Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services (Deviation Date: 20 Apr 2026)

ADDENDUM TO RFO PROVISION 52.212-2: Paragraph (a) is tailored as follows:

Evaluation:

IAW RFO 52.212-2, Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services, the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Quoter whose quote conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors will be used to evaluate quotes:

1. Price

2. Technical

3. Past Performance

BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD: This is a competitive, best value acquisition. Technical will be evaluated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis as a threshold requirement. Among quoters determined to be technically acceptable, award will be made using a trade-off between Past Performance and Price, which are approximately equal. A confidence assessment will be conducted for the Past Performance evaluation. Price will be evaluated as Total Evaluated Price (TEP). Technical elements will be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable for each solicitation response. The evaluation process shall proceed as indicated below:

Evaluation Approach:

Step 1: All contractors will be evaluated for responsiveness. Responsiveness is determined by verifying compliance with RFO 52.212-1 and its addendum.

Step 2: All responsive contractors will be ordered, by price, from the lowest to the highest Total Evaluated Price. A contractor's TEP is depicted in the Pricing Schedule Worksheet, on the Price Schedule Tab. The TEP is comprised of the total contract value (base and all options) plus the 6-month option available at RFO 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services. Pricing for RFO 52.217-8 is determined by taking the "amount" of the most recent option year exercised and dividing it by two (2).

Step 3: Technical evaluations will start with the lowest TEP quote and continue until two (2) solicitation responses are determined to be technically acceptable, or until all solicitation responses have been evaluated.

Step 4: The solicitation responses determined to be technically acceptable will then be evaluated for past performance until two (2) technically acceptable solicitation responses have been determined to have satisfactory or neutral confidence past performance. Steps three (3) and four (4) will continue until two (2) solicitation responses have been determined technically acceptable

with a rating of satisfactory confidence, neutral confidence, or higher in past performance, or until all solicitation responses have been evaluated.

Step 5: The Government will make a determination of price fair and reasonable.

Evaluation Factors for Award: Price Foreword: The government will evaluate quoters for award purposes based on their TEP. The government may determine that a solicitation response is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the government to exercise the option(s).

Volume I Price:

a.) Initially, solicitation responses shall be ordered from lowest to highest TEP, as previously defined.

b.) For evaluation purposes, RFO 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options and Pricing will be evaluated and applied to this evaluation. To evaluate the impact of clause RFO 52.217-8, the base and all options will be averaged by adding all together and dividing by two (2). Evaluation of options will not obligate the government to exercise the option(s).

c.) The TEP will be evaluated to determine whether it is reasonable. A reasonable price/cost represents a price/cost that provides best value to the government, considering market prices, the technical and functional capabilities of the contractor, and risk. Additionally, the government reserves the right to, but is not required to, conduct a price realism analysis on quotes that appear to be exceptionally low and not supported by the contractor's technical approach. In instances where a contractor's proposed price(s) appears exceptionally low, contractors may be requested to address this disparity by providing evidence of their capability and/or performance at similar price(s). The burden of proof as to price credibility rests with the contractor. An exceptionally or unrealistically low quote that's left unexplained may pose an unacceptable risk to the government and may be a reason to reject a contractor's solicitation response.

d.) The government anticipates adequate price competition and intends to award a contract without exchanges with respective contractors. The Government, however, reserves the right to conduct exchanges if deemed in its best interest

Volume II Technical:

a.) The technical volume will be evaluated as either acceptable or unacceptable for each subfactor.

i. Acceptable is defined as: "Required documents clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation".

ii. Unacceptable is defined as: "Required documents do not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation".

b.) The technical is comprised of five (5) subfactors, as listed in RFO 52.212-1 ADDENDUM. An overall technical rating will be assigned; failure to be assigned an acceptable in any technical subfactor will render the entire factor unacceptable and, therefore, ineligible for award. Only those responses determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or as a result of exchanges, will be considered for award. However, the contractor is reminded that the government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial solicitation response, as received, without exchanges, and may conduct exchanges with all, some, or none of the contractors.

c.) Evaluation criteria for the subfactors listed in RFO 52.212-1 ADDENDUM:

Evaluation Criteria
Subfactor 1: Effective and sufficient details and summarizes the offeror's technical approach in ensuring performance per the PWS and solicitation requirements. The standard is met when the conditions accurately describe performance in accordance with the PWS. Subfactor 2: A clear and effective summary of how assessments and analyses are conducted, the decision-making process, an unambiguous number of required personnel, offeror's gap analysis, and identification of factors that can impact personnel availability. Also sufficiently outlines the offeror's transition phase that most effectively minimizes interruptions or delays during the performance of the contract. Subfactor 3: Accurate documentation of how each employee will meet personnel identification requirements as specified in the PWS. Subfactor 4: Effective and logical processes for Quality Control to identify and prevent deficiencies during contract performance. Functional procedures for identifying unfavorable performance trends, problem areas, and corrective actions. Subfactor 5: Sufficiently and clearly demonstrates the offeror's ability to perform essential Contractor services IAW DRFOS 252.237-7024.

Volume III Past Performance:

Recent and relevant past performance is defined as past performance occurring within the last five (5) years preceding the date of solicitation issuance. Relevant past performance is defined as past performance providing candidates for services similar in scope to this requirement and complexity. The Government will consider relevancy, recency, extent of the past performance and the size and complexity of the past performance relative to this solicitation's requirement submitted by quoters as well as any information gathered by the Contracting Officer. Quoters that have no relevant past performance history will be assigned a neutral past performance evaluation rating; unknown will be rated as neutral confidence.

a.) An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. Recent contracts are contracts which have been performed for at least six (6) months and within the last five (5) years from the date of the issuance of this solicitation. Contract performance that does not meet these criteria will not be considered or evaluated.

b.) Relevant performance includes performance efforts involving Integrated Solid Waste Management that involved similar scope ranging from (Municipal Solid Waste; Food Waste; Recyclable commodity collection; Construction and Demolition debris, off-base disposal; vehicle weighing; full breakdown of services in PWS Section 1.), magnitude of effort, Complexity (unscheduled pickups and special event support; multiple waste streams, monthly reporting of weigh tickets; compliance with State, Local and Federal environmental regulations), contract type (Firm-fixed price), this solicitation requires, as identified in the table of Relevancy

Definitions below:

i. Very Relevant is defined as "Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires."
ii. Relevant is defined as "Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires."
iii. Somewhat Relevant is defined as "Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires."
iv. Not Relevant is defined as "Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope, magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires."

As a result of the relevancy and quality assessment of the recent contracts evaluated, quoters will receive an integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating. This rating represents the overall evaluation of contractor performance.

A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than an "Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant, favorable past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance. NOTE: The Government will not award a contract to an quoter rated "Limited Confidence" or "No Confidence" under the Past Performance factor.

The Past Performance factor will receive one of the Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings described below:

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the quoter's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the quoter will successfully perform the required effort.

Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the quoter's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the quoter will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the quoter's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The quoter may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the quoter's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the quoter will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the quoter's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the quoter will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

In the case of a contractor without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the contractor may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the Quoter shall be determined to have unknown past performance. Unknown or neutral past performance, in the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.

(End of provision)