What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 1 – Technical Approach

When reviewing proposals for Factor 1, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Visitor Center Ceiling (Historic Element)

- Does the proposal clearly describe the technical approach to removing, cataloging, and reinstalling the historic ceiling?
- Is the process for integrating new elements thoughtful and well-coordinated?

2. Server Relocation Strategy

- Does the proposal explain a phasing approach for relocating servers?
- Will Park operations and network connections be maintained during construction?

3. Winter Work Sequencing

- Does the proposal address how outdoor work will be sequenced during winter months in Grand County, Colorado?
- Is there a plan for coordinating temporary facilities (offices and visitor center) to maximize the period of performance?

4. Risk Analysis

- Has the contractor identified critical issues, potential problems, and areas of concern?
- Are recommended solutions and strategies provided for managing risks such as weather, unforeseen site conditions, material lead times, and workforce availability?

5. Overall Approach

- Is the technical approach realistic, appropriate, and efficient?
- Does it comply with contract requirements and demonstrate logical sequencing and scope understanding?
- Does the approach present a lower level of risk?

Administrative reminder: The Technical Approach narrative is limited to 7 pages; additional pages will not be evaluated. Pictures count toward the page limit.

What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 2 – Key Personnel Experience

When reviewing proposals for Factor 2, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Key Personnel Identification & Qualifications

- Are resumes provided for all required roles (Project Manager, Superintendent, On-site Quality Control Specialist, On-site Safety Specialist, Historic Preservation Treatment Specialist)?
- Are all personnel proposed in accordance with Section H and substitution requirements?

2. Relevant Project Experience

- Does the narrative clearly identify each Key Personnel's experience on the projects submitted in the Project Experience factor?
- Are their roles on those projects explicitly stated?
- Is additional relevant project experience described?

3. References

- Are references (name, phone, and/or email) provided for each Key Personnel?

4. Capability & Technical Knowledge

- Does each Key Personnel demonstrate capability in the same or similar positions on successful, relevant projects of similar scope and magnitude?
- Do they possess the technical knowledge and skills required for this solicitation?

5. Problem Solving & Communication

- Is there evidence of effective problem solving, communication, coordination, and organization?

6. Construction Experience with Federal/State Requirements

- Does the Key Personnel have construction experience implementing Federal or State published project management requirements (e.g., US Army Corps of Engineers, National Park Service, US Forest Service)?

7. Overall Risk

- Does the Key Personnel's experience present a lower level of risk for successful project delivery?

What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 3 – Project Experience

When reviewing proposals for Factor 3, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Relevant Project Experience

- Has the contractor submitted up to 4 relevant projects completed in the last 7 years, using the required Project Experience Form?
- Are the projects similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to this solicitation?

2. Prime Contractor Rehabilitation Experience

- Does the contractor have experience renovating historic buildings of similar size and use (administrative and public)?
- Is there evidence of technical knowledge and skills required for this solicitation?
- If the contractor lacks this experience, is it explicitly stated?

3. Carpentry Key Subcontractor Rehabilitation Experience

- Does the carpentry contractor (or the prime, if self-performing) have experience renovating historic buildings of similar size and use?
- Is there demonstrated experience with construction projects similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity, including technical skills such as window and door replacements?
- If the prime contractor is self-performing, is this clearly stated?

4. Experience in Remote Locations

- Does the contractor have experience with projects in remote locations?
- If not, is this explicitly stated?

5. Technical Knowledge & Skill

- Does the project experience demonstrate the technical knowledge and skill needed to meet or exceed the requirements for this solicitation?

6. Management & Problem Solving

- Is there evidence of effective management, problem solving, communication, coordination, and organization?

7. Weight for NPS Projects

- Are any of the relevant projects completed for the National Park Service? (These will be given more weight.)

8. Overall Risk

- Does the contractor's project experience present a lower level of risk for successful project delivery?

What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 4 – Management Approach & Project Team

When reviewing proposals for Factor 4, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Organizational Chart

- Is an organizational chart provided that clearly identifies the project team, major subcontractors, and key personnel?
- Are specific roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority shown?

2. Management Practices

- Does the narrative describe sound management practices and business processes?
- Is there evidence of effective cost and quality control?

3. Capacity & Resources

- Does the firm demonstrate capabilities and assets available for this project?
- Is there clear capacity to perform this work concurrently with ongoing projects?
- Are resources and equipment to be used for this project described?

4. Project Team Coordination & Experience

- Is prior project experience working with the proposed team (Key Personnel and Key Trade Subcontractors) described?
- If no prior experience with subcontractors, is this explicitly stated?
- Does the proposal explain how the project team will enhance coordination and ensure a successful outcome?
- Are all required Key Trade Subcontractors (carpentry, electrical, mechanical, plumbing, concrete) included?

5. Letter of Commitment

- Is a signed letter of commitment from each Key Trade Subcontractor included, indicating their role, resources, and intent to enter into a subcontract?

6. Team Structure & Communication

- Does the management approach demonstrate clear corporate and project team commitment, hierarchy, lines of communication, roles, responsibilities, and relationships?

7. Subcontractor Selection

- Apart from the required Key Trade Subcontractors, are subcontractors selected for the remainder of the Divisions of work? (Teams with more complete selection will be more favorably rated.)

8. Overall Risk

- Does the management approach and project team present a lower level of risk for successful project delivery?

Administrative reminder: The Management Approach & Project Team narrative is limited to 5 pages; additional pages will not be evaluated. Pictures count toward the page limit.

What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 5 – Schedule

When reviewing proposals for Factor 5, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Construction Schedule

- Does the proposed construction schedule show completion no later than May 1, 2028?
- Is the schedule based on a Notice to Proceed date of November 1, 2026?

2. Baseline Schedule Review Checklist

- Is the schedule in accordance with the Baseline Schedule Review Checklist included in Section J?

3. Schedule Narrative

- Does the narrative explain the schedule logic and identify critical path activities?
- Are procurement lead-times, subcontractor/trade coordination, on-site storage and staging, resource and time constraints accounted for?

4. Critical Path & Sequencing

- Does the schedule document a clear critical path and logical sequencing of activities?

5. Risk Mitigation

- Does the schedule and narrative demonstrate risk mitigation strategies to ensure successful completion within the required period of performance?

6. Overall Risk

- Does the schedule present a lower level of risk for timely and successful project delivery?

What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 6 – Small Business Participation

When reviewing proposals for Factor 6, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Identification of Small Business Firms

- Are U.S. small business firms (as defined in FAR Part 19) specifically identified in the proposal?

2. Substantive Commitment

- Does the proposal demonstrate substantive commitment to small business firms (e.g., letters of commitment, joint ventures, mentor/protégé agreements, or other binding commitments)?

3. Type and Variety of Work

- Is the type and variety of work to be performed by small business firms clearly identified?

4. Participation Value

- What is the extent of participation of small business prime Offerors and small business Subcontractors in terms of the total contract value?

5. Supporting Documentation

- Does the Offeror provide detailed explanations and documentation supporting the proposed quantitative participation?

6. Compliance with FAR Requirements

- Has the Offeror complied with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns?
- Has the Offeror complied with FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (when applicable)?

7. Best Value

- Does the proposal represent the best value in terms of Small Business Participation?

8. Small Business Prime Offerors

- If the Offeror is a small business prime, will they receive maximum credit for this evaluation factor (and do they need to submit supporting documentation)?

Small business prime offerors receive maximum credit for this factor and do not need to submit supporting documentation; other-than-small offerors must submit documentation addressing Section M criteria.

What Evaluators Will Ask for Factor 7 – Past Performance

When reviewing proposals for Factor 7, evaluators will answer questions such as:

1. Past Performance Information

- Has the offeror submitted Past Performance information for the same projects listed under Project Experience (Factor 3), using the required Past Performance Questionnaire or a PPIRS evaluation report?
- Is past performance information provided for both the offeror's firm and proposed subcontractors performing key trades and construction activities (only if relevant to the work they will perform)?

2. Questionnaire Submittal Process

- Did the offeror complete Sections A and B of the Past Performance Questionnaire and forward it to a client reference who was substantially involved with the project?
- Did the offeror submit copies of the questionnaire sent to references, including their point of contact information?

3. Narrative Disclosure

- Has the offeror submitted a narrative disclosing any instances of past performance that may be considered less than fully satisfactory?
- Are pertinent facts, circumstances, and remedial actions described for any deficiencies?

4. Relevancy and Quality

- Does the past performance demonstrate higher levels of success and quality on projects similar in scope and magnitude to this solicitation?
- Are projects more relevant to the requirements of this solicitation given more weight in the overall past performance rating?
- Are Project Experience ratings (Factor 3) considered in determining relevancy?

5. Federal, Public, and Private Contracts

- Is past performance on contracts with the Federal Government, other public agencies, or private organizations considered?

6. No Relevant Past Performance

- If the offeror has no past performance on similar work relevant to this solicitation, will they be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably?

7. Clarification and Adverse Information

- Will exchanges occur between the Government and offerors to clarify the relevance of past performance information or address adverse past performance information not yet responded to?

8. Overall Risk

- Does the past performance present a lower level of risk for successful project delivery?

The Government may use sources other than submitted references and may not contact all references during evaluation.