SECTION 00 22 00
EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. GENERAL SCOPE OF WORK

The Relay Ground Station South (RGS-S) site is located at Shriever Space Force Base outside of Colorado Springs, CO. The site is situated inside the restricted area. The purpose of the project is to provide the Space Force with the facilities and infrastructure (FI) needed to support RGS-S. The project will be executed using a Design-Build (DB) project delivery method, which will require the contractor to provide the Government with a complete design that will provide construction of a complete and usable facility to include warranty based on the Request for Proposal (RFP).

Facilities and infrastructure will be designed, procured, installed, and commissioned by the Contractor. The facilities and infrastructure will primarily consist of concrete pads, antenna pedestal foundations, radome ringwalls, site utilities, backup generators, fuel tanks, pathways and cabling, and shelters.

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)) IAW FAR 52.215-1. 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.

Competition for this contract will be full and open competition. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code is 237130 (Power and Communication Line and Related Structures), with a corresponding small business size standard of $45M.

THE OFFEROR SHOULD BE REGISTERED IN SYSTEM FOR AWARD MANAGEMENT WEBSITE (SAM.GOV).

2. SOLICITATION SELECTION PROCEDURES

The acquisition approach for this project will be a Best Value RFP following FAR Part 15 procedures. Upon receipt of proposals, the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will convene and begin to independently evaluate each proposal against the factors in the solicitation. Once the SSEB Evaluation Report has been received, per the DoD Source Selection Procedures, the Government will appoint a Source Selection Chairperson. The Chairperson will then review the ratings given by the SSEB and perform a comparative analysis of proposals against the requirements stated in the RFP. The chairperson will develop a recommendation report for the SSA. Once the recommendation report has been received, the Price Analysis review and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) review of the Best Value Tradeoff will then commence.

Offerors must submit a Volume I (Technical) and Volume II (Pricing) proposal as described below. Offerors shall assume that revisions to Volume I (Technical) proposals will not be allowed, accepted, or evaluated after formal Volume I submission on the requested date – unless requested by the Government by amendment or other formal correspondence.

3. FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

This Factor consists of four (4) elements as described herein when combined will equate the rating for Factor 1. <u>Element 1</u>- Technical Approach, <u>Element 2</u>- Organizational Approach, <u>Element 3</u>- Key Personnel, <u>Element 4</u> – Risk Assessment.

4. FACTOR 2 - SUMMARY SCHEDULE

5. FACTOR 1 & FACTOR 2 – TECHNICAL APPROACH & SUMMARY SCHEDULE

The Combined technical/risk ratings will be used to evaluate Factor 1 – Technical Approach and Factor 2 – Summary Schedule. The evaluation ratings for Technical Factors will be on an adjectival basis in conjunction with a narrative composed of the discussion of the particular strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies of the proposal. The Source Selection Team (SST) will use a combined technical/risk rating system that includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Combined technical/risk evaluations shall utilize the combined technical/risk ratings listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Combined Technical/Risk Ratings

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	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.
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 is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

RATING DEFINITIONS

Strength: is 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

Significant Strength: is 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.

Weakness: a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

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.

6. FACTOR 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE

6.1 The Past Performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an Offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, based on a demonstrated record of performance. The Past Performance evaluation results in an assessment of the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The Past Performance evaluation considers each Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. One performance confidence assessment rating is assigned for each Offeror after evaluating the Offeror's recent Past Performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements. There are three aspects to the Past Performance evaluation, Relevancy and Contractor Performance, which are described below:

6.2 Recency. The first aspect is to evaluate the recency of the offeror's past performance. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant and is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information. The criteria to establish what prior performance is recent shall be unique to each source selection and shall be stated in the solicitation. The recency timeframe established should be based on the acquisition and the market/industry. For example, some efforts would require longer recency periods to avoid restricting competition simply due to the lack of item production.

Recent is defined as Past Performance on contracts that had a construction completion date (otherwise known as a building occupancy date (BOD)) within the past seven (7) years from the date of this solicitation release, or at a minimum project shall at least be substantially complete, meaning approximately 90% invoiced and paid, within the past five (5) years from the date of this solicitation release.

6.3 Relevancy. The first aspect of the Past Performance evaluation is to determine how relevant previous projects accomplished by the Offeror is to the anticipated work to be accomplished under this project scope. Relevancy is defined as similarity of items stated within this solicitation such as: types of projects, dollar value, contract type, and relative complexity. With respect to relevancy, more relevant Past Performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the Past Performance confidence assessment. Relevancy is not a separate proposal rating but is used to develop an overall Past Performance Confidence Assessment. The four levels of relevancy ratings are:

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.

6.4 Quality of Performance (Products or Services). The third aspect of the past performance evaluation is to establish the overall quality of the offeror's past performance (see FAR 15.304[c][2]). The past performance evaluation conducted in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. Requirements for considering history of small business utilization are outlined at FAR 15.304(c)(3)(ii) and DFARS 215.305(a)(2). The Past Performance Evaluation Team 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 these into the performance confidence assessment (see paragraph 3.1.3.3). A separate quality assessment rating is not required; rather, the past performance rating, is based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance.

6.5 After evaluating recency, relevancy and quality of performance, a Performance Confidence Assessment rating will be determined. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each Offeror shall be assigned one of the following ratings:

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 sparce 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.

Although the SSEB may not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably regarding past performance, the SSA may determine that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" past performance rating in a best value tradeoff if the determination is consistent with stated solicitation criteria.

7. FACTOR 4 - SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN RATING METHOD

The small business evaluation for Factor 4 will utilize the following ratings as stated in the below table for this solicitation.

Table 2: Small Business Rating Method

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

8. OBTAINING PAST PERFORMANCE RECORDS

Past performance records may be obtainable by Offerors using one of the following methods:

(1) Accessing Past Performance information directly from Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) website at https://www.cpars.gov/ for CCASS completed before 27 June 2014 and for merged CPARS completed after 1 July 2014. CPARS is an electronic repository of performance information collected by all the major federal performance reporting systems and can be accessed at the website.

All Department of Defense (DoD) employees (military and civilian), including DoD Contractors that are working on site (military/government facilities) or contractors working offsite using Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) are required to use certificates from DoD Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) to access CPARS. If the contractor doesn't work on site or with GFE they are encouraged to obtain and use a certificate from an External Certificate Authority (ECA). For DoD users, the use of PKI Login is Mandatory. Federal and Contractor users can use the PKI login category if they have PKI.

External Certificate Authority
External Certificate Authorities (ECAs) and Interim External Certificate Authorities (IECAs) provide digital certificates to the DoD's private industry partners, contractors using their own equipment or working in non-government facilities, allied partners, and other agencies.

Additional information about the PKI certificate is at https://www.cpars.gov/sysreq.htm web page.

You will also need your Unique Entity ID (EID) and Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) to log onto CPARS. The MPIN number was selected by whoever registered your company in the System for Award Management (SAM) Registry at https://sam.gov/. If you do not know your MPIN number, you will need to contact the SAM help desk by emailing them from the email link on the SAM web page. Please be aware that they will only release the MPIN number to the person who originally registered your company. Additional instructions on locating your MPIN is located in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) section under the Help tab, or -

(2) Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) may be used to provide or supplement a firm's past performance with other than U.S. Governmental clients. Contact your client point of contact (POC) for the project you need a past performance record and request the POC to complete the PPQ. The PPQ included in this solicitation is provided for the Offeror to submit to the client for each project the Offeror may need a past performance record for to meet the requirements in this synopsis. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client POC. Completed PPQs should be submitted with your proposal. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). It is the Offeror's responsibility to follow-up with client POCs to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Brian Reynolds, Contract Specialist, via email at Brian.reynolds@usace.army.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs; this does not preclude an Offeror submitting a previously completed PPQ as long as the full PPQ is submitted and completed in its entirety. This also does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation. If a PPQ is to be submitted for a project, the complete PPQ shall be submitted (either by the client POC or the Offeror) prior to proposal closing date.

9. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Evaluation factors are listed below in descending order of importance:

Volume I Required Submittal Items (Not Rated)		
Location	*Description*	*Descending Order of Importance*
TAB A	SF1442 and Acknowledgement of Amendments	Not Rated
TAB B	Representations & Certifications	Not Rated
TAB C	JV Agreement or Teaming Agreement (if applicable)	Not Rated

Volume I Technical Evaluation Factors (Rated)		
Location	*Description*	*Descending Order of Importance*
TAB D	Factor 1 – Technical Proposal	1st Most Important Factor
Appendix 1	Factor 2 – Summary Schedule	2nd Most Important Factor
TAB E	Factor 3 – Past Performance	3rd Most Important Factor
TAB F	Factor 4 – Small Business Participation Plan	4th Most Important Factor

Volume II Price Evaluation Factors (Rated/Evaluated)		
Location	*Description*	*Descending Order of Importance*
TAB A	Factor 5 – Section 00 10 00, Pricing Schedule	All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are approximately equal to cost or price.

BASIS OF AWARD & DEBRIEFING OFFERORS

The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with the criteria described within the solicitation and will award a firm-fixed-price contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is determined to represent the best value to the Government utilizing the best value tradeoff process as described in FAR 15.101-1.

The Government reserves the right to evaluate proposals and award a contract without conducting discussions with Offerors In the event the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) concludes conducting discussions is in the best interest of the Government, the PCO will document the rationale for the competitive range determination, in which the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will review and approve the PCO's determination. If the PCO 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 PCO 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. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint.

Offerors may request a debriefing in accordance with FAR 15.505 Preaward Debriefing of offerors or FAR 15.506 Postaward Debriefing of Offerors.

10. PROPOSAL CHARACTERISTICS

10.1. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION, PAGE LIMITATIONS, AND FORMAT
Begin Amendment 01

Proposals shall be submitted by the time and date established in Block 13 of the Standard Form (SF) 1442, or Block 14 of the most recently issued SF 30 as applicable.~~as specified in Section 00 10 00, Page 1.~~

All submissions shall be in Adobe PDF format with Optical Character Recognition (OCR) applied to all documents that will enable word searches to be conducted using Adobe-compatible PDF software. The two (2) volumes listed below shall be submitted as "SEPARATE" single files.

~~Offers must be submitted electronically via Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation at https://piee.eb.mil/. Offerors must be registered in PIEE before they can submit a proposal.~~

~~REGISTER FOR ACCESS TO PIEE:~~

~~Every Vendor must register in the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment for the specific applications they wish to use. During registration, offerors will need to register for the solicitation module with the relevant~~

~~role (Proposal Manager).~~
~~To use an application in the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment system, you must establish a personal account in the system.~~
~~This account is activated by your Government Administrator or the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment Customer Support Center.~~
~~You will need to take several steps to establish your personal account:~~
~~On the PIEE Home Page, click the Help/Training button in the upper right-hand corner for steps needed to complete before registering.~~

a. ~~Complete your Vendor activation requirements (See Vendors Getting Started section on the Help/Training page).~~
b. ~~Set up your PC to use the applications (See Machine Setup link on the Help/Training page).~~
c. ~~Self-register as "Vendor" or your Contractor role for your CAGE codes (See the demo below for help with Self Registration).~~
d. ~~Have your GAM activate your account.~~

~~Additional registration instruction and step-by-step walkthrough can be found at:~~
~~https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/xhtml/wbt/portal/overview/vendorRegister.xhtml~~

~~UPLOADING PROPOSAL TO PIEE:~~
~~Detailed instruction on the uploading of proposals can be found at:~~
~~https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/xhtml/wbt/sol/solicitation/proposals.xhtml~~
~~PIEE Web based training: https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/~~

~~In the event an offeror is unable to register for a PIEE account or otherwise is unable to upload their proposal to PIEE, the offeror shall email the individuals identified below no later than 48 business hours prior to the offer due date and time, stating the issue they are having with PIEE, and request instructions for an alternate method to submit their proposal. This alternate method will be in the form of email to the following recipients:~~

1. ~~Brian Reynolds, Brian.Reynolds@usace.army.mil~~
2. ~~Jessica Beckman, Jessica.L.Beckman@usace.army.mil~~

Contractors shall submit their proposals via email to the following individuals:

Jessica Beckman, Contracting Officer: Jessica.L.Beckman@usace.army.mil
Brian Reynolds, Contract Specialist: Brian.Reynolds@usace.army.mil

Proposals received after the date and time stated within Block 13 of the SF1442, or Block 14 of the most recently issued SF 30 as applicable, will be considered late and will not be considered for award. To avoid rejection of a proposal, the offeror must make every effort to ensure its electronic submission is virus-free. Proposals should enter a description for every file submitted. For files over 20 megabytes (MB) the Contractor shall break the file into smaller files sent via separate emails with each email marked to identify which number the email is relative to the total number of emails submitted (i.e., "email one of four"). Once all the emails submitted have been received the Government will confirm receipt via responsive email.
Do not assume submission will be instantaneous. File size and number of files submitted shall be considered. Contractor/Teammate/Subcontractors should allow adequate time for submission completion because the entire proposal (i.e., Contractor's submission and all teammate/subcontractor(s) independent submissions) must be received by the due date and time specified in Block 13 of SF 1442, or SF 30 as applicable.

END Amendment 01

Page limitations for Volumes I & II, Technical Proposal (Evaluation Factors 1,2, 3, and 4) and Price Proposal (Evaluation Factor 5) are shown in the table below. Title Sheets, Tables of Content, Dividers, and blank pages are not included the page limitations below and should not be numbered. A one-page cover sheet or title sheet is recommended as the first page of each file identifying your firm’s name, the file’s title, and describing any

applicable contractor team arrangements as defined in Tab C below. Any extraneous information or cover letters that provide additional information about your firm - that is not specifically requested in the proposal submission requirements of this solicitation - will not be reviewed or evaluated.

Pages for each factor should be separately and sequentially numbered (i.e., the first page submitted for evaluation for each factor should be “1”). All text shall be at least 10 pt. font and easily read. All text shall be typed and single-spaced. Each page shall be 8-1/2” x 11” (organizational chart, risk assessment and project schedule are the only documents that may be submitted on an 11” x 17”). Margins should be no less than 1” (right, left, top, and bottom).

Pages that exceed the page limitations for any factor will not be reviewed and the information contained on those pages will not be considered for evaluation. Page limitations are per factor, i.e., an Offeror may not reduce the page count for one factor in order to submit additional pages for another factor.

Table 3: Page Limitations

Volume I, Technical Proposal		
Evaluation Factor	Title	Page Limitation
1	Technical Approach	Technical - Limited to 10 Pages Total (Excluding Resumes) Element 4 - Key Resumes Limited to 2 Pages per Resume for a total of 8 pages Technical Proposal Limited to 18 Pages Total
2	Summary Schedule	No Page Limit, Narrative limited to 1 page
3	Past Performance	Limited to 10 Pages Total (Excluding System Reports/PPQs)
4	Small Business Participation Plan	No page limit
Volume II, Price Proposal		
5	Price	No page limit
	Bond Capacity Information	No page limit

Volume I, Required Submittals, shall be submitted as the following:

W9128F26RA072_FIRMNAME_REQD_DOCS

Volume I, Technical Proposal, shall be submitted as the following separate files:

W9128F26RA072_FIRMNAME_FACTOR 1_TECHNICAL
W9128F26RA072_FIRMNAME_FACTOR 2_SCHEDULE _APPENDIX

Volume II, Price Proposal, shall be submitted as the following separate files:

W9128F26RA072_FIRMNAME_FACTOR5

10.2. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS FILE

There is no page limit for the Required Documents file.

For Volume I, the following shall be submitted within the file titled “W9128F26RA072_FIRMNAME_REQD_DOCS” in the sequence listed below:

- Title Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Completed SF 1442, to include acknowledgement of amendment(s) – Acknowledgement of amendment(s) on SF30s can be submitted as well but not required.
- Representations and Certifications (other than those completed online through https://www.sam.gov)
- Contractor Team Arrangement Requirements (if applicable)

10.3. COMPONENT REQUIREMENTS

a. Title Sheet: The title sheet shall contain:

- Solicitation number
- Name, title, address, email, and telephone number of the Offeror.
- Offeror's tax identification number (TIN)
- Names, titles, emails, and telephone numbers of persons authorized to negotiate on the Offeror's behalf with the Government in connection with this RFP.
- Name, title and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.
- A statement specifying agreement with all terms, conditions and provisions included in the RFP.

b. SF 1442: The SF 1442 shall be completed and signed by a person authorized by the Offeror. Include the Entity ID (EID) number and CAGE code in Block 14 of the SF1442 along with the Offeror's name and address.

c. Contractor Team Arrangement Requirements: For Contractor Team Arrangements, including Joint Ventures, submit the information required by "Contractor Team Arrangements" paragraph, below.

11. PROPOSAL CHARACTERISTICS

Reference Section 00 21 00 Instructions to Offerors.

12. CONTRACTOR TEAM ARRANGEMENTS

12.1. CONTRACTOR TEAM ARRANGEMENTS OTHER THAN JOINT VENTURE/MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ

a. A listing of each team arrangement member's corporate name (no abbreviations), address, point of contact, phone number, Entity ID (EID Number, and Cage Code.

b. A copy of the signed team arrangement agreement or binding letter of commitment between each team member. All team arrangements and letters of commitment shall:

1) Clearly identify the expected relationship, role and responsibility between the firms, Prime Contractor, and of the subcontractor or other entity (type and proportion of work to be performed); and

(2) Be signed by the appropriate individual(s) of each company.

12.2. CONTRACTOR TEAM ARRANGEMENTS - JOINT VENTURE/MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ

No contract may be awarded to a Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé that is not registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) database. **The Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé must have its own registered** Entity ID (EID) **number.** Any Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé agreement that is required to be approved by the Small Business Administration (SBA) shall be approved in accordance to the applicable Code of Federal Regulations

(CFR). If the applicable requirements are not met prior to the due date for proposals, the proposal will be rendered unawardable.

a. In a cover letter of your proposal for this factor, provide the complete names, addresses, and phone number of the firms comprising the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé.

b. A copy of the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé agreement.

c. Signature requirements: SF 1442, SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD, Block 20, requires that the name and title of a person authorized to sign the offer for the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé be provided. In the case of a Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé, subject Standard Form shall be signed by the principal representative of the Joint Venture/ Mentor-Protégé (or the alternate principal representative, if the principal representative is unavailable).

d. In addition to the requirements stated above, and to assure a single point of contact for resolution of contractual matters and payments, **the Offeror shall submit a certificate signed by each participant in the Joint Venture containing the following statement:**

   "The parties hereto expressly understand and agree as follows:

   1. **(Name, title, and company)** is the principal representative of the Joint Venture. As such, all communications regarding the administration of the contract and the performance of the work thereunder may be directed to him or her. In the absence of **(same name, title, and company), (enter name, title, and company of alternate)** is the alternate principal representative of the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé. These individuals have authority to sign on behalf of the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé.

   2. Direction, approvals, required notices, and all other communications from the Government to the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé, including transmittal of payments by the Government, shall be directed to **(enter name, title, and company of principal),** principal representative of the Joint Venture/Mentor-Protégé**."**

      NOTE: Provide telephone numbers and email addresses for the points of contact listed in the above statement.

12.3. INTEGRITY AND VALIDITY OF CONTRACTOR TEAM ARRANGMENTS

The Contracting Officer will recognize the integrity and validity of contractor team arrangements; provided that the arrangements are identified, and company relationships are fully disclosed and validation of formal agreements and relationships (i.e., Mentor-Protégé agreements, Joint Ventures, partnerships, etc.) are provided in the offer and submitted with the proposal responding to the solicitation. Nothing in the solicitation authorizes contractor team arrangements in violation of antitrust statutes or limits the Government's rights to:

a. Require consent to subcontracts (see FAR Subpart 44.2);

b. Determine, based on the stated contractor team arrangement, the responsibilities of the Prime Contractor (see FAR Subpart 9.1);

c. Provide to the Prime Contractor data rights owned or controlled by the Government;

d. Pursue its policies on competitive contracting, subcontracting, and component breakout initial production or an any other time; and

e. Hold the Prime Contractor fully responsible for contract performance, regardless of team arrangement between the Prime Contractor and its subcontractors.

13. VOLUME I FACTORS

13.1. VOLUME I – FACTOR 1 –TECHNICAL APPROACH

13.1.1. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The Offeror shall provide a narrative that describes the Offeror's Technical approach to executing the contract pursuant to the following four (4) elements. Clearly and concisely describe the technical approach, organizational approach, key personnel, and risk management approaches to overall technical approach and execution.

13.1.2. Element 1 – Technical Approach

Submission Requirements

Technical approaches that comply with applicable contract requirements; are realistic, appropriate, and efficient; and demonstrate clear logic and scope, understanding present lower levels of risk and will be more favorably rated. Approaches not demonstrating these attributes present higher levels of risk and will be less favorably rated.

- Describe the technical approach to the Design and Construction of the facility. Include any considerations to the project which will increase efficiencies in the schedule, such as design approach / integration with construction, construction sequencing, early and effective submittal management / integration with construction schedule, management of long lead time procurement, installation and restricted area access, site management, utility outages, etc.

Evaluation Criteria

Strengths may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Technical approaches that comply with applicable contract requirements are realistic, appropriate, and efficient; and demonstrate clear logic and scope, understanding present lower levels of risk.
- Proposals that offer methods to streamline design and construction and manage labor and other resource constraints to reduce costs and support an aggressive schedule to completion.
- Proposals that illustrate an understanding of design and construction practices inherent to Front-Range climates.
- Any other aspect of a proposal that the evaluators and/or the SSA believe enhances the merit of the proposal or increases the probability of successful performance of the contract.

Weaknesses may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Any aspect of a proposal that the Government identifies as a flaw that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiencies shall be given for each of the following criteria:

- Omission of one (1) or more of the elements stated under the Technical requirements of the solicitation.
- Any other 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.

13.2.3 Element 2 - Organizational Approach

Submission Requirements

An organizational approach that clearly and concisely describes the organizational and staffing approach to effectively manage performance, contain costs, manage the schedule and exhibits effective problem solving and oversight reduces risk and may be more favorably rated.

- Describe design-build approach and DOR and Construction Contractor roles and responsibilities in design phase, construction phase, and relationship between entities. The Offeror shall document unequivocal teaming arrangements with its lead entities and key subcontractors (at a minimum, the Designer of Record).
- List and describe key subcontractors, their roles and responsibilities, how they may be utilized, and any contractual arrangements that have been established to this point.

Evaluation Criteria

Strengths may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Proposals that demonstrate a detailed and coherent plan and provide logical methodology to execute the entire scope of work.
- Proposals that identify business practices that integrate design and construction
- Proposals that demonstrate understanding of work within a restricted area and managing access and access control.
- Proposals that demonstrate a clear understanding and/or usage of local subcontractors, the subcontractor market, and economy and/or how it will impact this project.
- Self-performance of major construction tasks by the Prime Contractor.
-

Weaknesses may be given for each of the following criteria:

- A proposal that does not demonstrate a clear understanding of solicitation requirements associated with the 01 30 00.24 OTHER ADMINSTRATIVE AND SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS specification.
- Any other aspect of a proposal that the Government identifies as a flaw that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiencies shall be given for each of the following criteria:

- An Approach that does not demonstrate the Prime Offeror as the lead entity for this project.
- Omission of one (1) or more of the elements stated under Technical requirements of the solicitation.
- Any other 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.

13.2.4 Element 3– Key Personnel

Submission Requirements

Key Personnel experience demonstrating (1) capability in same or similar key personnel positions on successful relevant projects of similar scope and magnitude to this solicitation; (2) strong technical knowledge and skill required for this solicitation; and (3) effective problem solving, communication, coordination, and organization present lower levels of risk and will be more favorably rated. Those not demonstrating these attributes present higher levels of risk and will be less favorably rated. Project Experience ratings will be considered in determining relevancy of projects submitted under this factor.

- Resumes are limited to two (2) pages per resume for a total of no more than eight (8) pages. Any pages in excess of this limitation will not be reviewed.

- Submit resumes for the following key personnel. If more than two (2) pages are submitted per resume, only the first two pages will be evaluated. Each resume should demonstrate experience and expertise on similar projects in similar roles as proposed for this solicitation. Each resume should include the following information:
- Proposed role/title for this solicitation
- Recent relevant projects: information should include the project name, role on project, prime contractor, owner, dollar amount, date of start and completion of role referenced, and brief scope of each project listed.
- Resume must clearly state how the individual meets the submission requirements.

i. Project Manager responsible for the overall project: The project manager should have 10 or more years of experience as a project or assistant project manager, managing projects similar to this solicitation.

ii. Contractor Quality Control (CQC) System Manager(s): The QC Manager must meet the following:
The QC Manager must be an individual with a minimum of five (5) years combined experience in the following positions: Project Superintendent, QC Manager, Project Manager, Project Engineer or Construction Manager on similar size and type construction Contracts which included the major trades that are part of this Contract. The individual must have at least 2 years' experience as a QC Manager.

iii. General Superintendent: The superintendent should have 10 or more years of experience as a superintendent or similar role managing multiple trades and subcontractors on projects with similar or greater value and scope to this project.

iv. Design Manager (Lead Design Entity)
Minimum experience requirements for the Design Manager and designers of record must demonstrate at least ten (10) years of design experience and must be registered in accordance with FAR 52.236-25 – Requirements for Registration of Designers. See Specification 01 33 00.32 – Design and Construction Deliverables.

Evaluation Criteria

Strengths may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Key personnel resumes that demonstrate experience that is recent (within seven (7) years of the date of proposal submission) and exceeds the minimum qualifications necessary.
- Capability in same or similar key personnel positions on successful relevant projects of similar scope and magnitude to this solicitation.
- Key personnel that have worked together on past projects.
- Key personnel listed on projects used for experience / past performance factor of this solicitatio.n
- Federal Government experience.
- Experience within a restricted area on a military installation.

Weaknesses may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Resumes that do not clearly demonstrate the capabilities, experience, and responsibilities of proposed key personnel.
- Past projects that do not represent recent relevant experience in the same or similar capacity/role as this solicitation.
- One or more personnel with a preponderance of past projects that do not exhibit experience with projects of similar scope, magnitude, or complexity to the proposed project.
- Any other aspect of a proposal that the Government identifies as a flaw that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiencies may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Omission of one (1) or more of the resumes required for evaluation.
- Any other 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.

13.2.5 Element 4 - Risk Assessment

Submission Requirements

Information that clearly identifies potential project risk(s) providing a logical, concise, and proactive approach to mitigate such risk exhibiting the Offeror's ability to manage risk appropriately may be more favorably rated.

- In spreadsheet format, submit a list of risks specific to the project. Identify the degree of risk, impact of the risk (schedule, cost, safety, etc.), whether it's within or outside the Offeror's control and a brief statement on how to mitigate the risk(s).

Evaluation Criteria

Strengths may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Proposals that demonstrate a very clear understanding of the project's risks and how to best mitigate them.

Weaknesses may be given for each of the following criteria:

- A risk assessment that does not provide specific risks to this project and a demonstration of how to mitigate those identified risks.

Deficiencies may be given for each of the following criteria:

- 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.

14. VOLLUME I FACTOR 2 – APPENDIX – SUMMARY SCHEDULE

Submission Requirements

Construction schedules and narrative descriptions documenting (1) clear and efficient critical path and logical sequencing; (2) account for procurement lead-time, subcontractor/trade coordination, on-site storage and staging, resource and time constraints; and (3) demonstrate risk mitigation and successful completion within the required period of performance present lower levels of risk and will be more favorably rated. Schedules which do not demonstrate these attributes present higher levels of risk and will be less favorably rated.

- Constraints: Offeror must demonstrate the capability and flexibility to plan and schedule the complete project to meet the proposed contract completion period of 420 calendar days to include design efforts. Identify milestones for option award to facilitate construction completion within the period of performance. Clearly identify any constraints on the schedule presented (e.g., labor or material availability, permits, weather). Indicate the anticipated overall critical path on the schedule.

- Provide a summary schedule or diagram graphically represented(may be on 11" x 17" sized sheet(s) and excluded from overall page limitation). This summary schedule will, after contract award, be replaced with a project schedule as required by Section 01 32 01.00 10: Project Schedule. The schedules shall be task oriented, indicating the number of calendar days after NTP, by which

milestones are to be achieved. The proposed project schedule shall reflect the proposed contract duration. Give attention to the following features:

- Show design complete milestone and any overlap between design and construction.

- Show the overall construction phase for the site work, foundations, utilities, and facilities. Include any long lead items and any fast-tracking starts. It isn't necessary to show the detailed breakdown construction (e.g., by trades)

- Show schedule line items for notifications and utility outages/connection permits.

- Show turnover of facility. The duration to complete the facility and turnover to the Government must consider the requirement for the Contractor's CQC completion inspection and the subsequent joint Contractor-Government turnover inspection.

- Provide a schedule narrative (NTE 1 page) describing the overall schedule. Outline any assumptions, constraints, resource loading, fast-tracking, or other critical items in the overall schedule.

Evaluation Criteria

Strengths may be given for each of the following criteria:

- Construction schedules and narrative descriptions documenting clear and efficient critical path and logical sequencing.
- Higher evaluation ratings may be given for proposals indicating a summary schedule that clearly identifies approach to design, construction, major milestones, clear path to turnover/BOD/closeout, and ones that demonstrate planned risk mitigation through proposed contract duration.
- Account for procurement lead-time, subcontractor/trade coordination, on-site storage and staging, resource and time constraints.
- Demonstrate risk mitigation and successful completion within the required period of performance present lower levels of risk and will be more favorably rated.

Weaknesses may be given for each of the following criteria:

- A proposed schedule whose duration is greater than that stated in the solicitation without discussion for exceeding duration.
- A proposed schedule that unreasonably condenses contract duration well below the period of performance (without discussion) which as determined by the government may increase cost or create a risk of contract/performance failure.
- A proposed schedule which does not address the features described in Section 00 21 00 under Paragraph 3.3.4.2.7 – Summary Schedule 1 through 4.

15. VOLUME I FACTOR 3 PAST PERFORMANCE

There are three aspects to the performance confidence evaluations: recency, relevancy and quality of past performance. In accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2), the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance shall be considered. Relevance and quality of performance will be combined to establish one performance confidence assessment rating for each Offeror. The project examples requested within this factor must be of relevant scope and complexity to the solicited project.

- The Offeror shall submit two (2) projects performed by the Lead Design entity and two (2) projects performed by the Prime Construction entity. Additionally, the Offeror may submit one (1) additional

Design-Build project performed by the Prime Construction Entity teamed with the Lead Design Entity describing past teaming experience/performance between current team members. Submission for each project is limited to two (2) pages per project for a total of no more than 10 pages and include the information outlined below with a brief narrative highlighting experience garnered under performance.

- Based upon the entity, project information shall identify if the project was for design, construction, or design-build project and **should** CLEARLY include:

    - Project title and location.
    - Summary of the project discussing major features and the relevance or similarities to this project.
    - Original contract award amount and final cost.
    - Original contract completion date and actual completion date (Month/Year).
    - Percentage (%) of work performed by the Prime Offeror; and Percentage (%) of work subcontracted.
    - Current percentage (%) complete of the project (must be approximately 90% paid).
    - Subcontractors utilized on the project, the extent to which they were utilized (by percentage of cost), and if they are proposed to be utilized for the project contained in this solicitation.
    - Prime Contractor Personnel on the project, what role they held, and if they are proposed to be utilized for this contract, and what role they will hold.
    - The name, address, telephone, and email of a representative of the owner (as well as one alternate individual not affiliated with your firm) familiar with your firm's experience on the project that can verify the experience cited.

- The Offeror should demonstrate construction experience on similar building projects using Attachment 1, 'Company Specialized Experience - Construction / Prime Contractor'

- All projects submitted should have a completion date (or BOD) no greater than the past seven (7) years from the date of this solicitation release; however, all projects submitted shall at least be substantially complete, meaning approximately 90% invoiced and paid, within the past five (5) years from the date of this solicitation release.

- The Offeror shall submit past performance evaluations and ratings for each project submitted. No other past performance record shall be submitted other than those related to the projects submitted for this factor. If available, submit the respective CPARS record for the project. For projects which were designed and/or constructed for other government entities, submit the performance appraisal sheets used by that government entity if available. For projects submitted that are not covered in the CPARS database or other Government Performance Rating System, submit a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ). A PPQ form is attached to this solicitation for convenience (see Attachment 2). A CPARS record or a complete PPQ shall be submitted for each project submitted under this factor prior to proposal closing date.

a. Performance Information

- Project information submitted shall be similar in project size, scope, and complexity to this project performed by the Prime Offeror/Lead Designer. Each project submitted should demonstrate experience on similar building and site improvement projects of a similar value.

- Projects submitted for this factor shall have been awarded to the Offeror as the Prime Contractor or Joint Venture for the project either singly or as one of the participants in a JV named on the SF-1442 for this solicitation. If the Offeror has multiple functions or divisions, limit the projects to only those

performed by the division or unit submitting the offer or by the team member having performed under the submitted project.

The table below provides example scenarios based on the requirements above:

Table 4: Scenario Based Examples

	Scenario Examples	Project Examples Qualify for Evaluation for Factor 3 (if all other requirements are met)
1	Past project was awarded to Company X only. Company X is proposing as a Prime Contractor for W9128F26RA072 and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072.	Yes
2	Company Y has formed a JV with Company Z (forming Company "YZ"). Past project was awarded to Company Y only. Company YZ is proposing as a Prime Contractor for W9128F26RA072 and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072.	Yes
3	Company Y has formed a JV with Company Z (forming Company "YZ"). Past project was awarded to JV Company YZ. Company YZ is proposing as a Prime Contractor for W9128F26RA072 and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072.	Yes
4	Past Project was awarded to Company "AY," a JV composed of Company A (not Prime Offeror for RFP W9128F26RA072) and Company Y. Company Y has formed a JV with Company Z (forming Company "YZ"). JV Company YZ is proposing as a Prime Contractor and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072.	Yes
5	Company Y has formed a JV with Company Z (forming Company "YZ"). Company YZ is proposing as a Prime Contractor for W9128F26RA072 and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072. Company Y performed work on the past project but was not the Prime Contractor for the past project (either singly or as a member of a JV).	No
6	Company X is proposing as a Prime Contractor for W9128F26RA072 and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072. Company X will use Company R as a teaming member/subcontractor but Company R is not part of a JV with Company X for W9128F26RA072. The past project was awarded to Company R as a Prime Contractor (singly or as a member of a JV), but not Company X (singly or as a member of a JV).	No
7	Company Y has formed a JV with Company Z (forming Company "YZ"). Company YZ is proposing as a Prime Contractor for W9128F26RA072 and has signed the SF 1442 for W9128F26RA072. Company YZ will use Company R as a teaming member/subcontractor but Company R is not part of the JV. The past project was awarded to Company R as a	No

	Prime Contractor (singly or as a member of a JV), but not to Companies Y or Z (singly or as a member of a JV).	

Past performance on contracts with the Federal Government, other public agencies, or private organizations will be considered. All submitted references may be contacted. Sources other than submitted references may be contacted as well. During proposal evaluations, exchanges between the Government and Offerors may occur to clarify the relevance of past performance information and/or address adverse past performance information which an Offeror has not yet had an opportunity to respond to.

The past performance evaluation conducted in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the Offeror's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the Offeror performed those past contracts. Requirements for considering history of small business utilization are outlined at FAR 15.304(c)(3)(ii) and DFARS 215.305(a)(2). The Evaluator(s) 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 these into the performance confidence assessment. A separate quality assessment rating is not required; rather, the past performance rating is based on the Offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance.

Although the SSEB may not rate an Offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably regarding past performance, the Technical Evaluation may determine that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" past performance rating in a best value continuum if the determination is consistent with stated solicitation criteria.

Past Performance on projects will examine how well an Offeror performed on relevant projects considering such criteria as: cost growth and adherence to budget; time growth, timeliness and adherence to schedule; quality and quality control measures; management of personnel and subcontractors; compliance with safety standards/safety plan; overall customer satisfaction; and responsiveness to customer concerns.

Government Utilization of Alternative Information Sources for Past Performance

The Government reserves the right to contact any persons who may be knowledgeable about the project or projects (this is not limited to contracts identified by the Offeror) submitted in an Offeror's proposal. In addition, the Government may review and take into consideration other sources of information pertinent to the evaluation of the Offeror's Past Performance, including both the previous experience projects and other similar projects performed by the Offeror. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, Past Performance information retrieved through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE)/ Entity ID (EID) numbers of team members (partnership, Joint Venture, teaming arrangement, or parent firm/subsidiary/affiliate) identified in the Offeror's proposal, 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.

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

If available, submit the respective CPARS record for the project. For projects which were designed and/or constructed for other government entities, submit the performance appraisal sheets used by that government entity if available. For projects submitted that are not covered in the CPARS database or other Government Performance Rating System, submit a PPQ. A PPQ form is attached to this solicitation for convenience (see Attachment 2).

A CPARS record or a complete PPQ shall be submitted for each project submitted under this factor prior to proposal closing date.

15.1.1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government's overall confidence level for this factor will be based on the Offeror's Past Performance to include recency and relevancy of the projects submitted and the quality of performance.

Past Performance on projects will examine how well an Offeror has performed on relevant projects considering such criteria as: cost growth and adherence to budget; time growth, timeliness and adherence to schedule; quality and quality control measures; management of personnel and subcontractors; compliance with safety standards/safety plan; overall customer satisfaction; responsiveness to customer concerns.

Project performance demonstrating higher levels of success and quality on more relevant projects similar in scope and magnitude to this solicitation present lower levels of risk and will be more favorably rated. Projects that are more relevant to the requirements of this solicitation will be given more weight in the overall past performance rating. If an Offeror has no past performance on similar work relevant to this solicitation, they will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably

CPARS/CCASS records may be given more weight than PPQs. The Government may, at its discretion, contact individuals other than those identified by the Offeror as references to verify the information contained therein. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an Offeror's performance history but may attribute more importance to work that is like the scope contemplated for this project.

16. VOLUME I – FACTOR 4 – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PLAN
Submission Requirements (There is no page limitation for Factor 4 - Small Business Participation Plan)

This factor requires all Offerors, regardless of size status to address their planned small business usage for this project. All Offerors are required to provide a Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD). It should address their corporate approach and methodology for acquiring, soliciting and using small businesses in the performance of this contract. All documentation for this factor should address the Offeror's commitments to providing subcontracting opportunities, as well as evidence of planned and /or continued outreach efforts to encourage and use small businesses. This SBPCD should include a breakdown of small business subcategories to be used as shown on the chart in (d) below.

Separate from the Small Business Participation Plan (Factor 4) required by all offerors, a Subcontracting Plan will ONLY be required from the Apparent Successful Offeror if the firm is an Other Than Small Business (OTSB) - meeting the requirements of FAR 52.219-9 and DFARS 252.219-7996. The Apparent Successful OTSB must submit an acceptable subcontracting plan to be eligible for award. Subcontracting Plans shall reflect and be consistent with the commitments offered in the Small Business Participation Plan. Please do not submit a Subcontracting Plan for Factor 3.

The SBPCD should demonstrate commitment to all federally designated categories of small business: Small Businesses (SBs), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSBs), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSBs) HUBZone Small Businesses (HUB), Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDBs), Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSBs.

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 SBPCD should identify all categories for participation as part of the Offeror's team. This should include a general description of the type of work, product or service anticipated to be supplied via a small business concern.

A specific format is not required, however, items stated below (a) through (f) shall be provided as a minimum.

a. Provide a Narrative addressing the corporate approach and methodology for acquiring, soliciting and using small businesses in the performance of this contract. The Narrative should address the Offeror's commitment to providing subcontracting opportunities, as well as evidence of planned and /or continued outreach efforts to encourage and use small businesses. The Narrative should provide detailed supporting documentation regarding the individual commitment expressed in percentages for evaluators to determine the goals stated are realistic.

   Check the applicable size and categories for the PRIME Offeror for this procurement – Check all applicable boxes:

   {___} Large Prime
   - or -
   {___} Small Business Prime; also categorized as a:
   {___} Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
   {___} Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
   {___} Historically Underutilized Zone (HUB Zone) Small Business
   {___} Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB)
   {___} Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)

b. Submit the total percentages 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). Percentages are based on Total Contract Value. **For this project, the minimum small business participation goal should be 20% of the Total Contract Value performed by the Small Business Community.**

   Total Percentage planned for Large Business(es): = _____%
   Total Percentage planned for Small Business(es): = _____%
   (Small Business Prime Contractors – Include yourselves in the above percentage.)

   For example: If you are a Small Business Prime Contractor and will be doing 40% of the work and you will be subcontracting another 20% of the Total Contract Value to other small business firms, then your Total Percentage planned for Small Business will equal 60%.

   Indicate the total percentage of participation to be performed by each type of subcategory small business. The percentage of work performed by Small Businesses that qualify in multiple small business categories may be counted in each category:

   For example: Firm A (WOSB and SDVOSB) performing 2%; and Firm B (SDB, HubZ and WOSB) performing 3%. Results equate to: SB 5%; SDB 3%; HubZone 3%; WOSB 5%; SDVOSB 2%; VOSB 2%;). SDVOSBs are also VOSBs automatically; however, VOSBs are not automatically SDVOSBs.

   Small Business _____%
   Small Disadvantaged Business _____%
   HUB Zone Small Business _____%
   Woman Owned Small Business _____%
   Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned SB _____%
   Veteran-Owned Small Business _____%

c. 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.

	Firm Name	CAGE Code	NAICS code	Type of Service
Prime Offeror				
Large Business				
Small Business				
SDB				
WOSB				
HUBZone				
VOSB				
SDVOSB				

Note: 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.

d. Describe the extent of commitment to use small businesses (e.g., what types of commitments, if any, are in place for this specific acquisition either – small business prime, written contract, verbal, enforceable, non-enforceable, joint venturing, 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 volume.

f. Include a summary with small business participation data for the projects submitted under Factor 1 Past Performance. At a minimum, include total small business participation as a percentage of the Total Contract Value, and the CPARS or PPQ rating received for small business participation (as applicable).

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Small Business Participation Commitment Document shall be consistent with the resultant Subcontracting Plan (if submitting a proposal as an Other-Than-Small-Business) and will be evaluated as follows:

Strengths may be given for each the following criteria:

- Offerors that propose a Total Small Business Participation percentage of 20% or higher.
- A proposal that indicates a realistic and thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives in respect to this project.
- Offerors that receive a CPAR rating for Small Business category of exceptional for the projects submitted under Factor 3 Past Performance may be rated more favorably.
- A SBPCD that provides clear detail of the services/supplies that small business firms are to perform.
- Copies of agreements regarding commitments with all small business firms who are identified in the SBPCD.
- Any other aspect of a proposal that the evaluators and/or the SSA believe enhances the merit of the proposal or increases the probability of successful performance of the contract.

Weaknesses may be given for each of the following criteria:

- A proposed Total Small Business Participation percentage less than the stated goal of 20%.
- Information submitted for items (a) through (f) above that is general or ambiguous language.
- Omission or incompleteness of any requested information that is not otherwise a deficiency.

- Any other aspect of a proposal that the Government identifies as a flaw that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiencies shall be given for each of the following criteria:

- Omission of any item (a) through (f) above.
- Any other material failure of a proposal to meet the Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

17. VOLUME II FACTOR 5 – PRICE

Submission Requirements *(There is no page limitation for Factor 5 Price)*

This volume shall contain all information necessary to support the proposed prices. Certified cost or pricing data are not required currently; however, the Government reserves the right to request such data prior to award, in accordance with FAR 15.403.

The proposed price must be submitted using the Proposal/Price Schedule provided in Section 00 10 00 of this solicitation. Offerors shall not modify the wording or format of the Price Schedule. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the proposal being deemed non-compliant and removed from further consideration.

As this is a Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) contract, the price proposal shall reflect a total fixed price. Proposals that contain contingencies, price escalation clauses, or any qualifications that condition pricing will be considered non-responsive and unacceptable.

The Offeror shall ensure that the prices submitted in this volume are consistent with the amounts listed on the SF 1442, the Price Schedule, and all continuation sheets.

Supplemental Price Breakdown
Price breakdown in Microsoft Excel format.

Evidence of Bonding Capacity:
Offerors shall submit evidence of bonding capacity in the amount of their total proposed price. This shall include the name, address, telephone number, and email address of the Offeror's surety or bonding agent. A formal bid bond is not required currently.

EVALUATION - PRICE ANALYSIS

This acquisition will result in a Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) contract. The Government will evaluate proposed prices for reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b). The evaluation will include all base and option Contract Line-Item Numbers (CLINs), all of which must be proposed on a firm-fixed-price basis.

The Government will employ price analysis techniques to determine whether proposed prices are fair and reasonable and to ensure that pricing is balanced across CLINs.

In evaluating price reasonableness, the Government will rely on data other than certified cost or pricing data, unless such data are specifically requested. The Government may apply one or more of the following price analysis techniques, as outlined in FAR 15.404 and applicable supplements:

Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation

Comparison with an independent Government estimate

Comparison with historical prices for the same or similar items

Parametric estimating methods or cost models

Evaluation of pricing information provided by the Offeror

Unbalanced Pricing
Offerors are cautioned against submitting materially unbalanced proposals. The Government will evaluate whether prices are unbalanced with respect to separately priced line items. Unbalanced pricing exists when the price of one or more line items is significantly overstated or understated, as determined through cost or price analysis techniques.

Even if the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) is determined acceptable, an offer may be rejected if the Contracting Officer concludes that the unbalanced pricing poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

To mitigate this risk, offerors are strongly encouraged to:

- Allocate direct costs (e.g., labor, materials, equipment, subcontractor costs) appropriately to relevant CLINs

- Distribute indirect costs (e.g., overhead, bond, profit) proportionately and consistently across CLINs

The Government reserves the right to withhold award if the total proposed price exceeds the established construction cost range.

If necessary, the Government may request a supplemental price breakdown (in Excel format) to assist in the analysis. Any such request will be made after initial proposal submission, with instructions and timelines provided at that time.

ATTACHMENT 1 - SECTION 00 22 00

COMPANY SPECIALIZED EXPERIENCE - CONSTRUCTION / PRIME CONTRACTOR

Provide the following information to show examples of projects your company constructed within the last **seven (7)** years as stated in Section 00 22 00, indicating experience with projects of similar type and scope. Use one form per project.

(a) Type of Facility and Construction Represented _____

(b) Your Firm's Name _____

(c) Name of Project _____

(d) Location of Project _____

(e) Owner/Customer _____

(f) General Scope of Construction Project _____

_____

_____

Your Role (Prime or Joint Venture) and % Work Your Company Self-Performed:

_____

_____

Construction Cost: Awarded_____ Completed_____

Type of Work and Extent (%) You Subcontracted Out _____

_____

_____

Dates Construction: Began_____ Original Completion_____ Actual Completion _____

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 & Email of Reference POC _____

ATTACHMENT 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONAIRE (FORM PPQ-0)

NAVFAC/USACE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Form PPQ-0)	
CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)	
1. Contractor Information	
Company Name:	CAGE Code:
Address:	EID/DUNS:
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: ☐ Company 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 CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR 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 CONTRACTOR. HOWEVER, QUESTIONNAIRES MAY BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO USACE. PLEASE CONTACT THE CONTRACTOR 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 PCO 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
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)***:**