ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-2
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1.0. Source Selection (SS)

1.1. Basis for Contract Award

This acquisition will utilize Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable (LPTA) Source Selection procedures, with technical proposals. Technical tradeoffs will not be made, and no additional credit will be given for exceeding acceptability. Award will be made to the offeror who is rated "acceptable" in Factor 1 Technical, has the lowest evaluated cost or price, and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by FAR 52.212-1 and it's Addendum of this solicitation). The Government reserves the right to award without discussions. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined necessary by the Contracting Officer.

1.1.1. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will strive for maximum objectivity, the Source Selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.2. Number of Contracts to be Awarded:

The Government intends to select one contractor for this acquisition. However, the Government reserves the right not to award a contract at all, depending on the quality of the proposals and prices submitted and the availability of funds.

1.3. Correction Potential of Proposals:

The Government will consider throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any proposal aspect evaluated as "unacceptable". The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an Offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable or if the amount and/or complexity of the corrections needed to meet the Government requirement requires a major proposal revision, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

1.4. Rejection of Offers

The Government may reject any evaluated proposal that fails to adequately address a significant portion of the requirement or contract terms and conditions. This may include the rejection of a proposal that does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the contract/program requirements and/or displays a fundamental lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risk of the program. All aspects/volumes of

the proposals may be reviewed to ensure adequate resources to perform the proposed technical approach.

1.5. Competitive Range Determination

During the evaluation process multiple competitive range determinations may be made that eliminate Offerors from the competition IAW FAR 15.505. A competitive range determination may eliminate Offerors based on their initial proposal evaluation results, after discussions (if necessary), prior to issuance of the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) request, or for efficiency. If Offerors are excluded from the competitive range they may request a debriefing IAW FAR 15.505.

1.6. Discussions

The Government intends to award without discussions, but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. Therefore, it is imperative that Offerors submit their best terms initially. However, if during the evaluation period it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the FPR will be considered in making the Source Selection decision. If a Request for FPR is issued, Offeror responses to ENs for Volume I (Technical), Volume II (Price), and Volume III (Contract Documentation) must be incorporated in the FPR in order to be considered in the final evaluation. Failure to include EN responses in the FPR may result in a final “unacceptable” technical rating, or otherwise make your company ineligible for award.

1.7 Solicitation Requirements (Terms and Conditions)

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements, in addition to those identified as factors and subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. The Government reserves the right to determine any such exceptions unacceptable, and the proposal, therefore, ineligible for award.

2.0. Evaluation Factors

2.1.1. Evaluation factors used to evaluate each proposal:

Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below.

Factor 1: Technical
- Subfactor 1: Work Plan
- Subfactor 2: Standards
- Subfactor 3: Capability

2.1.2. Evaluation Methodology:

The Government will evaluate all factors concurrently for all proposals. Initial ratings and evaluated price will be established for each offeror. Only those offerors determined to be technically acceptable, either initially, or as a result of discussions will be considered for award. Award will be made to the lowest evaluated priced proposal meeting the acceptability standards for Factor 1 Technical, who has been determined

responsible, and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by FAR 52.212-1 and it's Addendum of this solicitation).

2.2. Factor 1 – Technical

Each subfactor within the technical factor will receive one of the ratings described below based on the criteria listed below. Individual subfactor ratings will be used to determine the overall technical acceptability of each offeror. To be determined technically acceptable at the factor level, the Offeror must be rated acceptable in each subfactor. A final unacceptable subfactor assessment will determine an overall technical unacceptable rating. The technical evaluation will also consider risk in determining overall acceptability. Risk pertains to the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. Risk will not be receive a separate rating, rather, it will be inherent within the subfactor ratings, and the overall Technical rating. The technical ratings are defined as follows:

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

2.2.1. Subfactor 1: Work Plan

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Work Plan. Offerors are required to present all the information as stated in the Instruction to Offerors (ITO), Addendum to FAR 52.212-1. The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential components with little potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance.

2.2.2. Subfactor 2: Standards

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed compliance with required standards. Offerors are required to present all the information as stated in the Instruction to Offerors (ITO), Addendum to FAR 52.212-1. The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the essential components with little potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance.

2.2.3 Subfactor 3: Capability

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Capability. Offerors are required to present all the information as stated in the Instruction to Offerors (ITO), Addendum to FAR 52.212-1. The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential components with little potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance.

The contractor's offer must include the following required capability information in their offer:

2.2.3.1 The offeror must list and describe its capability to provide (i) all required types of containers, compactors or other equipment; (ii) storage; (iii) emergency services; and (iv) for special events.

2.2.3.2 The offeror must list and describe their capability to (i) handle recyclable materials, (ii) perform maintenance, and (iii) provide personal protective equipment (PPE) to adequately service the installations.

2.3. Factor 2 –Price

Price proposals will be evaluated for (1) completeness, (2) reasonableness, (3) price realism, (4) unbalanced pricing, and (5) Total Evaluated Price. Offerors whose price is determined incomplete, unreasonable, or unrealistic will not be considered for award. Additionally, an offeror's price may be rejected, if it contains unbalanced pricing to the extent it poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

2.3.1 Completeness

For completeness, offerors must provide unit prices for all line items listed in the pricing matrix within the Combo solicitation document. Incomplete proposals (without required unit prices) may render an offeror's proposal ineligible for award.

2.3.2. Price Reasonableness

The proposed prices will be evaluated for reasonableness. Analysis of price proposals will be performed using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404 in order to determine price reasonableness. Reasonableness must represent a price to the Government a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404.

2.3.3. Price Realism

Proposed prices will be evaluated for price realism. To be realistic, the proposed price must demonstrate an adequate understanding of the requirement, and must ensure the price does not pose a risk to performance. Unrealistic prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from the competition based on an apparent lack of adequate understanding of the requirement or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the requirement. To evaluate price realism, the Government may use one or more of the price analysis techniques described in FAR 15.404.

The Government may also use other evaluation techniques, as needed. Offerors are cautioned to not use underbidding as a pricing strategy with the intention of recovering under-bid costs after contract award via Requests for Equitable Adjustments (REAs) or other devices.

2.3.4. Unbalanced pricing

Offerors' proposals will be reviewed for unbalanced pricing. The Government will evaluate any supporting information provided by the Offeror explaining variances that appear unbalanced. Evaluated offers that are determined to be unbalanced may be deemed ineligible for award by the Contracting Officer if a determination is made that

lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total price, the price of one or more line items is significantly over or understated as demonstrated by application of price analysis techniques, such that:

a. There is reasonable doubt the offer would result in the lowest overall cost to the Government, even though it is the lowest priced Offeror; or

b. The offer is so grossly unbalanced; its acceptance would be tantamount to allowing an advanced payment.

2.3.5. Data Other than Certified Pricing Data

If requested by the contracting officer, data other than certified pricing data shall be evaluated to support a determination of reasonable and balanced pricing. This information will only be requested if all other sources have been insufficient to support a determination of reasonable and/or balanced pricing.

2.3.6. Total Evaluated Price (TEP):

Pricing proposals will be reviewed for compliance with the pricing instructions listed within the addendum to the provision 52.212-2 listed within the Combo solicitation document. The TEP calculation methodology is demonstrated below. Proposed pricing evaluated as the TEP is required in accordance with the following format.

The TEP will be calculated as the sum of the offeror's proposed prices for the Twelve (12)-month Base Period, four(4) one-year Option Periods and one six (6) Month Extension Period in accordance with FAR 52.217-8 "Option to Extend Services". The six (6) Month Extension Period unit prices will be based on the proposed Option Period four (4) unit prices. The 6 (six) Month Extension Period under FAR 52.217-8 will only be utilized if necessary.

TEP will be used for evaluation purposes only. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options. The 6 (six) Month Extension Period is not to be considered part of Option four (4) Period and will be a separate option exercise if it is utilized.

2.3.6.1. The Price Matrix within the Combo solicitation document provides information to be utilized as a basis for proposing prices by contract periods for CLINs X001 through X018, the Basic Period and Option Periods. An Extension Period of six (6) months is also required, that pricing shall be based on the last Option Period unit prices.

2.3.7. Other Documentation Review

In reviewing proposed prices, all additional information from the Price Volume will also be considered. Offerors may provide any additional data other than certified pricing data as believed necessary to support, justify or clarify their proposed pricing.