SECTION 00 22 18 – PROCEDURES
PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL AND EVALUATION OF OFFERS FOR PHASE II

1. **Overview**

1.1 The intent of this solicitation is to target ten (10) contractors for a firm-fixed-price Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) for primarily Design/Bid/Build (D/B/B) and Design/Build (D/B) Construction Activities for the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division Mission Boundaries.

1.2 This is a two-phase procurement. Following completion of the evaluation of Phase I, a target of ten (10) most highly qualified offerors will be selected to participate in Phase II. The selected offerors for Phase II will be invited to submit the information described in this Section 00 22 18, Procedures for Submittal and Evaluation of Offers for Phase II, for review and evaluation by the Government. No seed task order will be awarded as a result of this solicitation. Only the base IDIQs will be awarded.

1.3 This sample project is for Caesar Creek Visitor Center HVAC replacement at Caesar Creek Lake, Waynesville, Ohio. FAR 36.204(f): The magnitude of this project is between $1,000,000.00 and $5,000,000.00.

1.4 The basis of award is the Best Value Trade-Off process. Following completion of the Phase II evaluation, the Contracting Officer will award a target of ten (10) firm-fixed-price Indefinite Delivery Indefinite (IDIQ) contracts to the responsible offerors whom the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines conform to the solicitation, are fair and reasonable, and offer the best overall value to the Government, all factors considered. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offers or to reject all offers. For Phase II submittals, requirements stated in this RFP are minimums.

NOTE: The rating information from Phase I will not be considered in Phase II or in the final selection.

2. **Submittal of Offers**

2.1 Offerors submitting proposals for this project should limit submissions to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and monies will have been expended in preparing information required herein. However, in order to be effectively and equitably evaluated, the proposals must include information sufficiently detailed to clearly describe the offeror's technical information, and management capabilities necessary for successful completion of the project. For the Phase II submittals, requirements stated in this RFP are minimums. Innovative, creative or cost-saving proposals that meet or exceed the requirements are encouraged and will be rated accordingly. Proposals should follow in the order of sequence set forth in the RFP. Information provided out of sequence may not be evaluated and may result in the offeror's disqualification from award.

2.2 **Offerors shall submit their proposals in accordance with the ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS no later than the time and date specified in Section 00 10 00 of Standard Form 30.**

2.3 Standard Form 30: The Government is using a two-phase procurement approach for this design/build Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (MATOC). For Phase II, offerors are required to submit a proposal consisting of the information identified in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 below. All proposal materials shall be submitted in accordance with the **ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**. Phase II proposal sections should parallel the submission requirements identified herein.

2.4 Volume I for Phase II shall be submitted in accordance with the **ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS** and include the following information:

- Volume I – Factor I: Design / Technical
  - Sub-factor I – Design Narrative
  - Sub-factor II – Risk Management

NOTE: Volume I shall be submitted in accordance with the "File Naming Convention" and "File Organization" paragraphs of the **ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**. Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab (factor or sub-factor) may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information. Any specified page limits will be strictly adhered to and enforced. Information submitted which exceeds the specified limit will not be evaluated.

2.5 Volume II for Phase II shall be submitted in accordance with the **ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS** and include the following information:

- Volume II – Tab A: **A signed SF1442 acknowledging** all amendments and Price Breakout Schedules (Sample Project and Binding Rates)

NOTE: Volume II, with the Price Breakout Schedule for the Sample Project and the Price Breakout Schedule for the Binding Rates, shall be submitted in accordance with the "File Naming Convention" and "File Organization" paragraphs of the **ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**. Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab (factor or sub-factor) may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information.

3. **<u>Proposal Evaluation Process</u>**

3.1 A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) comprised of representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will evaluate the proposals. Offerors are advised that the

technical evaluation and rating of proposals will be conducted in strict confidence. Technical/quality (Volume I) proposals will be reviewed and rated without knowledge of the price offered. The number and identities of offerors will not be revealed to anyone who is not involved in the evaluation and award process or to other offerors. Proposals will be evaluated based on the factors described herein, and the basis of award is the Best Value Trade-Off Process, as stated in paragraph 1.4 above.

3.2 The evaluation process for Phase II essentially consists of four parts: proposal compliance review, technical evaluation, price evaluation, and cost/technical trade-off analysis.

3.2.1 Proposal Compliance Review: This is an initial review to ensure that all required forms and certifications are complete and that both a technical and price proposal were received.

3.2.2 Technical Evaluation: The SSEB will evaluate and rate the proposals against the Phase II RFP requirements. The factors will be rated using an adjectival-based system. The Government will evaluate and rate the Phase II Volume I proposals against the RFP requirements. Factor I will be rated using Table 5 below. The sub-factors under Factor I are considered equal in weight and will be combined into one factor rating.

3.2.3 Price Evaluation: The SSEB and SSA will evaluate price proposals independent of the technical evaluation. The SSEB will not have access to price information until completion of the technical evaluation. The Government will evaluate price proposals in accordance with FAR Part 15.404 independent of the Past Performance and Technical evaluations. Price will be evaluated based on the proposed price of the Sample Task Order as well as the binding rates that make up the Total Estimated MATOC Price. Price will be evaluated for fairness and reasonableness through the use of price analysis. Proposed pricing will be checked for unbalanced line items. Offerors are cautioned to distribute costs appropriately such that no line item is overstated or understated.

3.2.4 Price/Technical Trade-off Analysis: After all above evaluations and reviews are complete, the SSA will compare the relative advantages and disadvantages of technical proposals and compare prices. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will then consider all factors to select the proposals offering the best value to the Government.

4. Phase II Proposal Information and Related Evaluation Factors

4.1 Phase II proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the factors below, listed in relative order of importance. **All evaluation factors, other than price, when combined are considered approximately equal to price.** The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors. Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. 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.

4.2	**Volume I – Factor I: Design / Technical**	**1st**
	Sub-factor 1 – Design Narrative	Equal to Sub-factor II
	Sub-factor 2 – Risk Management	Equal to Sub-factor I
4.3	**Volume II – Price and Pro Forma Information**	**Not Rated**
	Tab A Standard Form **1442** and Price Breakout Schedules	Not Rated

4.4 **Ratings:**

Evaluators will apply the adjectival rating for the definition that most closely matches the evaluation.

Table 5
Technical Assessment Ratings

Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and of risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
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.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

4.5 **Definitions:**

1. 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. See FAR 15.001.

2. Strength. 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.

3. 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.

4. Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

5. Significant Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

6. Uncertainty. Any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the offeror is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission or mistake).

7. Clarification. Limited exchanges between the Government and offerors that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated. See FAR 15.306(a)(1).

8. Risk. As it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assess the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or subfactor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

5. **Volume I – Factor I: Design / Technical**

5.1 **Submission Requirements:**

5.1.1 Sub-factor I – Design Narrative

Provide a clear and concise narrative describing your design process for this project, while specifically addressing the following:

- Architectural including Roofing System
- Mechanical
- Structural
- Site Work / Utility Connections & Routing
- ASHRAE / EPACT
- AT/FP
- Coordination of design and construction with existing HVAC and Electrical Systems
- Installation of electrical and mechanical Systems
- Commissioning of the electrical and mechanical Systems
- Any Temporary Cooling or Heating systems in order to maintain the building temperatures.

5.1.2 Sub-factor II – Risk Management

Provide a risk management narrative that addresses the following information:

a. Identify significant areas of risk and provide your plan for mitigating risk during contract performance.

b. Discuss the key considerations and milestones associated with the construction schedule, and how along with your key subcontractors will execute the work to deliver the project within the period of performance. Discuss resources that are available to mitigate the risk of schedule slippage.

c. Describe how you will coordinate simultaneous/phased efforts with existing building functions and personnel to ensure minimal impacts to ongoing building operations.

NOTE: There is a limit of eight (8) single sided, 8.5" x 11" pages, using a minimum font size of 11 and a minimum margin of one-half inch on all sides, for the entirety of Factor I: Design/Technical.

*Proposals SHALL address each bullet point for Sub-Factor I – Design Narrative and Sub-Factor II – Risk Management or the proposal will be considered deficient and rated Unacceptable.

5.2 **Evaluation Criteria:**

5.2.1 Sub-factor I – Design Narrative:

Design Narrative will assess the Offeror's ability to provide a comprehensive, clear, and technically sound description of the design process, ensuring that the proposed architectural (including roofing), structural, and mechanical systems are integrated and feasible for the site conditions and utility requirements. The SSEB will evaluate the narrative for compliance with ASHRAE/EPACT energy standards and AT/FP security standards, while prioritizing the Offeror's methodology for coordinating new construction with existing HVAC and electrical infrastructure to prevent operational disruptions. The proposal will be evaluated on the thoroughness of its installation and commissioning strategies for electrical and mechanical systems and the adequacy of the proposed temporary cooling or heating solutions designed to maintain required building temperatures and protect mission-critical equipment throughout the execution phase.

5.2.2 Sub-factor II – Risk Management:

Narratives will be evaluated based on the level of understanding of project risks and the approach for minimizing these risks, particularly strategies that ensure minimal impacts to ongoing building operations. Plans that demonstrate a clear understanding of the project requirements and provide a thorough approach for mitigating project-specific risks may be rated more favorably by the SSEB.

6. **Volume II – Price and Proforma Information** (Submit in a separate electronic file).

6.1 Tab A – **Standard Form 1442 and Proposal Price Breakout Schedule.**

6.1.1 Submission Requirements:

The offeror shall complete and submit **Standard Form 1442** and the Proposal Price Breakout Schedules (Sample Project and Binding Rates). Both of the Price Breakout Schedules are included in Section 00 10 00 of this solicitation.

6.1.2 Evaluation Criteria:

The Total Evaluated Price to be used for evaluation purposes will be determined by adding the Total Estimated MATOC Price (Base plus Option) and the Total Proposal Price of the Sample Project. Offerors must complete all of the Price Breakout information for the purpose of evaluation. The price for the Sample Project, as well as the binding rates that make up the Total Estimated MATOC Price, will be reviewed by the SSEB and Contracting Officer/SSA for fairness and reasonableness through the use of price analysis. Price will also be checked for unbalancing of line items. Offerors are cautioned to distribute costs appropriately. The SSEB and Contracting Officer/ SSA will also confirm that the proposed binding rates are used for the Sample Project. Proposed prices that do not utilize the proposed binding rates will be considered Unacceptable.