Enclosure 3: General Proposal Submission and Tabbing Requirements

1.0 General Submission Instructions

In accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions, the Government reserves the right to make award without discussions. Therefore, offerors should submit their best technical and price terms in their initial offer and not automatically assume that they will have an opportunity to participate in discussions or to submit a revised offer. The Government may make award of a conforming proposal without discussions, if deemed to be within the best interests of the Government.

In accordance with 15.203 and FAR Clause 52.215-1(f)(4), Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

This enclosure provides detailed instructions for the preparation and submission of proposals.

Item	Requirement
Submission Method	Proposals must be submitted electronically via email. No hard copies will be accepted.
Points of Contact	**Contracting Officer:** Troy D. Small (troy.d.small@usace.army.mil) **Contract Specialist:** Jenifer Garland (jenifer.m.garland@usace.army.mil)
Deadline	Proposals are due no later than the time and date specified in Block 13 of Standard Form (SF) 1442 of the solicitation. Late submissions will not be considered. Proposals are due as specified on the solicitation document (as amended if applicable). Do not assume that electronic communication is instantaneous. Offerors should time their upload effort with prudence by not waiting until the last few minutes—this will allow for unexpected delays in the transmittal process. If an electronic submission is uploaded minutes before the deadline but the submission is not received until after the deadline, the submission will be considered late. Offerors are encouraged to keep a copy of the submission confirmation for their records.
Format	All files must be in Adobe PDF format on 8.5” x 11” pages. Text shall be no smaller than 10-point font.
File Naming	Files must be titled using the following format: • W912PM26RA004_[COMPANYNAME]_VOLUME_I • W912PM26RA004_[COMPANYNAME]_VOLUME_II
Page Limits	• Volume I: Shall not exceed 150 pages. • **Volume II:** Shall not exceed 150 pages. Pages submitted in excess of these limits will not be evaluated.
Bid Bond	A Bid Bond (SF 24) must be submitted electronically (in Volume I, Tab G) by the proposal due date.

Important Prohibitions:

- Do not include pricing information of any kind in Volume II.

- Do not include exceptions to the solicitation's terms and conditions in any volume. Should the offer include any standard company terms and conditions that conflict with the terms and conditions of the solicitation, the offer may be determined non-responsive and therefore "unacceptable" and ineligible for award. Questions regarding terms must be resolved prior to submission.
- Do not cross-reference information between volumes. All information must be self-contained within the appropriate volume and factor.

2.0 Proposal Structure and Content

Proposals shall be organized into two distinct volumes as described below. Each volume of the proposal shall contain a detailed table of contents. If more than one Adobe PDF file is used for a volume, the complete table of contents shall be included in each. Any materials submitted but not required by this solicitation (such as company brochures) shall be relegated to appendices

2.1 Volume I: Price & Administrative

This volume contains the offeror's administrative information and complete price proposal.

Tab	Content
A	**Table of Contents**
B	**Proposal Cover Sheet:** As required by FAR 52.215-1(c)(2), including contact information, UEID, CAGE code, and authorized negotiator details.
C	**Standard Form (SF) 1442:** Completed and signed by an authorized individual.
D	**Acknowledgement of Amendments:** Signed SF 30 for each amendment, if applicable.
E	**Factor 1: Price:** Completed price schedule from Section B of the solicitation.
F	**Representations and Certifications:** Completed online at SAM.gov or submitted with proposal.
G	**Teaming Arrangement Information:** If applicable, fully disclose all joint venture or subcontractor relationships.
H	**Financial & Bonding Capability:** Provide evidence of financial stability and a letter from a surety indicating bonding capability for this project. Include electronic copy of Bid Bond.

2.2 Volume II: Technical & Past Performance

This volume contains the offeror's response to the non-price evaluation factors. This volume must **not** contain any price data.

Tab	Content
A	**Table of Contents**
B	**Factor 2: Technical Approach**
C	**Factor 3: Key Personnel**
D	**Factor 4: Past Performance**
E	**Factor 5: Small Business Participation Plan**

3.0 Submission & Evaluation Criteria by Factor

This section details the specific submission requirements and corresponding evaluation criteria for each non-price factor in Volume II.

3.1 Factor 2: Technical Approach (Volume II, Tab A)

A. Submission Requirements:
The offeror shall submit a comprehensive narrative, **not to exceed thirty (30) pages**, detailing the proposed methodology, sequencing, scheduling, and execution of all work. The narrative must address, at a minimum:

1. **Site Management:** A detailed Site Plan and narrative covering mobilization/demobilization, laydown areas, work zones, access roads, and contractor facilities.
2. **Drilling and Installation:** Detailed processes for:
    - Inclinometer borehole drilling and fluid management.
    - Piezometer installation, including management of water pressure complications.
    - Spillway anchor borehole drilling on the ogee spillway, including rig access, fluid containment, anchor installation, tensioning, and testing.
3. **Risk Management:**
    - Methods to monitor and mitigate risks associated with drilling near existing anchors and within ASR-affected concrete.
    - Procedures to prevent damage to the dam and maintain dam safety throughout construction.
    - Approach to maintain dam integrity and spillway operability during high reservoir elevations.
4. **Resource & Subcontractor Management:** A detailed description of how labor, resources, and subcontractors will be coordinated. For Joint Ventures, clearly identify the work performed by each partner.
5. **Project Schedule:** A comprehensive, resource-loaded schedule demonstrating completion within the contract period of performance. The schedule must assume a Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of **[Date to be specified in Solicitation]** and include milestones for all major construction phases.

B. Evaluation Criteria:

The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed technical approach for its clarity, feasibility, and completeness. The evaluation will assess the degree to which the proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the project's complexities and risks. The evaluation will result in a Combined Technical/Risk Rating as described in Section 4.1.

- **Significant Strength** An aspect of an offerors' 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. An example of this would be that the technical approach would be an innovative, integrated solution that doesn't just meet the requirements but demonstrably reduces the government's biggest risks: dam safety, project delays, and cost overruns.

- **Strengths** An aspect of an offerors' proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.may include: detailed and efficient procedures, advanced risk mitigation strategies, and construction techniques that minimize dam safety risks and enhance project outcomes.
- **Weaknesses** are a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance, and may include: a generic or illogical schedule, an incomplete site plan, or a risk management approach not tailored to the specific conditions at Philpott Dam.
- **Significant Weakness** A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. For example, submitting a technical narrative where the individual sections are filled out as if from a checklist, but they contradict each other and fail to present a single, coherent, and safe plan would be considered a significant weakness.
- **Deficiencies** 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.and may include: failure to address a minimum submission requirement, or a schedule that exceeds the contract performance period. Exceeding the page limit may result in a deficiency because the pages exceeding the maximum limit, which could contain a submission requirement, are not reviewed.

3.2 Factor 3: Key Personnel (Volume II, Tab B)
Key Personnel are individuals proposed by the Offeror who are critical to the successful performance of the contract, occupying roles that require specific minimum educational, certification, and experience requirements. These individuals are typically identified by the Government for their essential functions (such as Project Manager, Quality Control Manager, and Construction Superintendent), but the Offeror may also propose additional personnel they deem essential, up to the specified maximum of 15. Their qualifications and the clarity of their integration into the organizational structure are evaluated to ensure a capable and effective project team.

A. Submission Requirements:

1. **Resumes:** Submit resumes for all proposed Key Personnel. Each resume shall not exceed two (2) pages. A maximum of fifteen (15) total resumes may be submitted.
2. **Minimum Qualifications:** The following personnel must meet specified minimum educational and experience requirements. Failure to meet any single requirement will be considered a deficiency.
    - **Project Manager:** Bachelor's degree from an ABET-accredited engineering program, a valid PMP certification, and 10 years of relevant project management experience.
    - **Quality Control (QC) Manager:** Degree in engineering, architecture, or construction management; a valid PE registration in Virginia; and 10 years of combined experience in relevant construction roles.
    - **Construction Superintendent:** 10 years of general construction experience, 5 years of experience as a superintendent on similar projects, and verifiable familiarity with EM 385-1-1 requirements.

3. **Organizational Chart:** Provide a comprehensive chart and narrative that clearly delineates the chain of command, identifies all Key Personnel and their locations (on-site vs. off-site), and shows the relationship between any joint venture partners.

B. Evaluation Criteria:

The Government will evaluate the qualifications and experience of the proposed team and the clarity of the organizational structure. The evaluation will result in a Combined Technical/Risk Rating as described in Section 4.1.

- **Significant Strength** An aspect of an offerors' 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. For example, A significant strength would be proposing a core team that not only exceeds the minimum requirements for the three named positions but also includes additional, specialized experts whose roles directly address the project's highest risks (drilling, ASR concrete, dam integrity), and demonstrating that this exact team has a successful track record on similar, high-risk dam projects.

- **Strengths** are an aspect of the proposal that exceeds a requirement in a way that is beneficial to the Government, and may include: personnel with experience substantially exceeding the minimum requirements, a well-supported on-site team with robust off-site resources, and a clear plan for personnel resiliency.

- **Weaknesses** are a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance, and may include: ambiguous lines of authority on the organizational chart, personnel whose experience is not on projects of similar scope or complexity, or a single individual proposed for multiple key roles.

- **Significant Weakness** A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. For example, a significant weakness would be proposing a team composed of high-level corporate executives who are geographically distant and have portfolio-level responsibilities, while the actual on-site leadership is either minimally qualified or not clearly identified.

- **Deficiencies** 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

3.3 Factor 4: Past Performance (Volume II, Tab C)

A. Submission Requirements:

1. **Project Submissions:** Submit **no fewer than two (2)** and **no more than four (4)** recent and relevant project examples for the prime contractor. Experience from parent companies or subcontractors will not be evaluated.

2. **Recent:** To be considered recent, projects must have been completed within the last six (6) year.

3. **Relevance:** To be considered relevant, projects must demonstrate experience in one or more of the following critical work elements:
    - Post-tensioned anchor installation into a concrete dam.
    - Drilling through a concrete dam affected by Alkali-Silica Reaction (ASR).
    - Installation of geotechnical instrumentation (inclinometers, piezometers) into a concrete dam.
4. **Questionnaires:** Submit a completed NAVFAC/USACE Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) for each project. It is the offeror's responsibility to ensure these are completed by their client references and submitted with the proposal. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

B. Evaluation Criteria:

The Government will evaluate the offeror's past performance to assess its capability to successfully perform the required work. The evaluation will result in a performance confidence rating as described in Section 4.2 below. The Government will consider information from the submitted PPQs, CPARS, and other available sources, focusing on:

- Timeliness of Performance & Schedule Adherence
- Cost Control & Financial Management
- Quality of Work & Conformance to Specifications
- Customer Satisfaction & Cooperation
- Management Effectiveness & Safety Record

An offeror without a record of relevant past performance will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating and will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably. Although the Government may not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the Government may determine, that a “Substantial Confidence” or “Satisfactory Confidence” past performance rating is worth more than a “Neutral Confidence” past performance rating.

Offerors may be provided an opportunity to address any negative past performance information about which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond if such information is determined to present an impact on the rating to be assessed

3.4 Factor 5: Small Business Participation Plan (Volume II, Tab D)

A. Submission Requirements:

All offerors are required to submit Small Business Participation Commitment Documents in accordance with the instructions in Section L. Small business

participation commitments will become requirements and be incorporated into the resulting contract.

The contractor shall report actual achievement of small business participation results on a quarterly basis and shall discuss performance in achieving the small business commitments/requirements.

The Offeror shall demonstrate small business participation by detailing its proposed approach to meet the requirements under the Small Business Participation factor by addressing the following areas in its Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD):

- Proposed Small Business Participation Plan in performance of the potential contract (applies to both other Than Small Businesses and Small Businesses)

- Commitment to Small Business

- Payment Procedures (applies to both Other Than Small Businesses and Small Businesses)

- Compliance with Small Business Subcontracting Plans (applies to Other Than Small Businesses only)

- The Offeror shall include a written statement of its established procedures to ensure timely payments to small business subcontractors in accordance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns (for those contracts under which it was required within the past three years from the closing date of this solicitation). If not required in any recent contracts, the Offeror shall so state.

- For Other than Small Businesses ONLY. Compliance with terms and conditions of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (if required on recent contracts). The Other than Small Business Offeror shall provide three Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISRs) for recent contracts (within the past three years from the closing date of this solicitation) that required a subcontracting plan. If not required in any recent contracts, the Offeror shall so state. If the Offeror has less than three recent contracts, the Offeror shall provide the most recent ISR for each contract it has, and state that the Offeror does not have three recent contracts.

B. Evaluation Criteria:

IAW Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS) 215.304(c)(i) the extent to which offeror's identify and commit to small business performance of the contract shall be evaluated.

The Government will evaluate the SBPCD based on the offeror's commitment to achieving the established goals and their past history of small business utilization. The evaluation will result in a Combined Technical/Risk Rating as described in Section 4.1. The Government will evaluate the following:

a. Past performance of the offerors in complying with requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

b. All prime offerors, **including small businesses**, submitting a proposal are required to meet or exceed the Minimum Quantitative Requirement(s) (MQRs) relative to the total contract value as

follows:

- **Small Business (SB):** 28.04%
- **Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB):** 10.67%
- **Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB):** 2.34%
- **HUBZone-Certified Small Business (HUBZone):** 1.42%
- **Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB):** 2.07%

For purposes of this requirement, total contract value is defined as total contract value is defined as the cumulative value of task order awards received that have opportunities to utilize small business concerns throughout the life of the contract. Small business prime offerors may achieve small business participation (meet or exceed MQR) through their own performance/participation as a prime and also through subcontracting to other small businesses.

4.0 Adjectival Ratings and Definitions

4.1 Technical and Small Business Ratings

Evaluation factors will be rated using the following adjectival descriptions. Evaluators will apply the appropriate adjective to each factor rated. The evaluator's narrative explanation must clearly establish that the offeror's submittal meets the definitions established below. As each factor is evaluated an assessment of Performance Risk will be made. Performance Risk relates to the assessment of an offeror's present and past work and accomplishments to determine the offeror's ability to successfully perform.

Combined Technical/Risk Rating. The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Each evaluation factor and its risk rating combined will be determined and assigned using the adjectival descriptions contained herein. Upon assessment of each individual factor and its risk rating, the appropriate overall rating for the proposal will be assigned using these same adjectival descriptions. The following table provides Ratings and Definitions for the Factors 2, 3 and 5.

Color	Rating	Definition
Blue	**Outstanding**	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding, contains multiple strengths, and has a low risk of unsuccessful performance.
Purple	**Good**	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding, contains at least one strength, and has a low to moderate risk.
Green	**Acceptable**	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach, and risk is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	**Marginal**	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach, and/or risk is high.
Red	**Unacceptable**	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies.

		Proposal is unawardable.

4.2 Past Performance Confidence Ratings

Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	High expectation of successful performance.
Satisfactory Confidence	Reasonable expectation of successful performance.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available.
Limited Confidence	Low expectation of successful performance.
No Confidence	No expectation of successful performance.

5. Price.

5.1 Price will not be rated but will be a factor in establishing the competitive range prior to discussions (if held) and in making the best value decision for award of any resultant contract.

5.2 The Government will perform a price analysis on all proposals received for the contract. Price analysis will be performed in accordance with FAR 15.404-1, to determine fairness and reasonableness as well as to assure an understanding of the work and ability to execute the contract at price proposed. The evaluation will determine the extent to which the price proposal is consistent with the requirements of the RFP. The Independent Government Estimate (IGE), or any other pricing tool, as necessary, may be utilized in making this determination. Offerors are advised that any offer wherein pricing is deemed unreasonable will be rendered ineligible for award.

5.3 In accordance with FAR 52.217-5 – Evaluations of Options (Jul 1990), the Government will evaluate offers, if any, for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

This total contract price including the price for optional line items is the evaluated price for making the best value decision.

6.0 Relative Importance of Factors.

The evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance.

1. Technical Approach and Key Personnel are of equal importance to each other and are, when combined, significantly more important than all other factors.

2. Past Performance is less important than Technical Approach and Key Personnel, but more important than Small Business Participation.

3. Small Business Participation Plan is less important than all other non-price factors.

4. Price is the least important factor. All non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

7. Basis for Award.

7.1 Proposals must meet the criteria stated in the RFP in order to be eligible for award, to include acceptability and responsibility.

7.2 In order to determine which proposal(s) represent the best value, the SSA will compare proposals to one another. Best value will be determined by a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in this RFP.

7.3 The contract will be awarded to that successful offeror whose proposal offers the best overall value.

7.4 As technical ratings and relative advantages and disadvantages become less distinct, differences in price between proposals are of increased importance in determining the most advantageous proposal. Conversely, as differences in price become less distinct, differences in scoring and relative advantages and disadvantages between proposals are of increased importance to the determination.

7.5 The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer(s) or the most highly rated offeror(s). The right is also reserved to reject any and all offers.