M. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The Government reserves the right to make award with or without discussions. The Government reserves the right to establish a competitive range.

The technical (non-price) factors will be evaluated using the following adjectival scale:

A. Outstanding: The proposal provides a very clear, comprehensive and detailed response which meets all requirements and includes significant strengths with no deficiencies or significant weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is very low as the quotation demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in outstanding performance.

B. Good: The proposal provides a sound response which meets all requirements and includes strengths with no deficiencies and few weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is low as the quotation demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in satisfactory performance.

C. Acceptable: The proposal provides a response which is capable of meeting all requirements but includes both strengths and weaknesses with no deficiencies. Strengths are not outweighed by the weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate as the quotation demonstrates a general understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in satisfactory performance.

D. Marginal: The proposal provides a response which does not meet all requirements and includes strengths, weaknesses, and/or deficiencies. Strengths are outweighed by the weaknesses and/or deficiencies. The risk of unsuccessful performance is high as the quotation does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in unsatisfactory performance.

E. Unacceptable: The proposal provides a response that does not meet all requirements and includes significant weaknesses and/or deficiencies which far outweigh any strengths. The risk of unsuccessful performance is very high as the quotation does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and will result in unsatisfactory performance.

Note: For the past performance factor, an Offeror who does not have any type of past performance will be rated as “Neutral.” The proposal receives no merit or demerit for this factor.

Award will not be made to an Offeror who receives a rating of Marginal or Unacceptable for any factor.

Offerors whose proposals exceed the standards identified in the Factors/Subfactors may be rated higher.

The award shall be made on a tradeoff basis, and contract award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation and is determined to be best value to the Government in accordance with the requirements stated below. The evaluation criteria are divided into Technical and Price categories. The technical factors are more important than price. However, as the difference in technical merit between the proposals becomes less significant, the relative importance of the proposed prices will increase. The Government reserves the right to make award with or without discussions. The Government

reserves the right to establish a competitive range.

The Government will only evaluate the written contents of the Offeror's proposal.

A. To be eligible for evaluation, proposals must be prepared in accordance with and comply with the instructions given in the solicitation, Section L.

B. The Evaluation Factors to be used in assessing the quality of each proposal are listed below in Section M.2, Proposal Evaluation Criteria. Factor 1 and Factor 2 are weighted equally. Factors 3, 4 and 5 are in descending order of importance.

C. The proposal's price will be separately evaluated from the proposal's technical merit.

D. Reference AOC52.215-5 Contract Award -Source (Jun 2004) for additional information.

M.2. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria to be used by the Contracting Officer for the selection of a contractor to perform the work specified herein are defined below. The criteria are divided into technical and price categories which consist of factors and sub factors corresponding to those in SECTION L, INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS in this solicitation. The technical criteria are more important than price criteria. However, as the difference in technical merit between proposals becomes less significant, the importance of the price will increase.

M2.1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS

Each Offeror's proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the technical evaluation factors listed below to determine whether it is responsive to the requirements of the RFP and is therefore acceptable and eligible for award. Technical evaluation Factor 1 and Factor 2 are weighted equally. Technical evaluation Factors 3,4, and 5 are listed below in descending order of importance. Subfactors within each factor are weighted equally.

M.2.1.1. FACTOR 1 – BASIC SERVICES - TECHNICAL APPROACH

The technical approach (to include the subfactors) will be evaluated to determine if the Offeror has identified/demonstrated an understanding of the basic services range of work and described the general processes the firm would use in accomplishing the tasks identified within the Section C including which tasks would be accomplished by subcontractors. The technical approach will be evaluated to determine if the Offeror provided satisfactory evidence of its team's knowledge and ability to perform the minimum performance requirements in Section L.2.2.1. Approach shall comply with solicitation requirements, propose staff and materials that are appropriate, and assure the efficient completion of the work at the highest quality level for all contract line items

M.2.1.1.1. Subfactor 1 - Facilities Management:

The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and describe its approach to facilities management to include: 24 hours/7 days a week/365 days per year for facility maintenance, operations, and repair as well as emergency operations, regulatory reporting, quality control, metrics and measurements and a continuous improvement process.

M.2.1.1.2. Subfactor 2 - Operations and Maintenance:

The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and describe its approach to

performing operations and maintenance to include: preventative, predictive and corrective maintenance; service calls; building systems operations, monitoring and controlling to maintain critical environmental conditions; testing requirements for pressure vessels and all fire/life safety systems; indoor air quality; and operation of the waterworks.

M.2.1.1.3. Subfactor 3 - Landscaping, Grounds and Plant Maintenance:
The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and describe its approach to performing landscaping, grounds and plant maintenance to include: lawn/turf areas, meadows, sedum roofs, drainage swales, the fence line, vines, trees, shrubs, beds and decorative landscaping structures including the reflection pool and gravel/rock beds/rock walls.

M.2.1.2. FACTOR 2 - ORGANIZATION, STAFFING, KEY PERSONNEL & SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal to determine whether it demonstrates that the Offeror has effectively organized its resources to ensure the successful and timely completion of the effort.

M.2.1.2.1. Subfactor 1 - Project Organization and Staffing Plan:
The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the project requirements and organize the project team to ensure the project will be successful. An organizational chart/staffing plan showing job titles, number of personnel, work days and hours, as well as absenteeism coverage shall be included.

M.2.1.2.2. Subfactor 2 - Key Personnel Resumes:
The Offeror must demonstrate that key personnel are well qualified in their areas of expertise and meet all qualifications outlined in Section H.15. The Government will evaluate the qualifications, training and experience of the key personnel to determine whether the Offeror has furnished evidence that these individuals are well qualified to successfully complete their assigned responsibilities. Failing to include resumes and/or signed letters of commitment from proposed key personnel will be evaluated as a deficiency.

M.2.1.2.3. Subfactor 3 - Subcontractor Management Plan:
The Offeror must propose a subcontractor management plan that demonstrates proposed subcontractors have the necessary qualifications and experience to successfully complete the services for which they will be assigned. Offeror's proposal shall include detailed information on work to be subcontracted; procedures for monitoring and controlling the work; appropriate assignments of responsibility and delegations of authority; and effective subcontract management procedures and performance assurances.

M.2.1.3. FACTOR 3 – REIMBURSABLE SERVICES - TECHNICAL APPROACH

The technical approach (to include the subfactors) will be evaluated to determine if the Offeror has identified/demonstrated an understanding of the reimbursable services range of work and described the general processes the firm would use in accomplishing the tasks identified within Section C including which tasks would be accomplished by subcontractors. The technical approach will be evaluated to determine if the Contractor provided satisfactory evidence of his team's knowledge and ability to perform the minimum performance requirements in Section L.2.2.3. Approach shall comply with solicitation requirements, propose staff and materials that are appropriate, and assure the efficient completion of the work at the highest quality level for all contract line items

M.2.1.3.1. Subfactor 1 - Snow Removal:

The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and describe its approach to performing snow removal to include: snow and ice removal for roads, parking areas, sidewalks and landings; surface treatments; and snow stockpiling.

M.2.1.3.2. Subfactor 2 – Projects/Reimbursable Work Efforts:
The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and describe its approach to performing project work. Project work may include consulting services; engineering studies; architect-engineer design services; commissioning; testing; construction or construction management; painting; equipment or system procurement, rental, repair, modification, alteration, replacement or disposal; and other reimbursable products or services.

M.2.1.4. FACTOR 4 - CORPORATE RESOURCES/MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE

The Offeror's proposals will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror and its proposed partner or subcontractor(s), if applicable, has demonstrated that they have experience with projects similar in size and scope.

M.2.1.4.1. Subfactor 1 - Similar Project Experience:
The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and profile projects that substantiate it has experience successfully managing contracts similar in scope, size, and complexity and involving tasks similar to those described in Section C of the RFP. The Offeror shall detail at least three (3) but not more than six (6) comparable projects performed within the past five (5) years.

M.2.1.4.2. Subfactor 2 - Support Infrastructure:
The Offeror must demonstrate an understanding of the requirement and experience in providing the necessary infrastructure at the corporate level to ensure successful project startup and operations to include: project oversight by corporate sponsor; human resources; contract management; and safety program. Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate a well-organized support infrastructure at the corporate level with defined processes and procedures to ensure project success.

M.2.1.5. FACTOR 5 - PAST PERFORMANCE

The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated to determine the degree to which the Offeror is currently successfully performing or has successfully completed similar projects within the past five (5) years. The evaluation will take into consideration the similarity of services performed to the services required under this solicitation, conforming to contract requirements, quality of workmanship, history of reasonable and cooperative behavior, and commitment to customer satisfaction.

When evaluating past performance, an Offeror without any past performance will be rated as "Neutral." This means that there is no relevant past performance available for evaluation. Offeror has asserted that it has no relevant directly related or similar past performance experience. Proposal receives no merit or demerit for this factor.

The Government may use other references/information to verify the Offeror's past performance.

Past performance of proposed subcontractor(s) will <u>not</u> be considered.

An Offeror will be given an opportunity to address especially unfavorable reports of past performance and the Offeror's response, or lack thereof, will be taken into consideration.

M.2.2. PRICE EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The Government will only evaluate the pricing proposals of offerors receiving Outstanding, Good or

Acceptable ratings for Factors 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Offerors receiving a rating of Marginal or Unacceptable for any technical factor will not have their price proposal evaluated. Price will not be rated but will be ranked according to total evaluated price. The Government will evaluate the total price of the Section J, Attachment 22 Pricing Spreadsheet (row 34) for the base year and all option years. Labor rates for snow removal and projects will also be considered. As the difference in the total evaluated price between proposals becomes less significant, the importance of the reimbursable labor rates for snow removal and projects rates will increase.

The offeror's price quote shall be evaluated for price reasonableness to prevent the Government from paying too much for the services outlined in the SOW. Additionally, a price realism analysis may be performed to determine whether an offeror's price is unrealistically low. Unrealistically low pricing may question whether an offeror fully understands the size, magnitude, complexity, and scope of services outlined in the SOW. Unrealistic pricing may serve as a rejection of the offer.

END OF SECTION M