, recency is a measure of the elapsed time since the past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant.

11. Relevancy. As it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the extent of similarity between the service/support effort, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and subcontract/ teaming or other comparable attributes of past performance examples and the solicitation requirements; and a measure of the likelihood the past performance is an indicator of future performance.

12. Risk. As it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an Offeror's proposed approach to the technical factor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

13. Discussions. Exchanges between the Government and the Offerors that are undertaken with the intent of allowing the Offeror to revise its proposal. Discussions take place after establishment of the competitive range. See FAR 15.306(d).

14. Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS). Systems in which batteries receive electricity from the power grid, straight from the power station, or from a renewable energy source like solar panels or other energy source, and subsequently store it as current to then release it when it is needed.

15. Generator. Generators harness mechanical energy, fueled by natural gas in this case, to create electricity. Natural gas generators use fuels such as propane or natural gas, drawn either from a direct line piped in by utility suppliers or via a tank, to generate electricity.

16. Photovoltaics (PV). PV is the conversion of light into electricity using semiconducting materials that exhibit the photovoltaic effect. A photovoltaic system employs solar modules, each comprising a number of solar cells, which generate electrical power. PV installations may be ground-mounted, rooftop-mounted, wall-mounted or floating. The mount may be fixed or use a solar tracker to follow the sun across the sky.

17. Microgrid. A group of interconnected loads and distributed energy resources within clearly defined electrical boundaries that acts as a single controllable entity with respect to the grid. A microgrid can connect and disconnect from the grid to enable it to operate in both grid-connected mode and island mode.

5.0 **Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance**

5.1 Submission Requirements:

5.1.1 Provide descriptions of up to three (3) projects substantially complete or completed by the Prime Contractor within the last seven (7) years (from the solicitation issue date) that are similar to this project in size and scope. Projects completed more than seven (7) years before the solicitation issue date may be considered for evaluation purposes but may lessen the overall relevancy rating for that project. Projects are considered substantially complete if 95% of the specified work has been completed. An Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract may be submitted only if a single task order could be considered similar to this project. Task orders may not be combined in order for the project to be considered similar.

NOTE: Each project description shall not exceed three (3) pages, 8.5" x 11," using a minimum font size of 11 and a minimum margin of one-half inch on all sides.

5.1.2 Projects considered similar in size **shall include construction of a microgrid demonstrating at least one (1)** of the following size elements. Sizes greater than those identified below will be considered similar in size:

a. Installation & construction of distributed energy resources (DER) to handle loads of .5 to 2.5 MW.
b. Installation of electrical and telecommunication duct bank for control of distributed energy resources of 100kW and above.
c. Installation of switchgear and necessary breakers for systems control of distributed energy resources of 100kW and above.

5.1.3 Projects considered similar in scope **shall include construction of a microgrid demonstrating at least three (3)** of the following scope elements:

a. Installation of Photovoltaic systems.
b. Installation of centralized generation.
c. Installation of electrical and telecommunication duct bank and controls for Microgrids.
d. Commissioning of Microgrid systems.
e. Implementation of control systems for electrical peak shaving.

5.1.4 The prime contractor must have self-performed at least 15 percent of the direct contract labor (including testing and layout personnel), exclusive of other general conditions or field overhead personnel, material, equipment, or subcontractors to be considered similar.

5.1.5 Additional consideration may be given for projects that contain the following features:

a. Performance of a new construction project for USACE.
b. Meet all similar in size and scope criteria.

5.1.6 The following information shall be provided for each project:

a. Project Title, Dollar Value, Location, and Contract Number/Unique Identifier.
b. Current percentage of construction complete and the date it was, or will be, completed.
    i. For projects that are not yet complete, provide description of work that has been completed and work remaining to be completed.
d. Scope of the project, to include purpose/use of facility.
e. Size of the project, differentiate square footage of new construction versus renovation if the project included both new construction and renovation.
f. Role of firm.
    i. Provide a description of the type of work performed and the percentage of work that was self-performed.
g. Two references for the project, with emails and telephone numbers.

5.1.7 For this factor, also include any ratings, letters, awards, etc. that support past performance on these projects. Any of this information that is submitted shall clearly identify to which of the submitted projects it pertains. A sample Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) is attached for your convenience. If used, the PPQ must be submitted by the Offeror with the proposal submission and **not** sent directly to the agency from the reference. For each project, the Offeror may provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the Offeror's respective corrective action. **Note: Project references, CPARS, PPQs, letters, awards, etc. which support past performance on these projects do not count toward the 3-page limitation for project description details.**

NOTE: For purposes of evaluating past performance, the Prime Contractor is defined as the contractor identified in Block 14 of the Standard Form 1442. Projects performed by contractors other than the Offeror, including, but not limited to, teaming partners, subcontractors, sister or parent companies, and affiliates will not be evaluated for past performance, unless those other contractors are part of a paragraph 7.2 Tab B Compliant joint venture Offeror, and/or Teaming Arrangement as demonstrated by a signed joint venture (JV) agreement and/or signed Teaming Arrangement, or unless those other contractors are affiliates of the offeror as defined in accordance with 13 CFR 121.103 and with proof of affiliation provided with the offer.

If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, or the Offeror listed in Block 14 is a joint venture (JV), the offering JV shall be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as a legal entity separate from the individual joint venture members. However, each member of a JV and/or Teaming Arrangement must submit its own Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) with the proposal. A copy of the Offeror's signed joint venture agreement and/or signed Teaming Arrangement shall be submitted with the proposal.

Projects performed by Joint Ventures other than the Prime Contractor will not be evaluated unless the Prime Contractor, Joint Venture Member, or Teaming Arrangement Member was a part of the Joint Venture performing the submitted project. These projects will only be considered if the project was performed by a Joint Venture that is registered in SAM with its own UEI of which the offering Prime Contractor, Joint Venture Member(s), or Teaming Arrangement member(s) were part.

In addition to the joint venture agreement, small business Offerors submitting a proposal as a Mentor-Protégé JV under the SBA Mentor-Protégé program (MPP) shall submit a copy of their SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé agreement.

If the Offeror represents the combining of two or more companies as a JV and/or Small Business Teaming Arrangement for the purpose of this RFP, each company in the JV or Teaming Arrangement may submit project examples, but the total submitted by the JV and/or Teaming Arrangement shall not exceed three (3) projects.

All Joint Venture and/or Teaming Arrangements must comply with paragraph 7.2 Tab B – Joint Venture, Mentor-Protégé Agreements, and Teaming Arrangements of this solicitation to be considered.

Relevant past performance information provided for affiliates of the offeror will be considered. Affiliates (as defined by FAR 2.101) means associated business concerns or individuals if, directly or indirectly either one controls or can control the other; or third-party controls or can control both. Affiliation will be determined in accordance with 13 CFR 121.103. In determining whether affiliation exists, the Government will consider the totality of the circumstances and may find affiliation even though no single factor is sufficient to constitute affiliation. If an offeror is submitting the past performance of an affiliate, the offeror must submit proof of affiliation pursuant to 13 CFR 121.103.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria:

5.2.1 The SSEB will first evaluate the relevancy of recent past performance identified in the proposal in response to paragraph 5.1 above. By using the criteria identified above, the SSEB will determine how relevant a past project is when compared to the scope, size, and magnitude of effort and complexities of the solicited project. A relevancy rating will be assigned to each submitted project using the Past Performance Relevancy Ratings table above.

5.2.2 The SSEB will next review how well the Offeror performed on those projects. The Government reserves the right to check any or all cited references to verify supplied information and to assess owner satisfaction. The Government also reserves the right to not contact the provided references. In addition to the information submitted by the Offeror, the Government reserves the right to review any other sources of relevant information for evaluating past performance, including projects other than those submitted by the Offeror. The Government reserves the right to review past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), including Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all CAGE Codes and Unique Entity Identifiers. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved from inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror.

5.2.3 The SSEB will review all past performance information collected and determine the quality of the Offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate this information into the performance confidence assessment. The SSEB will assign a final, overall Performance Confidence rating, using the ratings in the Performance Confidence Assessment table, Table 2, above, based on the SSEB's assessment of (1) the degree of the Offeror's recent, relevant experience, and (2) how well the Offeror performed that experience.

6.0 <u>Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach</u>

6.1 Submission Requirements:

6.1.1 **Element A – Management Plan**: Provide a narrative for the project that describes how your labor, resources, designers, subcontractors, and material suppliers will be managed, supervised, coordinated, and used to ensure successful completion of the project. Additionally, the Management Plan shall include the following information:

- Identify significant areas of risk and provide your plan for mitigating the identified risk during contract performance to include coordination with subcontractor, general labor, privatized utilities, Base Civil Engineering, and Security Forces
- Describe your process for managing, coordinating, and tracking changes that arise during construction.

There is a page limit of eight (8), 8.5" x 11" pages, using a minimum font size of 11 and a minimum margin of one-half inch on all sides for the Management Plan element.

6.1.2 **Element B – Schedule Narrative**: Based on the project budget and scope, provide a schedule narrative describing the construction sequence/process for successful completion of the project (Construction, Commissioning, and Close-Out). At a minimum, the Schedule Narrative shall address the timing and process(es) necessary to complete the key activities indicated below:

- Pre-Construction Submittals and Government Review
- Long Lead Items
- SWPPP Activities
- Key Permits
- Equipment lightoff through full system Commissioning Activities and Critical Submittals
- Project Closeout Planning and Coordination (including Red Zone Meeting)
- As-Builts

Additionally, Offerors are to provide a simple bar chart that shows the key activities indicated above.

NOTE: There is a page limit of five (5), 8.5" x 11" pages, using a minimum font size of 11 and a minimum margin of one-half inch on all sides, for the narrative portion of this element. There is a page limit of three (3), 11" x 17" pages, using a minimum font size of 11 and a minimum margin of one-half inch on all sides, for the bar chart portion of this element.

6.2 Evaluation Criteria:

The SSEB will be using Table 3, Technical/Risk Assessment Rating, in paragraph 4.5 to evaluate the Technical Approach.

Management Plan narratives will be evaluated based on the level of understanding of the work and the involvement the contractor will have in the management, oversight, control, coordination of the work, the identification and mitigation of risk and management of changes performed during construction of the project. Narratives that demonstrate a clear understanding of the project requirements and provide a thorough approach for successfully managing the solicited project may be rated more favorably by the SSEB.

The schedule narrative will be evaluated based on the understanding of events identified in paragraph 6.1.2 above and the Offeror's capability to complete the schedule within the contract duration. The bar chart will be evaluated based on the Offeror's understanding of the appropriate sequencing and durations of the identified key activities. Narratives that demonstrate a clear understanding of the schedule impacts of the key activities and provide a thorough approach for successfully completing the solicited project within the contract duration may be rated more favorably by the SSEB.

NOTE: The SSEB will evaluate the Offeror's schedule using calendar days, not dates.

7.0 Volume II - Price and Proforma Information

7.1 Tab A - Standard Form 1442 and Proposal Price Breakout Schedule.

7.1.1 Submission Requirements:

The Offeror shall complete and submit Standard Form 1442 and the Price Breakout Schedule. Both of these forms are included in this solicitation.

7.1.2 Evaluation Criteria:

The Standard Form 1442 will not be rated. The form will be reviewed to determine if required information is provided, amendments are acknowledged, and the offer signed.

The Government will evaluate price proposals in accordance to with FAR Part 15.404 independent of the Past Performance and Technical evaluations. Price will be evaluated for completeness, fairness, and reasonableness through the use of price analysis. Proposed pricing will be checked for unbalanced line items. Offerors are cautioned to distribute costs appropriately such that no line item is overstated or understated.

7.2 Tab B – Joint Venture and Mentor-Protégé Agreements

7.2.1 Submission Requirements:

If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, or the Offeror listed in Block 14 is a joint venture (JV), then a signed JV agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the Offeror shall be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as a legal entity separate from the individual joint venture members. However, each member of the JV must submit its own Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) with the proposal.

Joint Venture Mentor-Protégé Requirements
Small business Offerors (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone, SDVOSB) submitting a proposal as a JV Mentor-Protégé shall submit a copy from the Offeror's SBA Servicing Agency that the Offeror has notified and discussed the proposed joint venture for this specific project with the appropriate SBA Representative or Business Opportunity Specialist. Joint Venture agreements and approved 8(a) Mentor-Protégé agreements must be submitted with the proposal.

Teaming Arrangement Requirements
All Offerors may enter into a Teaming Arrangement with one or more subcontractors and submit an offer as a Teaming Arrangement. Offerors submitting a proposal as a Teaming Arrangement shall submit a copy of the written agreement between the Offeror and its subcontractor(s) through a written agreement between the parties that sets forth the different responsibilities, roles, and percentages (or other allocations) of work as it relates to the acquisition.

A small business contractor may enter into a Small Business Teaming Arrangement with one or more small business subcontractors and submit an offer as a small business without regard to affiliation, so long as each team member is small for the size standard assigned to the contract or subcontract.

Small business Offerors submitting a proposal as a Small Business Teaming Arrangement shall submit a copy of the written agreement between the Offeror and its small business subcontractor(s) through a written agreement between the parties that –

(A) Is specifically referred to as a "Small Business Teaming Arrangement"; and

(B) Sets forth the different responsibilities, roles, and percentages (or other allocations) of work as it relates to the acquisition;

Small business teaming arrangements may include two business concerns in a mentor-protégé relationship in the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program (see section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 4901 note prec.)) when both the mentor and the protégé are small. There is no exception to joint venture size affiliation for offers received from teaming arrangements under the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program.

7.2.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated. Joint Venture Agreements and Mentor-Protégé agreements must comply with the relevant regulations in Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations in order for an Offeror to be eligible for any small business-related price preference.

7.3 **Tab C – Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability**

7.3.1 Submission Requirements:

A. Financial Capability. Submit Proof of Financial Ability (Most recent financial statement covering assets and liabilities). Include the name, address and telephone number of the Offeror's banking institution. If the Offeror is a joint venture, submit this information for each joint venture member.

B. Bonding Capability. Submit information showing the Offeror's ability to be bonded for this project. Include the name, address and telephone number of the Offeror's bonding company.

7.3.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated. See FAR Part 28 for information related to bonds.

7.4 **Tab D - Pre-Award Information**

7.4.1 Submission Requirements:

A. The Offeror shall submit one completed copy of the included Representations and Certifications (Section 00 45 00).

B. The Offeror shall submit the following information:

a) Number of years the firm has been in business
b) Name, address and telephone numbers of two credit/trade references
c) A list of present commitments, including the dollar value

If the Offeror is a joint venture, submit this information for each joint venture member.

7.4.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated.

7.5 Tab E – Cybersecurity Maturity Model (CMMC) Level Certification

7.5.1 Submission Requirements:

Contractors and Subcontractors are required to provide adequate security on all covered contractor information systems and complete and maintain, as current for the duration of the contract, an affirmation by the affirming official of continuous compliance with the requirements associated with the CMMC level required for this contract**. Award can only be made to an Offeror with a CMMC Level that is fully compliant with the contract requirements.**

An offeror's approach to meeting the CMMC requirements will be evaluated to determine its eligibility for award. While an offeror may be considered for evaluation without having the required CMMC status at the time of proposal submission, an offeror will not be eligible for award until the CMMC requirements are met.

The Contractor shall have and maintain for the duration of this contract, order, or agreement a current CMMC status at the following CMMC level, or higher for all information systems used in performance of the contract, task order, or delivery order that process, store, or transmit FCI or CUI.

- *CMMC Level 2 (Self);*

Definitions and Compliance:

- FCI and CUI: Federal Contract Information (FCI) is information not intended for public release, as defined in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clause 52.240-93. Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) requires additional safeguarding and may be subject to dissemination controls, as defined in 32 CFR Part 2002.

- Governing Clause: Offerors are directed to review DFARS 252.204-7021, "Contractor Compliance With the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirements," for complete definitions, reporting standards, and subcontract flow-down information applicable to this contract.

Affirmation and Reporting:

Contractors and subcontractors are required to provide adequate security for all covered information systems. This includes an affirmation by the affirming official of the organization, maintained as current for the duration of the contract, of continuous compliance with the requirements associated with the CMMC level specified herein.

The Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) is the authoritative source for CMMC assessment scoring information. To enter or access CMMC Assessment information, users must be registered in the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) at https://piee.eb.mil/ and request the "SPRS Cyber Vendor User" role.

Vendor Help and Training Tutorials are available at https://www.sprs.csd.disa.mil/nistsp.htm and https://dodcio.defense.gov/cmmc/Resources-Documentation/
A Training Tutorial on how to request access to SPRS via PIEE is available at https://www.sprs.csd.disa.mil/videos/Tutorials/SPRS_Access_Via_PIEE/SPRS_Access_Via_PIEE.html
For Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on Cyber Reports (CMMC & NIST) and CMMC – Cybersecurity Model Certification, go to https://www.sprs.csd.disa.mil/faqs.htm#nist and https://dowcio.war.gov/Portals/0/Documents/CMMC/CMMC-FAQsv3.pdf

NAVFAC/USACE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Form PPQ-0)

CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)

1. Contractor Information
Firm Name: CAGE Code:
Address: Unique Entity Identifier:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
Point of Contact: Contact Phone Number:

2. Work Performed as: ☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Subcontractor ☐ Joint Venture ☐ Other (Explain)
Percent of project work performed:
If subcontractor, who was the prime (Name/Phone #):

3. Contract Information
Contract Number:
Delivery/Task Order Number (if applicable):
Contract Type: ☐ Firm Fixed Price ☐ Cost Reimbursement ☐ Other (Please specify):
Contract Title:
Contract Location:

Award Date (mm/dd/yy):
Contract Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):
Actual Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):
Explain Differences:

Original Contract Price (Award Amount):
Final Contract Price (*to include all modifications, if applicable*):
Explain Differences:

4. Project Description:
Complexity of Work ☐ High ☐ Med ☐ Routine
How is this project relevant to project of submission? (*Please provide details such as similar equipment, requirements, conditions, etc.*)

CLIENT INFORMATION (Client to complete Blocks 5-8)

5. Client Information
Name:
Title:
Phone Number:
Email Address:

6. Describe the client's role in the project:

7. Date Questionnaire was completed (mm/dd/yy)**:**

8. Client's Signature:

NOTE: NAVFAC/USACE REQUESTS THAT THE CLIENT COMPLETES THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUBMITS DIRECTLY BACK TO THE OFFEROR. THE OFFEROR WILL SUBMIT THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO USACE WITH THEIR PROPOSAL, AND MAY DUPLICATE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FUTURE SUBMISSION ON USACE SOLICITATIONS. CLIENTS ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONNAIRES DIRECTLY TO THE OFFEROR. HOWEVER, QUESTIONNAIRES MAY BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO USACE. PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFEROR FOR USACE POC INFORMATION. THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO VERIFY ANY AND ALL INFORMATION ON THIS FORM.

ADJECTIVE RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS TO BE USED TO BEST REFLECT YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE

RATING	DEFINITION	NOTE
(E) Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.	An Exceptional rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed multiple significant events that were of benefit to the Government/Owner. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
(VG) Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	A Very Good rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed a significant event that was a benefit to the Government/Owner. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.
(S) Satisfactory	Performance meets minimum contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	A Satisfactory rating is appropriate when there were only minor problems, or major problems that the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. Per DOD policy, a fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.
(M) Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	A Marginal is appropriate when a significant event occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming which impacted the Government/Owner.
(U) Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	An Unsatisfactory rating is appropriate when multiple significant events occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming and which impacted the Government/Owner. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating.
(N) Not Applicable	No information or did not apply to your contract	Rating will be neither positive nor negative.

TO BE COMPLETED BY CLIENT

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.

1. QUALITY:						
a) Quality of technical data/report preparation efforts	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements (without adverse effect on performance)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
2. SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:						
a) Compliance with contract delivery/completion schedules including any significant intermediate milestones. *(If liquidated damages were assessed or the schedule was not met, please address below)*	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Rate the contractor's use of available resources to accomplish tasks identified in the contract	E	VG	S	M	U	N
3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:						
a) To what extent were the end users satisfied with the project?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor was reasonable and cooperative in dealing with your staff (including the ability to successfully resolve disagreements/disputes; responsiveness to administrative reports, businesslike and communication)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) To what extent was the contractor cooperative, businesslike, and concerned with the interests of the customer?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Overall customer satisfaction	E	VG	S	M	U	N
4. MANAGEMENT/ PERSONNEL/LABOR						
a) Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors, suppliers, materials, and/or labor force?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Ability to hire, apply, and retain a qualified workforce to this effort	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Government Property Control	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Knowledge/expertise demonstrated by contractor personnel	E	VG	S	M	U	N
e) Utilization of Small Business concerns	E	VG	S	M	U	N
f) Ability to simultaneously manage multiple projects with multiple disciplines	E	VG	S	M	U	N
g) Ability to assimilate and incorporate changes in requirements and/or priority, including planning, execution and response to Government changes	E	VG	S	M	U	N
h) Effectiveness of overall management (including ability to effectively lead, manage and control the program)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
5. COST/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT						
a) Ability to meet the terms and conditions within the contractually agreed price(s)?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client	E	VG	S	M	U	N

c) If this is/was a Government cost type contract, please rate the Contractor's timeliness and accuracy in submitting monthly invoices with appropriate back-up documentation, monthly status reports/budget variance reports, compliance with established budgets and avoidance of significant and/or unexplained variances (under runs or overruns)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Is the Contractor's accounting system adequate for management and tracking of costs? *If no, please explain in Remarks section.*		Yes			No	
e) If this is/was a Government contract, has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending terminations? *Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.*		Yes			No	
f) Have there been any indications that the contractor has had any financial problems? *If yes, please explain below.*		Yes			No	
6. SAFETY/SECURITY						
a) To what extent was the contractor able to maintain an environment of safety, adhere to its approved safety plan, and respond to safety issues? (Includes: following the users' rules, regulations, and requirements regarding housekeeping, safety, correction of noted deficiencies, etc.)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor complied with all security requirements for the project and personnel security requirements.	E	VG	S	M	U	N
7. GENERAL						
a) Ability to successfully respond to emergency and/or surge situations (including notifying COR, PM or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent contractual issues).	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Compliance with contractual terms/provisions *(explain if specific issues)*	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Would you hire or work with this firm again? *(If no, please explain below)*		Yes			No	
d) In summary, provide an overall rating for the work performed by this contractor.	E	VG	S	M	U	N

Please provide responses to the questions above (*if applicable*) and/or additional remarks. Furthermore, please provide a brief narrative addressing specific strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, or other comments which may assist our office in evaluating performance risk *(please attach additional pages if necessary)***:**