AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
J W912QR26RA008-0001	1		2

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0001	30 OCT 2025		HUBZONE MATOC

6. ISSUED BY CODE W912QR

W072 ENDIST LOUISVILLE
KO CONTRACTING DIVISION, 600 DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR PL
LOUISVILLE, KY 40202-2230
UNITED STATES
JOEL HUBERMAN, EMAIL: JOEL.HUBERMAN@USACE.ARMY.MIL TELEPHONE: (502) 315-7409

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

SCD: PAS:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X)

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER W912QR26RA008

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 06 OCT 2025

☐ 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended. ☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

SEE SECTION G - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
☐	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
☐	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
☐	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
☐	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (*Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

REMOVING THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT "THE OFFEROR SHALL SUBMIT THE NAME, ADDRESS, AND UNIQUE ENTITY IDENTIFIER FOR ANY AND ALL KEY SUBCONTRACTORS IDENTIFIED IN THE PROPOSAL" LOCATED AT SECTION 7.4.1 (SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS) UNDER SECTION 00 22 16 - PHASE I PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL OF OFFERS AND PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
		JOHN BUTTS	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	30 OCT 2025

Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 11/2016)
Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Section 00 01 15 - List of Drawing Sheets

The attachments table has changed from:

Identifier	Document Name	Document Description	Reference Identifier	Date	Line Item	Page Numbers	Document Type	Provided Under Separate Cover
0001	SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS	Statement of Work		06 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0002	ProjNet Instructions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0003	PIEE Directions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0004	REPS AND CERTS	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0005	UAI 5152.236-9011	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0006	SECTION 00 22 16 10.06.2025	Statement of Work		06 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0007	Veterans Employment	Statement of Work		19 Aug 2025			Attachment	No

To:

Identifier	Document Name	Document Description	Reference Identifier	Date	Line Item	Page Numbers	Document Type	Provided Under Separate Cover
0001	SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS	Statement of Work		06 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0002	ProjNet Instructions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0003	PIEE Directions_	Statement of Work		03 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0004	REPS AND CERTS	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0005	UAI 5152.236-9011	Statement of Work		16 Jul 2025			Attachment	No
0006	SECTION 00 22 16 10.30.2025	Statement of Work		30 Oct 2025			Attachment	No
0007	Veterans Employment	Statement of Work		19 Aug 2025			Attachment	No

The following contract documents were added:

SECTION 00 22 16 10.30.2025

The following contract documents were deleted:

SECTION 00 22 16 10.06.2025

The following contract documents Page Counts were changed:

DOCUMENT PAGE COUNTS		
DOCUMENT NAME	**FROM**	**TO**
SECTION 00 22 16 10.30.2025		none

SECTION 00 22 16 – PHASE I

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL OF OFFERS AND PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. **Overview**

1.1 The intent of this solicitation is to select a target of ten (10) contractors for Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (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, and the basis of award is the Best Value Trade-Off Process. Potential offerors are invited to submit the information described in this Section 00 22 16 for review and evaluation by the Government. 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 Section 00 22 18, Procedures for Submittal of Offers for Phase II, for review and evaluation by the Government. Price will be evaluated in Phase II through use of a sample project and binding contract rates. No seed task order will be awarded as a result of this solicitation. Only the base MATOC contracts will be awarded.

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 past performance, and technical approach necessary for successful completion of the project. Requirements stated in the Request for Proposal (RFP) are minimums. 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 to the US Army Corps of Engineers using the PIEE Solicitation Module no later than the time and date specified in Block 13 of Standard Form 1442.
NOTE: The Louisville District is in the Eastern Time Zone.

2.3 The Government is using a two-phase procurement approach for this D/B/B or D/B Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) MATOC contract. For Phase I, 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 binders with a table of contents and tabbed section dividers. Phase I proposal sections should parallel the submission requirements identified herein.

2.4 Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance

- Prime Contractor
- A-E Designer of Record

Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach

NOTE: Volume I shall be submitted electronically in the PIEE Solicitation Module. 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 shall be submitted electronically in the PIEE Solicitation Module and include the following information:

- Volume II – Tab A: Standard Form 1442

- Volume II – Tab B: Joint Venture Agreements
- Volume II – Tab C: Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding & Proof of Financial Ability
- Volume II – Tab D: Pre-Award Information

NOTE: Phase I does NOT involve pricing submission. Volume II shall be submitted in a separate file through PIEE. 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.

Proposals: ALL SUBMISSIONS TO THIS PROPOSAL ANNOUNCEMENT SHALL BE SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY. No paper copies, CD-ROMs or facsimile submissions will be accepted. Electronic Proposal Submission is required through the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation Module https://piee.eb.mil/xhtml/unauth/home/login.xhtmlm.

Instructions on how to create a vendor account will be posted to sam.gov and can be located at: https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/dpc/ce/cap/docs/piee/PIEE_Solicitation_Module_Vendor_Access_I nstructions.pdf
Instructions on how to submit an offer will be posted to sam.gov and can be located at: https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf

NOTE: Do NOT enter Privacy Act Data (Personal Identification Information (PII)) in the File Description.)

Upload Completion & Deadline: Interested parties shall submit responses no later than the date specified on the solicitation document. The time & date of proposal receipt will be the upload completion delivery time & date recorded within PIEE Solicitation Module site. Do not assume that electronic submission will occur instantaneously. Large files (e.g. 10MB or more) will take some time to upload. 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. Offerors are encouraged to keep a copy of the upload confirmation for their record. As noted above, offerors will not receive a confirmation email but instead will receive upload confirmation in the browser following successful upload. Email the upload confirmation to Joel Huberman at Joel.Hubmeran@usace.army.mil.

Submissions after the deadline will be considered late and will be processed in accordance with FAR 15.208.

Electronic Files: Submission shall be in a searchable Adobe PDF format.

File Naming Convention: To ensure your submission is received and processed appropriately, it is important that interested parties CAREFULLY ensure their electronic files adhere to the following naming convention:

- W912QR26A008-FIRMNAME -VOLUME I
- W912QR26A008-FIRMNAME -VOLUME II

Each file name shall begin with the solicitation number followed by the firm's name and a brief file description. Please see examples above

3. **Proposal Evaluation Process**

3.1 A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) comprised of representatives of the Corps of Engineers, User/Customer, and other required personnel will evaluate the proposals. Offerors are advised that the technical evaluation and rating of proposals will be conducted in strict confidence. 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 a Best Value Trade-Off.

3.2 The evaluation process for Phase I essentially consists of two parts: (1) proposal compliance review and responsibility determination; and (2) past performance/technical evaluation.

3.2.1 Proposal Compliance/Responsibility Review: This is an initial review to ensure that all required forms and certifications are complete, and that the offeror is financially capable of sustaining performance under the

contract and is able to obtain the required level of performance and payment bonds from an acceptable surety.

3.2.2 Past Performance/Technical Evaluation: The SSEB will evaluate and rate the proposals against the RFP requirements.

Factor I – Past Performance will be rated based on overall confidence in performance (using Table 2, below), with the final confidence assessment rating based on the extent of recent, relevant past experience (using Table I, below), and the quality of the offeror's performance on that experience.

Factor II – Technical Approach will be rated using an adjectival-based system (using Table 3, below). The Contracting Officer / Source Selection Authority will select up to a target of ten (10) most highly qualified offerors to continue on to Phase II. **Phase I factors will not carry forward into Phase II for inclusion in the best value trade-off analysis.**

4. **Proposal Information and Related Evaluation Factors**

4.1.1 Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the factors below, listed in relative order of importance. Offerors are reminded to include their best technical approach in their initial offer and not to automatically assume that they will have an opportunity to participate in discussions or be asked to submit a revised offer. The Government may make award of a conforming proposal without discussions, if deemed to be within the best interest of the Government.

4.2	Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance	1st
•	Prime Contractor	Equal to A/E
•	A/E Designer of Record Equal to Prime	
4.3	Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach	2nd
4.4	Volume II – Pro Forma Information	
Tab A	Standard Form 1442	Not Rated
Tab B	Joint Venture Agreements	Not Rated
Tab C	Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and Proof of Financial Ability	Not Rated
Tab D	Pre-Award Information	Not Rated

4.5 Ratings:

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

Table 1

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Table 2

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

Table 3

Technical Assessment Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and 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.

4.6 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. Adverse Past Performance. Past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating from sources where the information is from other than formal rating systems such as "PPIRS" or "FAPIIS."

9. Risk. As it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses 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: Past Performance**

5.1 **Submission Requirements:**

Prime Contractor

5.1.1 Provide descriptions of up to (3) three projects substantially complete or completed by the prime contractor within the last 5 years (from the solicitation issue date) that are similar in size and scope. Projects completed more than 5 years before issue of solicitation date may be considered for evaluation purposes but may lessen the overall relevancy rating for that project. Projects are considered substantially complete if enough work has been performed such that it demonstrates the ability to successfully complete all phases of the project. An Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract may be submitted only if a single task order could be considered similar to this project. Task orders may not be combined in order for the project to be considered similar.

5.1.2 Projects considered similar in size shall be a minimum of 1,500 square feet. This square footage may be a combination of multiple facilities, provided all work was completed under a single contract action.

5.1.3 Projects considered similar in scope shall be horizontal or vertical new construction or renovation D/B or D/B/B projects and must demonstrate work covering multi-engineering disciplines (architectural, mechanical, structural, civil, and/or electrical) to be considered similar. Additionally, at least one project shall demonstrate renovation or new construction. Similar projects include but are not limited to new building construction, building renovation, all types of building/facilities demolition, building debris type removal, structural repairs, site work, utility installation/replacement, paving, civil works (flood damage reduction, such as channel improvements, bank stabilization, levees, and floodwalls), industrial repairs, equipment upgrades, landscaping, geotechnical work, instrumentation, architectural, security systems, lead paint, PCB, HTRW, and asbestos abatement and design associated with all of the various aforementioned tasks.

If D/B/B projects are submitted, please note they may be considered less relevant than D/B projects given the lesser degree of overall complexity of D/B/B projects.

5.1.4 The prime contractor must have self-performed at least 20% of the cost of the contract, and this percentage of work shall consist of direct contract labor (including testing and layout personnel), exclusive of material, equipment, or subcontractors to be considered similar.

NOTE: Each task order may require specific individual professional licenses or trade licenses, these do not have to be divulged for this solicitation but will be required per task order solicitation.

5.1.5 Additional consideration may be given for the following:

- Experience with USACE Design/Build Criteria (i.e., AT/FP, UFC, Specs Intact.)
- Previous successful working relationships between the Designer of Record (DOR) and Prime Contractor for this solicitation.

5.1.6 The following information shall be provided for each project:

a) Project Title, Contract Number, and Location.

b) Current percentage of construction complete and when it was or will be completed. If project is not yet complete, provide a description of work remaining to be completed.

c) Scope of the project, to include purpose/use of facility.

d) Size of the project; differentiate square footage of new construction versus renovation (if the project

includes both).

e) Type and percentage of work that was self-performed.

f) Whether the project was Design/Build (include the name of the Designer of Record (DOR)) or Design/Build/Build.

g) Customer Primary Point of Contact and alternate POC (name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current and correct phone number, and current and correct email address)

NOTE: Each project description shall not exceed one (1) page (front and back) including all narratives and pictures. Any information provided beyond the one (1) page (front and back) limit for the project description will not be considered.

5.1.7 For this factor, also include any ratings, letters, awards, etc. which support past performance on these projects. Any of this information that is submitted shall clearly identify to which of the submitted projects it pertains. A sample Past Performance Questionnaire is attached for your convenience. If used, the Past Performance Questionnaire must be submitted by the offeror with the proposal submission and NOT sent directly to the agency from the reference.

A-E Designer of Record

5.1.8 Provide descriptions of up to three (3) projects that have been constructed (i.e., construction is substantially complete) within the last five (5) years (from the solicitation issue date) that are similar in size and scope (see paragraphs 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 above). In order to be considered similar, the proposed A-E firm must have been the DOR on the submitted project. The listed design firm must be used for the MATOC contract awarded under this solicitation. No deviations will be permitted unless approved by the Contracting Officer. Identification of more than one (1) design firm will result in an evaluation based on the least qualified firm. Indicate any previous working relationship with the prime contractor. Additional consideration will be given for those projects demonstrating items in paragraph 5.1.5.

NOTE: For purposes of evaluating Past Performance, the Prime Contractor is defined as the contractor identified in Block 14 of the Standard Form 1442. Projects performed by contractors other than the offeror, including, but not limited to, teaming partners, subcontractors, sister or parent companies, and affiliates will not be evaluated for past performance, unless those other contractors are part of a joint venture offeror as demonstrated by a signed joint venture agreement, or unless those other contractors are affiliates of the offeror as defined in accordance with 13 CFR 12.103 and with proof of affiliation provided with the offer. If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, or the offeror listed in Block 14 is a joint venture (JV), then a signed joint venture agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the offeror shall be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as a legal entity separate from the individual joint venture members. However, each party of the Joint Venture must submit their own Unique Entity Identifier number with the JV proposal. If the offeror represents the combining of two or more companies as a joint venture for the purpose of this RFP, each company in the joint venture may submit project examples, but the total submitted by the joint venture will not exceed three (3).

Relevant past performance information provided for affiliates of small business offerors will be considered. Affiliates (as defined by FAR 2.101) means associated business concerns or individuals if, directly or indirectly either one controls or can control the other; or third-party controls or can control both. Affiliation will be determined in accordance with 13 CFR 121.103. In determining whether affiliation exists, the Government will consider the totality of the circumstances and may find affiliation even though no single factor is sufficient to constitute affiliation. If an offeror is submitting the past performance of an affiliate, the offeror must submit proof of affiliation pursuant to 13 CFR 121.103.

5.2. **Evaluation Criteria:**

5.2.1 For both the Prime and DOR, the SSEB will first evaluate the relevancy of recent past performance identified in the proposal in response to paragraph 5.1 above. By using the criteria identified above, the

SSEB will determine how relevant a past project is when compared to the scope, size, and magnitude of effort and complexities of the solicited project. A relevancy rating will be assigned to each submitted project using the Past Performance Relevancy Ratings table above.

5.2.2 For both the Prime and DOR, the SSEB will next review how well the offeror performed on those projects. The Government reserves the right to check any or all cited references to verify supplied information and to assess owner satisfaction. The Government also reserves the right to not contact the provided references. In addition to the information submitted by the offeror, the Government reserves the right to review any other sources of relevant information for evaluating past performance, including projects other than those submitted by the offeror. The Government will, at a minimum, review past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), including Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all CAGE/Unique Entity Identifier numbers. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved from inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

5.2.3 The SSEB will review all past performance information collected for both the Prime and DOR. The SSEB will determine the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate this information into the performance confidence assessment. The SSEB will assign a final, overall Performance Confidence rating, using the ratings in the Performance Confidence Assessment table above, based on the SSEB's assessment of (1) the degree of the offeror's recent, relevant experience, and (2) how well the offeror performed that experience.

NOTE: The Past Performance of both the Prime and A/E DOR will be weighted equally in the establishment of the overall Performance Confidence rating.

6. **Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach**

6.1 **Submission Requirements:**

6.1.1 Provide a narrative that describes the offeror's Design/Build team and intended technical approach to executing the Design/Build contract per the detailed requirements herein. Clearly but concisely describe the offeror's Design/Build team, and how members of the team will work collaboratively to ensure timely, quality completion of the project. The Technical Approach narrative shall address the information described in paragraphs 6.1.2 – 6.1.5 below.

6.1.2 Organization: Describe the firms that compose the offeror's Design/Build team, their resources and how their resources will be utilized, their roles and responsibilities, and any contractual arrangements that have been established. Present a matrix of responsibilities for each firm in executing the key design and construction activities for each major feature of the effort. Describe the proposed management structure for the Design/Build team, explaining how the design and construction process will be managed and the authorities and the delegations of authority within the Design/Build team.

6.1.3 Collaborative Approach for Design/Build: Describe interactions and communications within the Design/Build team and with the Corps of Engineers during the design. Describe the role of the construction team members during design. Describe the role and interaction of the design team with the construction team during construction, addressing, at a minimum:

- design during construction, including control and approval of revisions to the accepted design;
- requests for information;
- shop drawing and submittal reviews and approvals;
- progress meetings;
- site visits, if any;
- contract completion, closeout, as-built and completion documentation

6.1.4 Planning and Scheduling: Describe the offeror's schedule control capabilities and any systems the offeror will use to plan design and construction activities. Explain how the schedule will be used to manage design and construction. Discuss internal procedures for handling delays to minimize time growth or "schedule creep," include any consideration of fast-tracking design and construction. Discuss how you plan to streamline construction, manage labor, and handle any other resource constraints to reduce cost and achieve task order completion within the period of performance.

6.1.5 Quality Control: Describe the Design/Build team's quality control approach, corporate systems, and capabilities to maintain quality control of the design and construction.

Describe the proposed quality control organization, including the proposed staffing plan.

Provide specific information on how you will manage design quality control and track design evolution and changes during design to meet the schedule and to facilitate Government reviews.

Provide information on how you will handle internal and external requests for information, shop drawings, submittal reviews, progress meetings, site visits, contract completion, closeout, as-built, and completion documentation.

In addition to the required DOR roles specified within the RFP for maintaining integrity of the design, describe any other DOR involvement in the quality control process, if any. There is no need to submit a quality control plan as the successful offeror will provide that after award. Describe the offeror's system to control and track revisions to the design.

NOTE: There is a page 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 Technical Approach narrative.

6.2 **Evaluation Criteria:**

6.2.1 The Government will evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and any deficiencies in the technical approach. The Government will evaluate the firm’s understanding of the design/build process (and the requirements described in the Division 01 requirements of the Solicitation) and how well it has demonstrated its ability to successfully execute the project. Some additional specific evaluation considerations are listed below. This list is not all-inclusive.

6.2.2 Organization: The Government will evaluate clarity and strength of the overall organization, the structure and staffing to execute the entire scope of work.

6.2.3 Collaborative Approach for Design/Build: The Government will evaluate the integration of the design and construction firms during design and construction. Proposals demonstrating that construction personnel will be actively involved in the design process may be viewed more favorably by the SSEB. The Government will evaluate the offeror’s understanding of the design process and the roles of the designers of record and the Government reviewers. The Government will evaluate the role of the designer in maintaining design integrity throughout the process, including its key roles during construction.

6.2.4 Planning and Scheduling: The Government will evaluate the offeror’s understanding of and ability to manage an integrated fast track Design/Build schedule. Offerors that propose effective methods to streamline construction, minimize delays, and to manage labor and other resource constraints may be viewed more favorably by the SSEB.

6.2.5 Quality Control: The Government will evaluate the offeror’s capabilities and understanding of the contractually required quality control processes for both design and construction. The Government places value upon continued participation by the DORs during the construction quality control process. The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the staffing plan to cover all required tasks and responsibilities. The Government will evaluate the strength of the offeror’s proposed system to control and track revisions to the design.

7. **Volume II – Price and Pro Forma Information**

NOTE: Phase I does NOT involve pricing submission.

7.1 **Tab A: Standard Form 1442**.

7.1.1 Submission Requirements:
The offeror shall complete and submit Standard Form 1442.

7.1.2 Evaluation Criteria:
The Standard Form 1442 will not be rated. The form will be reviewed to determine if required information is provided, amendments are acknowledged, and the offer signed.

7.2 **Tab B: Joint Venture and Mentor-Protégé Agreements**

7.2.1 Submission Requirements:
If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, or the offeror listed in Block 14 is a joint venture (JV), then a signed JV agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the offeror shall be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as a legal entity separate from the individual joint venture members. However, each member of the JV must submit its own Unique Entity Identifier (formally DUNS number) with the proposal.

Small business offerors (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone, SDVOSB) submitting a proposal as a JV or Mentor-Protégé shall submit evidence from the offeror's SBA Servicing Agency that the offeror has notified and discussed the proposed joint venture for this specific project with the appropriate SBA Representative or Business Opportunity Specialist. Joint Venture agreements and approved 8(a) Mentor-Protégé agreements must be submitted with the proposal.

7.2.2 Evaluation Criteria:
This information will not be rated, but Joint Venture Agreements and Mentor-Protégé agreements must comply with the relevant regulations in Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations in order for an offeror to be eligible for any small business-related price preference.

7.3 **Tab C: Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding & Proof of Financial Ability**

7.3.1 Submission Requirements:

A. Financial Capability. Submit Proof of Financial Ability (Most recent financial statement covering assets and liabilities). Include the name, address and telephone number of the offeror's banking institution.

B. Bonding Capability. Submit information showing offeror's ability to be bonded for projects up to the task order limit of the awarded contract. Include the name, address and telephone number of the firm's bonding company, which must be on the approved Treasury list available at https://fiscal.treasury.gov/surety-bonds/list-certified-companies.html. Bonding information shall include the offerors current single and aggregate performance and payment bond limits.

7.3.2 Evaluation Criteria:
This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated. See FAR Part 28 for information related to bonds.

If the offeror is a joint venture, submit this information for all joint venture members.

7.4 **Tab D: Pre-Award Information**

7.4.1 Submission Requirements:

A. The offeror shall submit one completed copy of Section 00 45 00, Representations and Certification.

B. The offeror shall submit the following information:

a) Number of years the firm has been in business

b) Name, address and telephone numbers of two credit/trade references

c) A list of present commitments, including the dollar value

~~C. The offeror shall submit the name, address, and Unique Entity Identifier for any and all key subcontractors identified in the proposal.~~

7.4.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated.

Prime Past Performance Project Detail Sheet

Your firm's name _____

Name of Project/Location/Square Footage _____

_____

General Scope of Project

_____

_____

_____

Your role (prime, joint venture, subcontractor) and work your company self-performed

_____

_____

_____

Percentage of Work completed by Prime Contractor Personnel: _____%

Construction Cost: _____

At Award: $_____ Reason for the cost growth: _____

Final Cost $_____

Award Date: _____

Scheduled Completion: _____ Reason for the time growth: _____

Actual Completion: _____

Extent and type of work you subcontracted out

_____

_____

Owner's Point of Contact (POC) for reference (name and company and telephone number)

_____

A-E DESIGNER OF RECORD DESIGN FIRM EXPERIENCE

Name of your firm _____

Project Name/Location

_____

General Scope of Project

_____

_____

Your role (prime, joint venture, subcontractor) and the work your firm self-performed

_____

_____

_____

Description of work subcontracted to others

_____

_____

Design Fee: $_____ Construction cost of work designed $_____

Award Date: _____ Completion: _____

Your performance evaluation by Owner

_____

_____

Your performance evaluation by Prime for this project

_____

_____

Owner's POC for reference (name and company and telephone number)

_____

Prime contractor's POC for reference (name and company and telephone number)

_____

Past Working History/Relationship with Prime (including joint ventures and partnering experience)

_____

_____

NAVFAC/USACE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Form PPQ-0)

CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)

1. Contractor Information
Firm Name: CAGE Code:
Address: Unique Entity Identifier:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
Point of Contact: Contact Phone Number:

2. Work Performed as: ☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Sub Contractor ☐ Joint Venture ☐ Other (Explain)
Percent of project work performed:
If subcontractor, who was the prime (Name/Phone #):

3. Contract Information
Contract Number:
Delivery/Task Order Number (if applicable):
Contract Type: ☐ Firm Fixed Price ☐ Cost Reimbursement ☐ Other (Please specify):
Contract Title:
Contract Location:

Award Date (mm/dd/yy):
Contract Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):
Actual Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):
Explain Differences:

Original Contract Price (Award Amount):
Final Contract Price (*to include all modifications, if applicable*): Explain Differences:

4. Project Description:
Complexity of Work ☐ High ☐ Med ☐ Routine
How is this project relevant to project of submission? (*Please provide details such as similar equipment, requirements, conditions, etc.*)

CLIENT INFORMATION (Client to complete Blocks 5-8)

5. Client Information
Name:
Title:
Phone Number:
Email Address:

6. Describe the client's role in the project:

7. Date Questionnaire was completed (mm/dd/yy)**:**

8. Client's Signature:

NOTE: NAVFAC/USACE REQUESTS THAT THE CLIENT COMPLETES THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUBMITS DIRECTLY BACK TO THE OFFEROR. THE OFFEROR WILL SUBMIT THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO USACE WITH THEIR PROPOSAL, AND MAY DUPLICATE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FUTURE SUBMISSION ON USACE SOLICITATIONS. CLIENTS ARE

HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONNAIRES DIRECTLY TO THE OFFEROR. HOWEVER, QUESTIONNAIRES MAY BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO USACE. PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFEROR FOR USACE POC INFORMATION. THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO VERIFY ANY AND ALL INFORMATION ON THIS FORM.

ADJECTIVE RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS TO BE USED TO BEST REFLECT YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE

RATING	DEFINITION	NOTE
(E) Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.	An Exceptional rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed multiple significant events that were of benefit to the Government/Owner. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
(VG) Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub- element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	A Very Good rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed a significant event that was a benefit to the Government/Owner. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.
(S) Satisfactory	Performance meets minimum contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	A Satisfactory rating is appropriate when there were only minor problems, or major problems that the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. Per DOD policy, a fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.
(M) Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	A Marginal is appropriate when a significant event occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming which impacted the Government/Owner.
(U) Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	An Unsatisfactory rating is appropriate when multiple significant events occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming and which impacted the Government/Owner. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating.
(N) Not Applicable	No information or did not apply to your contract	Rating will be neither positive nor negative.

TO BE COMPLETED BY CLIENT

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.

1. QUALITY:						
a) Quality of technical data/report preparation efforts	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements (without adverse effect on performance)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
2. SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:						
a) Compliance with contract delivery/completion schedules including any significant intermediate milestones. *(If liquidated damages were assessed or the schedule was not met, please address below)*	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Rate the contractor's use of available resources to accomplish tasks identified in the contract	E	VG	S	M	U	N
3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:						
a) To what extent were the end users satisfied with the project?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Contractor was reasonable and cooperative in dealing with your staff (including the ability to successfully resolve disagreements/disputes; responsiveness to administrative reports, businesslike and communication)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) To what extent was the contractor cooperative, businesslike, and concerned with the interests of the customer?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Overall customer satisfaction	E	VG	S	M	U	N
4. MANAGEMENT/ PERSONNEL/LABOR						
a) Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors, suppliers, materials, and/or labor force?	E	VG	S	M	U	N
b) Ability to hire, apply, and retain a qualified workforce to this effort	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) Government Property Control	E	VG	S	M	U	N
d) Knowledge/expertise demonstrated by contractor personnel	E	VG	S	M	U	N
e) Utilization of Small Business concerns	E	VG	S	M	U	N
f) Ability to simultaneously manage multiple projects with multiple disciplines	E	VG	S	M	U	N
g) Ability to assimilate and incorporate changes in requirements and/or priority, including planning, execution and response to Government changes	E	VG	S	M	U	N
h) Effectiveness of overall management (including ability to effectively lead, manage and control the program)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
5. COST/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT						
a) Ability to meet the terms and conditions within the contractually agreed price(s)?	E	VG	S	M	U	N

b) Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client	E VG S M U N
c) If this is/was a Government cost type contract, please rate the Contractor's timeliness and accuracy in submitting monthly invoices with appropriate back- up documentation, monthly status reports/budget variance reports, compliance with established budgets and avoidance of significant and/or unexplained variances (under runs or overruns)	E VG S M U N
d) Is the Contractor's accounting system adequate for management and tracking of costs? *If no, please explain in Remarks section.*	Yes No
e) If this is/was a Government contract, has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending terminations? *Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.*	Yes No
f) Have there been any indications that the contractor has had any financial problems? *If yes, please explain below.*	Yes No
6. SAFETY/SECURITY	
a) To what extent was the contractor able to maintain an environment of safety, adhere to its approved safety plan, and respond to safety issues? (Includes: following the users rules, regulations, and requirements regarding housekeeping, safety, correction of noted deficiencies, etc.)	E VG S M U N
b) Contractor complied with all security requirements for the project and personnel security requirements.	E VG S M U N
7. GENERAL	
a) Ability to successfully respond to emergency and/or surge situations (including notifying COR, PM or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent contractual issues).	E VG S M U N
b) Compliance with contractual terms/provisions *(explain if specific issues)*	E VG S M U N
c) Would you hire or work with this firm again? *(If no, please explain below)*	Yes No
d) In summary, provide an overall rating for the work performed by this contractor.	E VG S M U N

Please provide responses to the questions above (*if applicable*) and/or additional remarks. Furthermore, please provide a brief narrative addressing specific strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, or other comments which may assist our office in evaluating performance risk *(please attach additional pages if necessary)***:**

SECTION 00 22 16

PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL AND EVALUATION OF OFFERS FOR PHASE II

1. Overview

1.1 The intent of this solicitation is to select target ten (10) contractors for a 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.

1.3 This sample project is for Caesar Creek Visitor Center HVAC Replacement Waynesville, OH. The cost range 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 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
  - o Sub-factor 1 – Design Drawings
  - o Sub-factor 2 – Design Narrative
- Volume I – Factor II: Management Approach
  - o Sub-factor 1 – Schedule Narrative
  - o Sub-factor 2 – Management Plan

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. **Proposal Evaluation Process**

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 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.

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.

3.2.4 Cost/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 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 and sub-factors below, listed in relative order of importance. **All technical evaluation factors and sub-factors, other than cost or price, when combined, are approximately equal to cost or price.** Offerors are reminded to include their best technical approach in their initial offer and not to automatically assume that they will have an opportunity to participate in discussions or be asked to submit a revised offer. The Government may make award of a conforming proposal without discussions, if deemed to be within the best interest of the Government.

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

4.5 Ratings:

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

Technical Assessment Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and 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.

4.6 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. Adverse Past Performance. Past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation.

9. Risk. As it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses 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 1 – Design Drawings
Provide a clear and concise narrative describing this project, while specifically addressing the following:

- Coordination of design and construction with existing HVAC and Electrical Systems.
- Coordination of design and construction to ensure minimal impact to an occupied facility (egress/ingress to main entrance, ADA compliance, lay down areas, fire lane access, etc)

5.1.2 Sub-factor 2 – Design Narrative

Provide a clear and concise narrative describing the project, while specifically addressing the following:

- Architectural including Roofing System
- Mechanical
- Structural
- Site Work / Utility Connections & Routing
- ASHRAE / EPACT

- AT/FP

  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 Design/Technical Factor. All information must be clearly legible. Any information that is not clearly legible may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information.

5.2 Evaluation Criteria:

5.2.1 Sub-factor 1 – Design

1. Coordination with Existing HVAC and Electrical Systems

a. Thoroughness: How comprehensively does the proposal address integration with existing HVAC and electrical systems?

b. Feasibility: Are the proposed design and construction methods practical and technically feasible in relation to existing systems?

c. Risk Mitigation: Does the narrative identify potential conflicts or challenges with HVAC and electrical systems and provide clear mitigation strategies?

d. Compliance: Are all applicable codes and standards (e.g., electrical safety, ventilation requirements) considered and incorporated?

2. Minimizing Impact on Occupied Facility

a. Egress/Ingress Management: How effectively does the design ensure safe and unobstructed access to main entrances and emergency exits?

b. ADA Compliance: Does the proposal explicitly address maintaining or enhancing accessibility during construction?

c. Operational Continuity: Are construction phases planned to minimize disruption to occupants, including noise, dust, and access?

d. Site Logistics: Are laydown areas and fire lanes clearly identified, preserved, or temporarily rerouted with minimal impact on facility operations and safety?

3. Clarity and Legibility of Narrative

a. Organization: Is the narrative well-organized, with clear headings and logical flow addressing all required points?

b. Conciseness: Is the information presented concisely within the page limits without sacrificing essential detail?

c. Visual Aids: Where applicable, are diagrams or tables used effectively to enhance understanding?

d. Legibility: Is the font size at least 11pt, margins at least 0.5 inches, and text clearly readable throughout the document?

5.2.2 Sub-factor 2 – Design Narrative:

The Design Narrative will be evaluated for completeness and thoroughness, by including the building features of the RFP as outlined in the Statement of Work. Proposals that demonstrate a complete understanding of the project requirements in the Statement of Work, may receive additional consideration.

*Proposals SHALL address each bullet point for Sub-Factor 1 – Design and Sub-Factor 2 – Design Narrative or the proposal will be considered deficient and rated Unacceptable.

6. **Volume I – Factor II: Management Approach**

6.1 Submission Requirements:

6.1.1 Sub-factor 1 – Schedule Narrative

Based on the project budget and scope, provide a schedule narrative describing the construction process for successful completion of the project (Design, Construction, Commissioning and Close-Out) within the duration shown in FAR 52.211-10. Offerors may propose a shorter duration for completion, but Government review times shall not be shortened. The Schedule Narrative shall address at a minimum the major construction milestones and tasks indicated below:

- Design Phase / Packages
- Pre-Construction Submittals and Review
- Long Lead Items
- Commissioning with critical submittals
- Red Zone Meeting
- As-Builts
- Closeout

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 Design Narrative sub-factor.

6.1.2 Sub-factor 2 – Management Plan

Provide a management plan narrative for the project that describes how your labor, resources, designers, subcontractors, and material suppliers will be managed, supervised, coordinated, and used to ensure successful completion of the project. Additionally, the Management Plan shall address the following information:

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

- Describe your process for managing, coordinating, and tracking changes that arise during the design and construction phases.

- Provide an organizational chart for this project showing home office support, on-site management, and the responsible chain of command. Joint venture offerors must show the respective areas of responsibility for each partner. Clearly delineate on-site from off-site personnel on the organizational chart.

NOTE: There is a page 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 Management Plan sub-factor. All information must be clearly legible. Any information that is not clearly legible may result in a lower rating if the evaluators cannot readily find the appropriate information.

*Proposals SHALL address each bullet point for Sub-Factor 1 – Schedule Narrative and Sub-Factor 2 – Management Plan or the proposal will be considered deficient and rated unacceptable.

6.2 <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u>

6.2.1 Sub-factor 1 – Schedule Narrative

The narrative will be evaluated based on the understanding of events identified in paragraph 6.1.1 above and the offeror's capability to complete the schedule within the contract duration. Narratives that demonstrate a clear understanding of the schedule impacts of the major milestones and tasks and provide a thorough approach for

successfully completing the contract within the contract duration may be rated more favorably by the SSEB.
NOTE: The SSEB will evaluate the offeror's schedule narrative using calendar days, not dates.

6.2.2 Sub-factor 2 – Management Plan

Plans will be evaluated based on the level of understanding of the work and the involvement the contractor will have in the management, oversight, control, and coordination of the work performed during construction of the project.

Plans will also be evaluated based on the level of understanding of project risks and the approach for minimizing these risks. The offeror's organizational chart will be evaluated based on the clarity, adequacy, capabilities and strengths for managing a successful project. Plans that demonstrate a clear understanding of the project requirements and provide a thorough approach for successfully managing the project may be rated more favorably by the SSEB.

7. **Volume II – Price and Pro Forma Information** (Submit in a separate electronic file).

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

7.1.1 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.

7.1.2 Evaluation Criteria:
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.