SECTION III

CRITERIA AND FACTORS FOR EVALUATION, BASIS OF AWARD, EVALUATION CRITERIA, RATING SYSTEM AND DEFINITION

SECTION 00 22 10 – SELECTION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF AWARD

BEST VALUE TRADE OFF

1.0 OVERVIEW
2.0 BASIS OF AWARD
3.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS
4.0 PROPOSAL INFORMATION AND RELATED EVALUATION FACTORS, SUBFACTORS AND ELEMENTS
5.0 VOLUME 1 – PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY
    5.1 TAB A – FACTOR 1 – PAST PERFORMANCE
    5.2 TAB B – FACTOR 2 – PROPOSED CONTRACT DURATION, PHASING AND SUMMARY SCHEDULE
    5.3 TAB C – FACTOR 3 –TECHNICAL APPROACH
6.0 VOLUME 2 – SMALL BUSINESS
    6.1 TAB A – FACTOR 4 – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN
    6.2 TAB B – FACTOR 4 – PAST UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS
7.0 VOLUME 3 –PRICE AND PRO FORMA INFORMATION
    7.1 TAB A – PRICE (STANDARD FORM 1442, PROPOSAL DATA SHEET AND CONTRACT LINE ITEM SCHEDULE)
    7.2 TAB B – BID GUARANTEE
    7.3 TAB C – SELF PERFORMED WORK

ATTACHMENTS

1 – PROPOSAL DATA SHEETS

2 – PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

3 – SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE PRIME CONTRACTOR OR KEY SUB CONTRACTOR

4 – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1.0 OVERVIEW

This is a single-step "Best Value Trade Off" solicitation in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.101-1 for the Electrical Switching Station North project located at Watervliet Arsenal, NY. The Government will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the criteria described herein, and award a firm fixed price contract to the responsible firm, whose proposal conforms to all the terms and conditions of the solicitation and is fair and reasonable and offers the best overall value to the Government.

2.0 BASIS OF AWARD

This is a Best Value Trade Off procurement where the Contracting Officer will award a firm fixed price construction contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal the Source Selection Authority and Contracting Officer have determined conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable, and offers the best overall value to the Government, considering all non-price factors described herein, and price, considering a magnitude of the project between $10,000,000.00 and $25,000,000.00.

All technical factors (1-4) when combined are approximately equal in importance to price. **Technical factor 1 is the most important technical factor, followed by technical factor 2 and technical factor 3 that are equal in importance to each other and less important than technical factor 1. Technical factor 4 is less important than factors 1, 2, and 3.** The intent of this solicitation is to obtain the best value for the Government. After the Government individually evaluates and rates each proposal, the Source Selection Authority and Contracting Officer will compare proposals to determine which proposal represents the best value.

The price used in the trade-off analysis shall be the aggregate amount for the base items and options (CLINS 0001-0004). The trade-off analysis will be conducted, and a best value proposal will be determined. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers. The Government will not award a contract to an Offeror whose proposal contains a deficiency, as defined in FAR 15.001. If there is a lower priced, conforming offer(s), the Source Selection Official must determine that the added value of a more expensive proposal (within an acceptable range) would justify award to that Offeror. The magnitude of the project is between $10,000,000 and $25,000,000.

As part of the evaluation, the Government will evaluate betterments in proposals relative to the minimum standards in the RFP to determine if they offer additional value to the Government. In addition, innovations in proposals will be evaluated to determine if creative ideas of the Offeror are a better value to the Government compared to the minimum criteria.

3.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

3.1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

3.1.1 Who May Submit:

i. Competition will be unrestricted (i.e. open to all businesses regardless of Small Business status). Any legally organized Offeror may submit a

proposal.

3.1.2 Inquiries about this solicitation:

i. Prospective Offerors should submit inquiries related to this solicitation only by e-mail to the Contract Specialist and Contracting Officer.

ii. Include the solicitation number, and project title with any questions/clarifications. Written questions must be received by this office not later than 7 (seven) calendar days prior to the date set for receipt of offers. TELEPHONE INQUIRIES WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

Oral explanations or instructions are not binding. Any information given to an Offeror which impacts the solicitation and/or offer will be given in the form of a written amendment to the solicitation.

As this is a competitive negotiation acquisition, there is no public proposal opening and no information will be given out as to the number of Offerors or the results of the competition until all awards are made.

3.1.3 Page Limit and Size of Electronic Materials shall be submitted in the following volumes:

Volume	Tab	Title	Maximum Pages
1	A	Factor 1: Past Performance	No Page Limit
1	B	Factor 2: Proposed Contract Duration, Phasing and Summary Schedule	15
1	C	Factor 3: Technical Approach	15
2	A	Factor 4: Small Business Participation Plan	No page limit
2	B	Factor 4: Past Utilization of Small Business	No page limit
3	A	Price (Standard Form 1442 & Contract Line Item Schedule)	No page limit
3	B	Bid Guarantee	No page limit
3	C	Self-Performed Work	No page limit

In order to effectively and equitably evaluate all proposals, the Contracting Officer/PCO must receive information sufficiently detailed to clearly address submission requirements as outlined below. Pages containing text shall be submitted electronically on standard 8-1/2 x 11 inch size paper. Schedules, Drawings and/or sketches may be submitted electronically on paper not exceeding 11 x 17 inch paper, (each 11 x 17 counts as two pages). Use of 'TAB' pages are encouraged to identify each section of the proposal and shall not count against proposal's total page count. Each page of text shall be minimally single spaced with a minimum 12-point font and one inch margins all around. Any sheet with printed material (text or graphics) shall be considered a page, excluding dividers, cover sheets, letters of commitment, team agreements, and/or Joint Venture agreements.

3.1.4 Joint Ventures

i. When an Offeror is submitting a proposal as a joint venture, all members of the joint venture must sign the SF 1442 and any financial surety instrument that is required, unless a written agreement by all members of the joint venture is furnished with the proposal designating one firm with the legal authority to bind the other member(s) of the joint venture. Signatures on the written agreement designating one member of the joint venture as having legal authority to bind all other members of the joint venture must be executed by the duly authorized representatives of the respective joint venture members. All joint venture members will remain jointly and severally liable for all actions, representations, and other activities by the joint venture and by other joint venture members in

connection with this solicitation and subsequent contract. A copy of the joint venture agreement and agreement providing evidence of the authority to legally bind all other members of the joint venture must be submitted with the Offeror's proposal. Failure to comply with the foregoing requirements may eliminate the proposal from further consideration.

ii. If submitting a proposal as a joint venture, the experience, past performance, and other information about each of the joint venture partners can be submitted for the joint venture. The experience of each joint venture partner will be considered the experience of the joint venture entity. Joint ventures must also submit the following additional documentation:

3.1.4.ii.1 A copy of the Joint Venture Agreement.

3.1.4.ii.2 A detailed statement outlining the following in terms of percentages, where appropriate:

3.1.4.ii.3 The relationship of the joint venture parties in terms of business ownership, capital contribution, and profit distribution or loss sharing.

3.1.4.ii.4 The structure of the joint venture and decision making responsibilities of the joint venture parties in terms of who will control the manner and method of performance of the work under the contract.

3.1.4.ii.5 Identification of key personnel having the authority to bind the joint venture to any and all agreements, including any subcontracts, executed by the joint venture.

3.1.4.ii.6 Identification of party or parties maintaining the joint venture bank accounts for the payment of all expenses and the deposit of all receipts, keeping the books and records of the joint venture, and paying applicable taxes for the joint venture.

3.1.4.ii.7 Identification of party or parties having overall control of the joint venture.

iii. Other sections of the proposal shall identify, where appropriate, whether key personnel are employees of the individual joint venture entities and identify the entity, or whether they are hired directly as employees of the joint venture.

iv. A complete and legally binding document with all information required under this section titles "Joint Ventures" shall be included in Volume I of the proposal.

3.2 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

3.2.1 Proposal Requirements and Submission

Proposals should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms. Do not assume that Offerors will be contacted or afforded an opportunity to clarify, discuss or revise their proposals.

Do not submit any material not required by this solicitation (such as company or system brochures). Offerors shall meet all technical portions (construction criteria) of the RFP.

The fact that the technical specifications and the drawings are not evaluated factors during solicitation does not relieve the Offerors from meeting all technical, or other, requirements of the RFP.

The Government will not make assumptions concerning the intent, capabilities, or experiences of the Offerors. Clear identification of proposal details shall rest as sole responsibility of the Offeror. Therefore, the proposal shall meet the following basic requirements:

i. Proposals shall be typed and easy to read. Margins (1-inch) shall be clean and clear.

ii. Must contain a Proposal Cover Sheet, to include the Offeror's e-mail address, cell phone number, Name, Address, Unique Entity ID (SAM), and CAGE code. The proposal cover sheet is required by Provision "FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition."

iii. Proposals shall be organized, concise, and submitted in the volumes and in the order indicated herein. Volumes shall be clearly identified and tabbed. Each factor shall be described in a separate tabbed section.

iv. Proposals shall contain a Table of Contents and include at the bottom left side of each page the volume and page number.

v. Offerors shall submit a signed dated Standard Form 1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award. Any and all amendments must be acknowledged by the Offeror in accordance with the instructions on the Standard Form 30, Amendment of Solicitation.

vi. Offerors are reminded that elaborate corporate marketing information, formatting, special reproduction techniques, and the like are not necessary. However, proposals shall completely and adequately address the requirements of this solicitation.

vii. Failing to submit attachments or failing to properly complete the proposal, may result in rejection of the Offer without further evaluation. Therefore, Offerors are urged to follow instructions and contact the Contract Specialist if instructions are not understood.

3.2.2 Where to Submit:
The Offeror's proposal shall be submitted electronically, as described below. The RFP will provide the Government address and receipt date for proposal submittal. The Offeror's proposal shall not contain classified data. The use of hyperlinks in proposals is prohibited.

NOTE: The only authorized transmission method for proposals in response to this solicitation is electronically via EMAIL. NO OTHER TRANSMISSION METHODS (FACSIMILE, REGULAR MAIL, HAND CARRIED, ETC.) WILL BE ACCEPTED.

The Offeror's proposal must be received by the Government by the date/time specified in the solicitation. Offerors shall email their proposals.

Please send proposals electronically via EMAIL to Contract Specialist Orlando Nieves and to Contracting Officer Nicholas Emanuel.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING ELECTRONIC PROPOSALS:
In an effort to reduce paperwork and cost, all proposals shall be submitted electronically through email. Submission shall be in Adobe PDF format. If you have a large number of files, recommend that you combine or ZIP your files before uploading in email. (total size cannot exceed 5MB). Offerors may use compression utility software such as WinZip or PKZip to reduce file size and facilitate transmission.

FILE DESCRIPTION: Include a "File Description" for each file(s) you upload. The "File Description" will be included in the email notice to each of the recipients you choose to have access your file(s). NOTE: Do NOT enter Privacy Act Data (Personal Identification Information (PII)) in the File Description.) Submission shall be in Adobe PDF format.

RECEIPT OF SUBMISSIONS: For the purposes of establishing whether a proposal submission is considered timely, the government considers the date and time the submission is received by the Government.

The government will not be responsible for submissions delivered to any location or to anyone other than those designated to receive proposals. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that proposals are submitted so as to reach the designated recipient. Offerors are responsible for allowing sufficient time for the proposal to be received in accordance with the instructions provided.

3.3 VOLUME 1– MINIMUM SUBMISSION CRITERIA (TECHNICAL PROPOSAL): For purposes of this RFP, an "Offeror" may include a group of two (2) or more entities that have formed a "contractor team arrangement," as that term is defined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, Part 9.6. In the case of entities that have formed a contractor team arrangement, the experience and performance history of any member of the team, whether or not gained while working with the other member(s) of the currently proposed contractor team arrangement, will be considered as a part of the evaluation of the Offeror's proposal.

In the case of affiliates, past performance of an Offeror's "affiliate," as that term is defined in FAR 2.101, will be evaluated (as described within this section) if the Offeror demonstrates a firm commitment that the affiliate will participate meaningfully (e.g., roles, responsibilities, etc.) in the performance of the contract. This commitment, nature of each entity's relationship and meaningful participation shall be described in a document signed by authorized representatives of both the Offeror and its affiliate. If a teaming agreement or commitment is not provided, the projects and experience of any team members outside of the Prime Offeror will not be considered.

The contractor team agreement/commitment shall be provided at the beginning of the Offeror's technical proposal, prior to Factor 1, and will not be included in the overall page count.

The following are to be used in determining the status of the Offeror's team for the evaluation of project submissions under Factor 1:

3.3.1 In the case of contractor team arrangements involving a Prime Contractor and Subcontractor(s), where the Prime Contractor submits the proposal in response to this RFP, the Prime Contractor is considered the "Prime Offeror".

3.3.2 In the case of joint ventures, the "Prime Offeror" experience is limited to entities with signed agreements.

3.3.3 In the case of mentor/protégé relationships, the relationship must be established by the two Offerors and approved by the chosen Government Agency prior to proposal submission. The "Prime Offeror" experience is limited to entities with signed agreements. The approved mentor/protégé document from the Government Agency must be submitted along with the teaming agreement.

3.3.4 In the case of additional projects submitted by subcontractors, the subcontractor must submit the final cost of their portion of the project along with total project cost and all other required information.

3.3.5 In the case of Offerors that are large, multi-function firms (consisting of subsidiaries), experience may be submitted by any segment of the firm (e.g., division, group, and unit) that is submitting a proposal in response to this RFP.

3.3.6 In the case of affiliates, Past performance of an Offeror's "affiliate," as that term is defined in FAR 2.101, will be evaluated (as described within this section) if the Offeror demonstrates a firm commitment that the affiliate will participate meaningfully in the performance of the contract. This commitment and meaningful participation shall be described in a document signed by authorized representatives of both the Offeror and its affiliate.

3.3.7 If a teaming agreement or commitment is not provided, the projects of any team members outside of the Prime Offeror will not be considered. If the Joint Venture/Mentor Protégé is a Small and Large Business, the Small Business will be evaluated as the Prime Offeror.

4.0 PROPOSAL INFORMATION AND RELATED EVALUATION FACTORS, RATINGS AND ELEMENTS

The SSEB will evaluate the proposals and assign a consensus rating for the evaluation factor.

Offerors are cautioned to put forth their best efforts, and to furnish all information clearly to allow the Government to evaluate proposals. Firms should not assume that they will have an opportunity to clarify or correct anything in their proposal after submission. However, the Government reserves the right to hold discussions if it determines that discussions are necessary. Therefore, proposals should be submitted on the most favorable terms that the Offeror can submit to the Government. If discussions are necessary, the Contracting Officer reserves the right to 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.

Determination of Competitive Range refers to the range of proposals that are identified as the most highly rated, unless the range is further reduced for the purposes of efficiency. Competitive range will be determined on the basis of the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation factors. The Government must then indicate to, or discuss with, each Offeror still being considered for award, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of its proposal. The Contracting Officer will notify all contractors eliminated from the competitive range.

If discussions are held, the Government may engage in exchanges with those firms in the competitive range, in accordance with FAR 15.306 (d). The Government will provide the Firm an advance agenda for the discussions. During discussions, the Government may ask the Firm to further explain its proposal and to answer questions about it.

Upon conclusion of discussions, those firms still considered within the competitive range, will be afforded an opportunity to submit their proposal revisions for final evaluation and selection.

4.1 VOLUME 1 – PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY

LOCATION	FACTOR NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
Volume 1 Tab A	Factor 1	Past Performance	Technical factor 1 is the most important technical factor, followed by technical factor 2 and 3 that are equal in importance but less important than technical factor 1.
Volume 1 Tab B	Factor 2	Proposed Contract Duration, Phasing & Summary Schedule	
Volume 1 Tab C	Factor 3	Technical Approach	

4.2 VOLUME 2 – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN

LOCATION	FACTOR NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
Volume 2 TAB 1	Factor 4	Small Business Participation Plan	Technical factor 4 is less important than factors 1,2 and 3.

Volume 2 TAB 2	Factor 4	Past Utilization Of Small Business	

4.3 VOLUME 3 – PRICE

LOCATION	FACTOR NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
Vol 3	N/A	Price	All technical factors (1-4) when combined are approximately equal in importance to price.

- **5.0 VOLUME 1 – PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY**

GENERAL: The technical factors consist of examples of Past Performance that meet the relevant scope, complexity, and magnitude described below. This Volume also includes factors for a Proposed Contract Duration, Phasing & Summary Schedule, Organizational Approach, Technical Approach, and Small Business Participation Plan.

DEFINITIONS:

- Deficiency: A material failure of a response or 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. (FAR 15.001)

- Weakness: A flaw in the response or proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

- Significant Weakness: A flaw in the response or proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. Denoted with an (S).

- Strength: Any aspect of a proposal that, when judged against a stated evaluation criterion, enhances the merit of the proposal or increases the probability of successful performance of the contract.

- Significant Strength: A significant strength appreciably enhances the merit of a proposal or appreciably enhances the probability of successful contract performance. Denoted with an (S).

- Deviation: Proposal implies or specifically offers a deviation below the specified criteria. The Offeror may or

may not have called the deviation to the Government's attention. A deviation is a deficiency. The proposal must conform to the solicitation requirements for award.

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

EVALUATION RATING SYSTEM

- General: The Government will review the proposals and rate the quality of each evaluation factor. The SSEB will rate each proposal against the specified evaluation criteria in the Solicitation requirements. They will not compare proposals at this time. After all proposals are rated, the Government will compare the ratings and relative advantages and disadvantages of proposals against each other.

- Review Write-up: The Government will support each rating with a narrative, separately listing all strengths or advantages, weaknesses or disadvantages, deficiencies, and required clarifications.

- Rating System: After listing proposal strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies, the SSEB will assign an adjective rating of "Outstanding", "Good", "Acceptable", "Marginal", or "Unacceptable" to each factor except the Past Performance Factor, which reflect the Government's confidence in each Offeror's ability, as demonstrated in its proposal, to perform the requirements stated in the RFP. The adjectival ratings shall be assigned, using the evaluation criteria, which incorporate a proposal risk assessment:

VOLUME 1 – FACTOR 1 – PAST PERFORMANCE

The Offeror will provide Past Performance information on relevant projects using the Past Performance and Specialized Experience Questionnaires included in the solicitation. Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) shall be submitted for projects, when available. Your client should receive form ATTACHMENT 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (PPQ) with items 1 through 4 completed and the "Note" that appears on its reverse side as well as the "Adjective Rating and Definitions" that are used for the ratings in the form. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed Past Performance Questionnaires should be submitted with your proposal. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before the proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ form, which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Contract Specialist prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

Also include performance recognition documents received within the last five (5) years such as award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

The Government reserves the right to verify the experience by reviewing the Construction Contractor (or Architect-Engineer) Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), other DoD or Government appraisal systems or to interview commercial owners or references. The Government may check any or all cited references to verify supplied information. The relevant experience of key personnel proposed for this project will not be evaluated or considered under this factor.

While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

The source selection evaluation team will review this past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to a performance competence assessment as described in the guidelines, below.

Less than satisfactory performance information includes the issuance of cure notices, terminations for default, or the requirement for excessive oversight in order to achieve satisfactory completion. A single example of less than satisfactory performance, if significant enough, may lead to a less than satisfactory rating for this factor. Likewise, multiple examples of less significant less than satisfactory performance may lead to a less than satisfactory rating for this factor.

In conducting the performance competence assessment, the Government will consider the relevancy of the past performance information available. Highly relevant projects are those that are similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to the current solicitation, although the past performance may still be considered if the projects do not fully meet the criteria for Factor 1.

In addition, the Offeror is required to provide any information on past projects (within the past five (5) years) that were terminated (for any reason) or in which they have been issued a CURE NOTICE and provide accompanying information as to the details for such action(s) with an explanation of why they were terminated or issued a cure notice.

In Addition to the above, an offeror is required to provide responses to the following:
In the past three (3) years, have you ever:

1. Received a cure notice?
2. Had liquidated damages assessed?
   Received a show cause notice?
3. Had a non-responsibility determination:
4. Received any unsatisfactory performance ratings in CPARS?

If so, please provide the name of the project, the client, and the date of action.

5.1.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The SSEB will evaluate the risks associated with an Offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the RFP based on the Offeror's demonstrated performance on recent, relevant contracts. A performance confidence assessment rating will be assigned to each past performance.

Rating Guidelines for Factor 1: Refer to the Table is section 5.1.3

NOTE: In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or "neutral confidence") past performance.

5.1.2 RELEVANT PAST PERFORMANCE

The Offeror will be evaluated on the relevancy of the experience demonstrated in the submitted form, ATTACHMENT 3 - SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE. The Offeror must list their experience of similar project scope, complexity and magnitude.

For the construction contractor experience– submit a minimum of two (2) projects but no more than Four (4) projects. One project shall be completed and turned over. The second project shall be at least 75% construction complete. The percentage completion of a project shall be based on billed expenses towards that specific project. All the submitted projects shall be recent construction experience which means that completion shall be no more than seven (7) years preceding the date of this solicitation. Completion shall be described as a project being substantially complete, whereas the project is deemed sufficiently completed to the point where the customer can use it for its intended purpose with little to no follow-on work. The projects shall meet the descriptions of scope, complexity and magnitude as outlined below. At least two (2) projects should be examples showing infrastructure upgrades as described in this solicitation.

If any firm has multiple divisions, limit the project examples to those performed by the division submitting the offer.

Letters of commitment (Signed by both the Subcontractor and Offeror) are required in order for the Government to consider Subcontractor experience in the proposal evaluation. Other divisions within the Offer's company may be considered as subcontractors for the submitting division.

The projects submitted should include the following criteria. Projects do not have to include all of the criteria; however, projects that meet many or all of the criteria would be given a higher degree of relevancy.

i. Similar scope is defined as the construction of or renovation of a facility to include power generation facilities, electrical distribution facilities, manufacturing spaces, and other buildings with similar usage/occupancy.
ii. Similar complexity is projects demonstrating:
    a. Coordination between multiple technical disciplines including Architecture, Civil Engineering, Structural Engineering, HVAC, Fire Protection, plumbing, and electrical.
    b. Experience with work on a constrained site.
    c. Experience working and coordinating with other ongoing construction activities in the same vicinity.
    d. Installation of high voltage electrical switching gear (equal to or above 600 volts).
    e. Experience with installation of multiple pieces of power generation equipment (equal to or above 1 MW or greater).
iii. Very Similar magnitude shall be considered for construction or renovation projects with contract costs above $20,000,000.00. Similar Magnitude will be considered between $15,000,000.00 and $25,000,000.000. Somewhat similar will be considered between $9,000,000.00 and $14,999,999.00. Projects below $8,999,999.00 will be considered not similar.

The Government will consider the experience demonstrated by the projects in its evaluation. Proposals will be highly rated when the Offeror demonstrates extensive experience in all or nearly all of the aspects defining relevance and listed below. Where this experience includes the following, the proposal may be given strengths (the following list does not encompass all possible items for which additional consideration may be given):

i. The Offeror acted as a prime contractor in the majority of the example experiences.
ii. More than one (1) recent relevant experience involving high voltage infrastructure installation.
iii. The majority of the example experiences are projects performed at Watervliet Arsenal or with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
iv. The majority of the experiences are projects performed within the last three years.
v. Prime contractor experience working as a prime contractor.
vi. Projects demonstrating self-performance by the prime contractor or past experience demonstrating the prime contractor and proposed subcontractors working together.
vii. Projects showing experience of installation of new construction in constrained locations.
viii. Completed and turned over projects will be rated higher than projects that are submitted and 75% complete.
ix. The Government will consider the experience demonstrated by the projects in its evaluation. Proposals will be more highly rated when the Offeror demonstrates experience in all or nearly all of the aspects defining relevance and listed below. Where this experience includes the following, the proposal may be given additional consideration (the following list does not encompass all possible items for which additional consideration may be given):
    a. Projects demonstrating experience working within an occupied and constrained space.
    b. Projects demonstrating experience adding onto an existing infrastructure.
    c. Majority of Project scope demonstrated experience installing high voltage electrical systems.
    d. Project demonstrated experience installing power generation equipment.

Where this experience includes the following, the proposal may be given weaknesses (the following list does not encompass all possible weaknesses):

i. Few or no projects are provided where the Offeror acted as Prime contractor.
ii. Example experiences where the Offeror or their proposed subcontractor were subcontractors and their role was minor in comparison to the whole project.
iii. Example projects were performed by a Division of the company other than the Division submitting the offer.
iv. Example experiences are from proposed subcontractors in lieu of the Offeror.
v. The example experiences do not demonstrate previous teaming experience between current proposal team members.

vi. Experience examples are not verifiable.
vii. Few or no projects involving the installation of infrastructure.

5.1.3 RATING GUIDELINES FOR FACTOR 1

PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS	
RATINGS	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.

PAST PERFORMANCE (CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT RATING SYSTEM)

Past Performance Risk Ratings assess the risks associated with an Offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the RFP based on the Offeror's demonstrated performance on recent, relevant contracts. Performance Confidence Assessment (Overall) Rating System:

PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT	
RATINGS	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 be able to successfully perform the required effort.

Based on the Offeror's recent relevant performance record, the Government will make a determination as to the expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. A performance confidence assessment rating will be assigned.

Where 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 will receive a Neutral Confidence (neutral) rating. This rating is neither favorable nor unfavorable.

5.2 VOLUME 1 – FACTOR 2 – PROPOSED CONTRACT DURATION, SUMMARY SCHEDULE

Submit a summary level schedule for the Electrical Switching Station North Project. The schedule must be task oriented, indicating number of calendar days, after notice to proceed, by which milestones are to be achieved. Schedule pages must be legible on 11x17 sheets of paper. This summary schedule will, after contract award, be replaced with a project schedule as required by Section 01 32 01.00 10: Project Schedule shall have the same minimal requirements described herein. The length of the schedule can match the proposed contract duration but not exceed it. If it is shorter than the proposed contract duration, it is binding. For the purposes of the summary schedule, assume a notice to proceed date of 1 JUNE 2026 when providing a schedule for review. The schedule at a minimum should include the following activities.

i. Kick-Off Meeting
ii. Submission of quality control and safety plans
iii. Procurement for material and equipment such as switching gear, generators, mechanical systems and other items that have long lead times as to not delay completion
iv. Delivery of electrical gear addressing at a minimum the switching gear and generators
v. Delivery of mechanical gear addressing at a minimum the fuel polishing system
vi. Exterior site work
vii. Exterior site utilities
viii. Phasing and coordination of demolition
ix. Phasing and coordination of construction
x. Testing and balancing of infrastructure
xi. Other critical closeout activities including as-built drawings and O&M Manuals
xii. Beneficial Occupancy Date
xiii. Post construction commissioning
xiv. Turn-over of laydown and storage area to Government
xv. Contract Closeout

Submit a narrative discussing the project's critical path. The critical path must be shown on the summary level schedule. Discuss critical path activities that have the greatest risk to project delivery. Discuss how your schedule mitigates those risks and what measures you will take to ensure the project is delivered on time. Submit narrative discussing submittal procedures and linkage of submittal register to scheduled activities. In the narrative, discuss how the schedule accounts for management of the submittal process and lead time is reflected in the submittal register to meet activity early start date. Discuss internal procedures for preventing late submittal submission to minimize time growth. Identify any constraints on the schedule presented (i.e. labor or material availability, weather, permits, etc.).

Submission must include the following for each activity: activity duration, early start, early finish, late start and late finish, float, predecessors and successors. This information can be provided in table format or graphically.

Submission should include a phasing plan for construction activities based on the constrained location and based on the fact that the equipment the infrastructure will support is being installed by others. Phasing plan should provide a narrative explaining phases of work, identify activities, limits, locations, and durations and include explanations for what work cannot occur during this phase, and how the phased plan will provide an efficient means to accomplish work.

The narrative and summary schedule shall also discuss all preconstruction activities, design milestone dates, manufacturing durations, anticipated durations of the shut down of

utilities/equipment, and furnace commissioning activities.

The time to complete the project and turnover to the Government must consider the requirement for the Contractor's CQC completion inspection and the subsequent joint Contractor- Government turnover inspection.

The schedule should include all anticipated commissioning activities, and clearly indicate accurate logic and succession of commissioning activities. The schedule should include sufficient time to complete all commissioning requirements in accordance with the RFP.

5.2.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The SSEB will evaluate the schedule to assess the offeror's understanding of the project scope, restrictions which must be considered in the schedule (i.e. long lead items), etc. The SSEB will evaluate the strength of understanding of all elements required in the submission and the offeror's capability to schedule the complete project within the proposed contract duration and the realism of the schedule. A schedule that offers advantage(s) to the SSEB over one that merely indicates an adequate understanding of the scope, restrictions, major milestones and general understanding of the various events that can affect start and completion of construction will receive additional consideration. Schedule factors the SSEB will consider advantageous include, but are not limited to:

i. Plan to reduce risks and mitigate schedule growth.
ii. Minimum 30 Calendar Day Early Contract Completion Date. A logical and realistic approach to early completion much be demonstrated.
iii. Plan to accurately and efficiently address and document existing conditions early on and throughout selective demolition process.
iv. Plan to effectively identify long-lead materials and equipment early on during construction in order to procure and install without causing delays
v. Planning for testing of all installed building systems prior to use and turnover
vi. Planning for seasonally dependent activities such as HVAC commissioning and work that incorporates steam.
vii. Narratives which demonstrate understanding of USACE schedule management tools and techniques
viii. Narratives which provide actionable insight to the government
ix. Narratives which demonstrate how the contractor would define potential risks and ways to mitigate risk, including but not limited to, weather, long lead times, deliveries, shutdowns, etc.

The proposal may be given weaknesses (the following list does not encompass all possible weaknesses):

i. Little to no insight on how to address construction phasing
ii. Omission of one or more scheduling activities mentioned above

The Government will evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and any deficiencies in the plan focused on logic, task duration and critical path.

The Government will not award to an Offeror who receives an unsatisfactory rating.

5.2.2 RATING GUIDELINES FOR FACTOR 2

5.2.2.1 Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method

The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings.

Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	DESCRIPTION
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates 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.
Purple	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.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high. Proposal is unawardable.

The government will not award to an Offeror that receives an unsatisfactory rating in this factor.

5.3 VOLUME 1 – FACTOR 3 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

The design-technical Factor consists of conceptual level presentation drawings, technical approach narratives and information regarding material and system quality. It must clearly define the proposed scope and quality levels that the Offeror is proposing to the Government in enough detail for the Government and the Offeror to mutually understand whether or not the proposal meets or exceeds the minimum Solicitation requirements. Fully developed drawings, details, or specifications are not desired and will not be rated more favorably.

Factor 3 must include the following:

i. Describe the approach for the full scope of work in the contract, including a list of specific scope features and address specific constraints. The Government is looking for the proposed construction/installation approach employed by the Offeror in schedule management, material/equipment delivery and management, methods of installing infrastructure and relating phasing, construction coordination with the equipment manufacturer and installer to be completed by others, delivery of long lead time items and the use of limited onsite storage, labor management, cost management, site security and personnel assurance.

ii. The Offeror should include their technical approach for infrastructure work including construction at project site prior to the delivery of the generators and associated testing.

iii. The offeror should include how they plan to work with the limited project site and limited laydown area The offeror should include how they plan to maximize efficiency.

iv. Describe interactions within the team and with the Corps of Engineers during the

construction. Describe the role and interaction of the construction team during construction, addressing elements such as schedule management, material/equipment delivery and management, labor management, cost management, site security and personnel assurance system management, progress meetings, documentation and quality control.

v. Describe quality control procedures during construction. Include description of quality control verification and communication plan with the Corps of Engineers regarding submittal register, request for information, payment, change order and schedule control. Particular attention should be paid to effectively incorporating the requirements of the list external requirements into both the Quality Control Plan and Submittal Register.

vi. Describe the contractor's plan to accomplish mechanical and electrical system testing and commissioning within the period of performance.

vii. Describe the contractor's approach for efficient and early identification of existing conditions including identification, documentation, and remediation of hazardous materials.

5.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

The Government places a higher value on an Offeror that provides proposed methods to streamline construction and manage labor and other resource constraints in an effort to reduce costs and support an aggressive schedule. The Government will also consider whether the approach reduces on-site fabrication and susceptibility to inclement weather delays. The Government will consider proposed methods to demolish and replace building elements in an organized, contained manner with minimal impact to the remainder of the facility. The government will consider proposed methods to minimize conflicts between trades on site. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's capabilities and understanding of the contractually required quality control processes for construction.

Technical Approach items the government may consider advantageous include, but are not limited to:

i. Planning for construction taking place within a constrained area.
ii. Description of the contactor's approach for mitigating disruptions to power.

5.3.2 RATING GUIDELINES FOR FACTOR 3

i. The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings.

Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	DESCRIPTION
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates 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.
Purple	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.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high. Proposal is unawardable.

6.0 VOLUME 2 – FACTOR 4—SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN & PAST UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The Offeror shall use Attachment 4 as a form to provide the following required information in a clear concise manner.

6.1 VOLUME 2 – FACTOR 4 – TAB A SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN

IAW Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS) 215.304(c)(i), the extent to which Offerors identify and commit to small business performance of the contract shall be evaluated. Offerors shall submit a Small Business Participation Plan (SBPP) which specifies the Offeror's level and degree of commitment to small business utilization/participation in performance of this requirement. An SBPP is required from all Offerors, including companies with commercial plans and comprehensive subcontracting plans.

All Offerors shall identify the extent to which Small Businesses (SBs), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSBs), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSBs), HUBZone Small Businesses, Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDBs), and Woman-Owned Small Businesses (WOSBs) would be utilized in the performance of this proposed contract. For small businesses, as defined by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code applicable to this solicitation, the Offerors shall identify their own participation as a SB, VOSB, SDVOSB, HUBZONE SB, SDB, or WOSB and it will be considered in evaluating the Participation of Small Business Factor. See Section 01 30 00, "Administrative Requirements".

Address the following information in detail. Provide the names of SB, VOSB, SDVOSB, HUBZONE SB, SDB, and WOSB who would participate in the proposed contract, identifying specific type of services or supplies to be subcontracted by Small Businesses, and the estimated total dollars for such work.

Large business contractors may achieve the small business participation goals through subcontracting to small businesses. Small business contractors may achieve small business participation goals through their own performance/participation as a prime and also through a joint venture, teaming arrangement, and subcontracting to other small businesses. A small business prime is not required to subcontract to other small businesses in order to achieve the small business participation goals.

All Offerors (both large and small businesses) will be evaluated on the level of proposed participation of U.S. small businesses in the performance of acquisition (as small business prime Offerors or small

business subcontractors) relative to the objectives and goals established herein.

6.2 GOAL REGARDING THE PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

6.2.1 Application. This clause applies to all Offerors submitting proposals.

6.2.2 Goals. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers considers the following goals for Small Business Participation, reasonable and achievable for the performance of the resultant contract:

i. 12% of total contract amount with small business concerns (SB).

6.2.3 Socio-Economic Goals: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers considers the following socio-economic goals for Small Business Participation, reasonable and achievable for the performance of the resultant contract:

i. 4% of total contract amount with those small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (SDB, including 8(a)).

ii. 3% of total contract amount with those small business concerns owned and controlled by women (WOSB).

iii. 2% of total contract amount with those small business concerns owned and controlled by Service-Disabled Veterans (SDVOSB).

iv. 1% of total contract amount with those small business concerns owned and controlled by HUBZones.

v. 2% of total contract amount with those small business concerns owned and controlled by Veterans (VOSB).

Note: Socio-Economic goal percentages listed are to be part of the total percentage submitted to meet or exceed the 12% small business goal identified in 5.5.2(b)(i) (not in addition to).

Note: Offerors shall provide both the percentage and total dollars to be performed by small businesses and each subcategory (based on the total contract value). The Small Business Deputy will verify the total proposed price (not individual cost elements), and any subcontracting information with the Cost/Price team to ensure the dollar amounts are consistent with what is being proposed in the SBPP. If an Offeror does not use the value of their total acquisition to base their participation goals on it will result in a deficiency.

Note: If an Offeror is unable to meet the full RFP participation goals for any of the socioeconomic categories (e.g., HUBZone, WOSB, etc.), the Offeror must provide an explanation as to why the participation goal(s) cannot be met and/or what actions will be taken to increase the participation for any of the socioeconomic participation goal categories the Offeror is unable to meet.

Pursuant to DFARS PGI 215.304(c) the following elements will be considered in evaluating an Offeror's Participation Plan:

i. The extent to which such firms, as defined in FAR Part 19, are specifically identified in plans;
ii. The extent of commitment to use such firms (enforceable commitments will be weighted more heavily than non-enforceable ones);
iii. Identification of the complexity and variety of the work such firms are to perform;
iv. The extent to which the Offeror meets or exceeds the goals, as indicated herein in terms of percentage of the total value of the acquisition;
v. Past performance of the Offerors in complying with requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

Note: Offerors shall provide both the percentage and total dollars to be performed by small businesses and each subcategory (based on the total contract value). The Small Business Deputy will verify the total proposed price (not individual cost elements), and any subcontracting information with the Cost/Price team to ensure the dollar amounts are consistent with what is being proposed in the SBPP. If an Offeror does not use the value of their total acquisition to base their participation goals on it will result in a deficiency.

Note: If an Offeror is unable to meet the full RFP participation goals for any of the socioeconomic categories (e.g., HUBZone, WOSB, etc.), the Offeror must provide an explanation as to why the participation goal(s) cannot be met and/or what actions will be taken to increase the participation for any of the socioeconomic participation goal categories the Offeror is unable to meet.

See Table in Section 6.3.6, for the Small Business ratings criteria.

6.3 VOLUME 2 – FACTOR 4 – TAB B - PAST UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

6.3.1 Submission Requirements: Provide a description of the Offeror's performance, over the past seven (7) calendar years, in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, including description and available documentation of the methods employed to promote small business utilization and the internal methods used to monitor such utilization. Factor 4, Small Business Participation Plan (Volume 4), also required in the Source Selection phase, and the Subcontracting Plan required prior to award if requested by the Contracting Officer, are both separate and different requirements than Factor 4 (Volume 2), Past Utilization of Small Business.

6.3.2 Past performance of the Offeror in complying with the requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and, for all large business Offerors, FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (JUL 2013), based on the Offeror's presentation of facts, details of efforts and successes in complying with the clause(s) on Federal contracts. Offerors must show documentation of reasonable efforts in complying with the clause for a "satisfactory" rating.

6.3.3 Offerors who are large, as defined by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code applicable to this solicitation, shall provide a description of their performance over the past seven (7) calendar years in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and/or FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, including documentation of their accomplishment on prior contracts with any Federal Agency. For Large Business: Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR) system located at https://www.esrs.gov3. For Large and Small businesses: provide descriptive information for all small business categories. Any information concerning long-term relationships with Small Business subcontractors, such as mentor-protégé relationships, should be provided. Contractors using the Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) with non-DoD agencies may submit a Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR) for plan type individual. The SSR is the former SF-295. USACE is using eSRS effective October 2008.

6.3.4 Large businesses that have never held a contract incorporating FAR 52.219-8 and/or FAR 52.219-9 shall so state. Large Businesses may use company records to document Past Utilization of Small Business.

6.3.5 Small business utilization for each of the projects submitted under Factor 1 shall be included in this section. Information to be provided includes:

i. Extent and type of work you subcontracted out.
ii. Type of firm subcontracted to (LB, SDVOSB, WOSB, etc.).
iii. Company subcontracted to.
iv. Subcontracted company's address.
v. Subcontracted company's Unique Entity ID (SAM).
vi. Subcontracted company's NAICS.
vii. Amount subcontracted to small business.
viii. Details of efforts and successes in complying with the clauses(s) of Federal contracts.
ix. Explanation for no prior performance information.

6.4 RATING GUIDELINES FOR FACTOR 4 – TAB B - PAST UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

RATINGS	DESCRIPTION
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Good	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives.
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Unsatisfactory	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

The government will not award to an Offeror that receives an unsatisfactory rating in this factor.

7.0 VOLUME 3– PRICE AND PRO FORMA INFORMATION

GENERAL: Submit the Pro Forma information in a separate electronic file labeled: "Volume 3 – Pro Forma Requirements."

7.1 VOLUME 3 TAB A – PRICE (STANDARD FORM 1442 AND CONTRACT LINE ITEM SCHEDULE)

Submission Requirements: Submit the properly filled out and executed SF 1442, along with the CLIN Schedule, containing proposed line item and total pricing, as well as the proposed contract duration.

7.1.1 Supplemental Cost Breakdown. The Government may requests a cost breakdown of the Contract Line items in a sealed envelope marked “Cost Breakdown Information”, in Excel format. The Government will provide details for the preparation of the cost breakdown. This information maybe required for the initial proposal and, if requested, for any revised proposals. This information is not an opportunity for an Offeror to revise its non-price or price proposal.

7.1.2 Price will not be rated or scored but will be evaluated for fairness and reasonableness through the use of a price analysis by the Price Evaluation Board (PEB). The PEB will also check for appearance of unbalanced line item prices. Offerors are cautioned to distribute direct costs, such as material, labor, equipment, subcontracts, etc. and to evenly distribute indirect costs, such as job overhead, home office overhead, bond, etc., to the appropriate contract line items. Both parties shall presume that field overhead costs through the proposed contract duration are inclusive in the offered price for the contract. Evaluation preference shall be in accordance with FAR Clause 52.219-4 “Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns.”

7.1.3 If deemed necessary, the supplemental price breakdown information will be used to assist the Government in performing the price evaluations described above.

7.1.4 The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers. The Government will not award a contract to an Offeror whose proposal contains a deficiency, as defined in FAR 15.001. If there is a lower priced, conforming offer(s), the Source Selection Official must determine that the added value of a more expensive proposal (within an acceptable range) would justify award to that Offeror.

7.2 VOLUME 3 – TAB B – BID GUARANTEE

7.2.1 Submission Requirements: Submit the Bid Bond in accordance with the solicitation request for proposals. If the Offeror cannot provide a Bid Guarantee in accordance with FAR 52.228-1, the Offeror's proposal may be rejected as ineligible for award.

7.2.2 Evaluation Requirements: This item is not rated. In order to assure adequate interest in and supervision of all work, the Contractor shall be required to perform a significant part of the contract with its own forces. This public policy is expressed in various Statutes, as well as in the Federal Acquisition Regulations and in the Small Business Administration Code of Federal Regulations. The Firm must confirm that it understands the amount of work performed, based on the status of the firm, and that it will self-perform the required amount of work with its own forces. For purposes of these clauses, work that is performed off-site, such as factory fabrication or factory assembly of modules, or direct design work, may also be taken into account as self-performed work.

7.3 VOLUME 3 TAB C – SELF-PERFORMED WORK

7.3.1 Submission Requirements: The Firm shall confirm that it understands and that it shall perform the amount of work required to be self-performed, in accordance with the appropriate clause in Section 00 70 00 that applies to the contract performance.

7.3.2 Evaluation Requirements: This item is not rated. In order to assure adequate interest in and supervision of all work, the Contractor shall be required to perform a significant part of the contract with its own forces. This public policy is expressed in various Statutes, as well as in the Federal Acquisition Regulations and in the Small Business Administration Code of Federal Regulations. The Firm must confirm that it understands the amount of work performed, based on the status of the firm, and that it will self-perform the required amount of work with its own forces. For purposes of these clauses, work that is performed off-site, such as factory fabrication or factory assembly of modules, or direct design work, may also be taken into account as self- performed work.

7.4 TAB D - REQUIRED PRE-AWARD INFORMATION

7.4.1 Submission Requirements:
Submit this information for the Source Selection Authority's determination of Offeror responsibility, which includes, but is not limited to the following:

(1) A list of present commitments, including the dollar value thereof, and name of the organization under which the work is being performed. Include names and telephone numbers of personnel within each organization who are familiar with the prospective contractor's performance.

(2) A certified statement listing; (1) each contract awarded within the preceding three month period exceeding $1,000,000.00 in value with a brief description of the contract; and (2) each contract

awarded within the preceding three year period not already physically completed and exceeding $3,500,000.00 in value with a brief description of the contract.

(3) If the prospective contractor is a joint venture, each joint venture member will be requiredto submit the above defined certification.

One copy of the following information shall be provided:

(1) Proof of Financial Ability (Most recent financial statement covering assets and liabilities)

(2) Number of years the firm has been in business.

(3) Name, address and telephone number of firm's bonding company.

(4) Information showing Offeror's bond-ability for this project. Include the bond rate.

(5) Name, address and telephone numbers of two credit/trade references.

7.5 TAB E – REPRESENTATIONS & CERTIFICATIONS

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS: Confirm that the Offeror's representations and certifications have been completed and also include hard copies under this Tab.

EVALUATION CRITERIA: The representations and certifications submitted under this tab and online will be reviewed to ensure the Offeror's representations are consistent, accurate, and in accordance with regulation. It will not be rated.

In addition to the other proposal information, the Source Selection Authority shall use this information in making an affirmative responsibility determination for award to the Successful Offeror, in accordance with FAR Part 9.

ATTACHMENT 1 - PROPOSAL DATA SHEET

(1) Name of Solicitation:

(2) Name of Firm

Address:
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Unique Entity ID (SAM) # (used for accessing the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS) or A-E Contractor Administration Support System (ACASS) Database)

Also provide any other assigned number that identifies the member firm(s) in the ACASS or CCASS databases. If a separate Unique Entity ID (SAM) has been created for a joint venture (J-V) it must also be submitted. Provide a Unique Entity ID (SAM) number for each company identified in any proposed Contractor-subcontractor association of firms. If the firm is a joint venture or contractor-subcontractor association of firms, list the individual firms and briefly describe the nature of the association. Provide Unique Entity ID (SAM) for each.

Firm 1:
Firm 2:
Firm 3:

Nature of Association:

(3) AUTHORIZED NEGOTIATORS. FAR 52.215-11

The Offeror represents that the following persons are authorized to negotiate on its behalf with the Government in connection with this Request for Proposals (RFP).

[List names, titles, and telephone number of the authorized

negotiator.] Name of Person Authorized to Negotiate:
Negotiator's
Address:
Negotiator's
Telephone:
Negotiator’s
E-mail:

ATTACHMENT 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (PPQ)

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

CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)

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

2. Work Performed as: ☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Sub Contractor ☐ 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.

ATTACHMENT 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (PPQ) (cont.)

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.

ATTACHMENT 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (PPQ) (cont.)

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

ATTACHMENT 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (PPQ) (cont.)

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, Engineer-in-Charge, 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)***:**

ATTACHMENT 3 - SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE
PRIME CONTRACTOR OR KEY SUBCONTRACTOR

Provide the following information to show examples of projects your company constructed within the last **six** years indicating experience with projects of similar type and scope. Use one form per project.

Type of Facility Represented_____

Your Firm's Name:_____

Name of Project_____

Location of Project_____

Owner_____

General Scope of Construction Project_____

_____

_____

Your Role (Prime, Joint Venture, or Subcontractor, etc.) and Work Your Company Self-Performed:

_____

_____

Construction Cost_____

Did this project include LEED (Bronze, Silver, Gold or Platinum)_____

Percent of Work Self Performed _____

Extent and Type of Work You Subcontracted Out _____

_____

_____

Dates Construction: Began_____Completed_____

Your Performance Evaluation by Owner, if known _____

_____

Were You Terminated or Assessed Liquidated Damages?_____

(If either is "Yes", attach an Explanation)

Owner's Point of Contact for Reference(Name and Company)_____

_____

Current Telephone Number of Reference _____

ATTACHMENT 4 - SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN

SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIAPTION PLAN PROPOSAL FORMAT: The Small Business Participation Plan (SBPP) proposal format is designed to streamline and bring uniformity to responses and evaluations for Small Business Participation (FAR 15.304 and DFARS PGI 215.304). The format provides clarity in that it is distinctly different than the Small Business Subcontracting Plan required for large businesses only (FAR 52.219-9 and AFARS Appendix DD). Do not submit a hybrid plan that includes a combination of elements from a SBPP (IAW DFARS PGI 215.304) and elements of a Subcontracting Plan (IAW FAR 52.219-9/AFARS Appendix DD).

All Offerors (**both large and small businesses**) are required to complete a Small Business Participation Plan proposal. Offerors should propose the level of participation of small businesses (as a small business prime, joint venture, teaming arrangement, and/or small business subcontractors) in the performance of the acquisition relative to the objectives/goals set forth in the evaluation of this area.

The format below is to be utilized for the SBPP Proposal, but does not preclude Offerors from providing additional information that further demonstrates their extent of commitments to small businesses presently and in the past. Offerors must comply with all elements spelled out with Submission Requirements listed above and information requested within the SBPP Proposal Format.

(a) Check the applicable size and categories for the **PRIME** Offeror only -- Check all applicable boxes:

{ } Large Prime
{ } Historically Black Colleges or Universities and Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI)
or
{ } Small Business Prime; also categorized as a
{ } Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
{ } Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
{ } Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone)
{ } Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)
{ } Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)

(b) Submit the total combined dollar value and percentage of work to be performed by both large and small businesses (include the percentage of work to be performed both by Prime, joint venture, teaming arrangement, and subcontractors):

Example: If Prime proposes a price of $1,000,000 (including all options), and small business(es) will provide $250,000 in services/supplies as a prime or subcontractor, the % planned for small businesses is 25%; and 75% for large business equaling 100%.

The SBEB will use the information provided within this section to assess an Offerors compliance of item (d) as described under how the government will evaluate, SBPP Submission Requirements and respond accordingly.

Total Percentage Planned for Large Business(es)_____% = $ _____

Total Percentage Planned for Small Business(es)_____% = $ _____

When combined, Large and Small Business totals must equal 100%.

100% = $_____

(c) Please indicate the total percentage (%) and dollar value of participation to be performed by each type of subcategory small business. Not doing so will result in a weakness. The percentage of work performed by small businesses that qualify in multiple small business categories may be counted in each category:

Example: Victory Prop Mgt (WOSB and SDVOSB) performing 2%; and Williams Group (SDB, HUBZone and WOSB) performing 3%. Results equate to: SDB 3%; HUBZone 3%; WOSB 5%; SDVOSB 2%; VOSB 2%;). SDVOSBs are also VOSBs automatically; however VOSBs are not automatically SDVOSBs.

Provide both the percentage and total dollars to be performed by small businesses to ensure consistency for evaluation purposes. Not doing so will result in a weakness.

Small Businesses	**% of Total Acquisition Value (TAV)**	**Corresponding Dollars**
Small Disadvantaged Business	_____%	$
Woman Owned Small Business	_____%	$
HUBZone Small Business	_____%	$
Veteran-Owned Small Business	_____%	$
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	_____%	$
HBCU/Minority Institutions* (Aspirational goal)	_____%	$

(d) Identify the Prime Offeror and type of service/supply that the Prime Offeror will provide. Then list each of the intended subcontractors and principal supplies/services to be provided by that subcontractor. Provide the Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code for the Prime and each intended subcontractor. Also, provide the anticipated NAICS codes(s) that the Prime Offeror believes best describes the product or services being acquired by its subcontracts with each intended subcontractor. Small business Primes and small business subcontractors that qualify as small businesses in multiple small business categories should be listed in each applicable small business category.
The SBEB will use the information provided under this section to assess (1) the extent to which such firms are specifically identified in proposals as referenced within item (a) and (2) complexity and variety of the work small firms are to perform as described within item (c) of how the government will evaluate, SBPP Submission Criteria.

Example: If a Small Business qualifies also as a WOSB and a SDVOSB, and you can add them to each category below in which they qualify.

Offerors are not limited to the space provided below.

	Name of Company (Include CAGE Code)	Anticipated NAICS Code for Each Subcontractor (1)	Type of Service/Service
Prime Offeror:			
Large Business:			
Small Business:			
SDB:			
WOSB:			
HUBZone Small:			
VOSB:			
SDVOSB:			
HBCU/MI:			

Notes:

(1) Pursuant to Sections 8(d) of the Small Business Act, a business is considered small for Government procurements if it does not exceed the size standard for the NAICS code that the prime contractor believes best describes the product or services being acquired. In other words, the size of the prime's suppliers is determined by the applicable NAICS code of their joint venture, teaming partner, or subcontract, which may or may not be the same NAICS code as the one for your prime contract with the Government.

(e) Describe the extent of commitment to use small businesses (for example, what types of commitments if any are in place for this specific acquisition either – small business prime, written contract, verbal, enforceable, non-enforceable, joint venture, mentor-protégé, etc.) Provide documentation regarding commitments to small business for this effort. Copies of such agreements should be provided as part of your small business participation plan and will not count against the page limitation for this binder. See item (b) under how the government will evaluate, SBPP Submission Requirements and respond accordingly.

(f) Utilization of Small Business: Extent of small business subcontracting compliance/business relations –e.g. record of complying with requirements of FAR Clauses 52.219-8 and 52.219-9. See item (e) under how the government will evaluate, SBPP Submission Requirements and respond accordingly.

See specifics for the submission of Small Business Subcontracting Plan under SBPP Submission Criteria. Failure to submit a subcontracting plan will result in a deficiency.

ATTACHMENT 5 – KEY PERSONNEL RESUME

(Note this form may be duplicated or re-created in a similar format and without horizontal lines)

Match the positions on this page to the list of key personnel in the narrative submission requirements and evaluation criteria.

a. Name & Title (e.g.: Sr. Architect)_____

b. Assignment on this Project_____

c. Name of Current Employer_____

d. No. of Years (in the current field of expertise): With this Firm_____With other Firms_____

e. Education: Degree(s)/Year/Specialization/Institution_____

_____

f. Active Professional Registration, if any: _____

First Year/ Current Year_____/_____

g. Describe Your Specific Experience and Qualifications Relevant to this Project (include previous employers, name of position, duration of employment, a brief description of duties, and highlight relevant necessary requirements, such as, IBC, UFC, High Energy Efficiency design experience):

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____