Section M – Evaluation Factors for Awards

M-1 Source Selection Methodology: This acquisition will utilize the Tradeoff approach Source Selection procedures in accordance with RFO 15.103-1 and 15.201 / Subpart 15.2 as supplemented by the DoD Source Selection Procedures referenced in R-DFARS 215.201 / 215.202-70 and DAF Part 15 Source Selection to make an integrated assessment for a best value award decision.

It is a competitive 8(a) set-aside for firms certified with the Small Business Administration (SBA) in the Massachusetts approved geographical region which can include having a bona fide office located in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Syracuse NY or Vermont.

The Government intends to award one task order to your acquisition contract as a result of this solicitation.

The Government will utilize a hybrid Best Value Tradeoff process. First, proposals will be evaluated under Volume I for completeness of the RFP. All offerors that pass this compliance check will proceed to the next step. Proposals will then be evaluated under Volume II (Technical) on a strictly Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Proposals rated “Unacceptable” will be eliminated from further consideration.

All subfactors within Volume II are of equal importance. The Government will evaluate each subfactor independently to determine its technical merit and risk. To be eligible for award, an offeror must receive a rating of “Acceptable” in every subfactor under Volume II. A rating of “Unacceptable” in any single technical subfactor will result in the entire Volume II being rated as “Unacceptable”. An overall Volume II rating of “Unacceptable” renders the entire proposal ineligible for award and excludes the offeror from further consideration in the tradeoff analysis, regardless of their proposed cost or ratings in other factors.

For all proposals that receive an “Acceptable” rating in Volume II, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will conduct a Best Value Tradeoff analysis between Volume III (Company Experience) and Volume IV (Price). In this tradeoff, Volume III is significantly more important than Volume IV. The Government may award to a higher-priced offeror if the SSA determines that the offeror's superior experience warrants the additional cost. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the tradeoff process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

M-2 Number of Contracts to be Awarded: The Government intends to award one contract for the Simplified Acquisition for Base Engineering Requirements (SABER) for one base year plus four (4) one-year option periods, if exercised at the discretion of the Government. However, the Government reserves the right to not award a contract.

M-3 Number of Offers: The Government will only evaluate one proposal from each offeror.

M-4 Guaranteed Minimum: At the time of award, the Government will issue a task order for the Repair ATCALS B5505 project to the successful contractor that is awarded a Simplified Acquisition Base Engineer Requirement (SABER) contract. This task order will be for the guaranteed minimum of this contract.

M-5 Negotiations: The Government intends to award without negotiations but reserves the right to conduct negotiations if determined necessary. Any negotiations will be conducted in accordance with RFO 15.204. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of most highly rated proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer, with the concurrence of the SSA, may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly evaluated proposals.

Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information, in the format specified by Section L, Proposal Preparation Instructions. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, the relevance of Company Experience information). Clarifications conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute negotiations and the Contracting Officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

M-6 Evaluation: The Government intends to evaluate proposals in accordance with the following process:

VOLUME I – COMPLETED RFP

1. Complete and sign blocks 14, 15, 17, 19, and 20 (a-c) of the RFP Section A, SF1442. By signing Block 20b. of the SF1442, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP.
2. Acknowledge any amendments issued block 19 of the SF1442.
3. Offerors shall ensure that all clauses, provisions and certifications that require "fill in" information are appropriately completed in Section I through K and submitted with their proposal.

The requirement is met when: The offeror provides a completed RFP in accordance with Section L, Instructions to Offerors.

EVALUATION: The Government's Source Selection team will evaluate all proposals for timeliness and responsiveness according to Section L, Instruction to Offerors. The team will assess submission of all required volumes and documents, compliance with terms and conditions of the solicitation, completed representation and certifications, and acknowledgement of all amendments. All offerors that pass this compliance check will proceed to the next step.

VOLUME II – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL The Government technical evaluation team shall then evaluate the technical proposals using ratings of "Acceptable," or "Unacceptable." Failure to meet a requirement will result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable. All offerors that receive an overall "Acceptable" Technical Rating will proceed to the next step.

The technical proposal shall be evaluated against the following sub factors, and address the following:

Sub Factor 1- Organizational Structure and Team Qualifications

The offeror shall provide their organizational structure identifying all management and key personnel with a description of their work experience relating to projects similar in scope to those expected to perform work with this project with experience in multi-trade commercial and institutional building construction projects, renovations, alterations and repair, etc. with a minimum value of $250,000, to ensure compliance with the SABER Statement of Work, Section D, Part 1, Personnel requirements. *NOTE*: Any deviations or substitutions of key personnel named on the project must be approved by the Contracting Officer.

- **Team Qualifications Form, Attachment A**, is provided with the solicitation for offerors to provide their organizational structure and proposed team.
- **Key Personnel Qualifications, Attachment B**, is provided with the solicitation for offerors to identify all key personnel with a description of their work experience relating to projects similar in scope to those expected to perform work with this project with experience in multi-trade commercial and institutional building construction projects, renovations, alterations and repair, etc. with a minimum value of $250,000.
- For joint ventures, the organizational chart shall show the respective areas of responsibility for each partner. In addition, a narrative shall describe the roles and responsibilities of each joint venture partner.

The requirement is met when: The offeror's proposal includes the organizational structure of the proposed team, and clearly and comprehensively meets all personnel requirements as detailed below and in accordance with the SABER Statement of Work. All submitted documents, including charts and narratives, must be well-organized, legible, and clearly define the responsibilities for each team member. Submissions that are confusing, cluttered with duplicate information, or ambiguous will not meet the requirement.

- The Program Manager (PM) shall be a Professional Engineer (P.E.), Registered Architect (R.A.), have a degree in Construction Management or Program Management, or have at least five (5) years' experience as a Program Manager of a similar-type contract with the same scope and value as this contract.
- All Project Managers, Quality Control Managers, Environmental Managers, and Project Superintendents shall have a minimum of five (5) years of experience performing in that function, and all non-professional and/or technician Project Managers shall have relevant experience in the discipline they are designing/working
- The Project Management Staff shall have capability to provide civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering support, and support positions of administration, quality control, safety, estimation, environmental, Computer Aided Drafting and Design/Geographic Information System (CADD/GIS), field supervision and financial management experience.
- The contractor shall have ready access to professional experts for each discipline capable of physically visiting the job site within seven (7) calendar days of notification to resolve specific technical issues as required. The contractor is not required to have a contract/retainer with the engineering/architect firm throughout the contract.

Sub Factor 2- Initial Task Order Project
The offeror shall provide a proposal for the initial Task Order Seed Project – Repair ATCALS, Building 5505. Refer to Section B, Part 2 for information on Task Order Proposal Preparation. For the purpose of evaluation, design shall be required up to 35% Schematic Design.

The requirement is met when: the offeror's proposal includes a complete Task Order proposal package in accordance with the SOW which demonstrates a clear understanding of the work and an ability to successfully complete the project.

Sub Factor 3 – Surge Plan
The offeror shall provide a surge plan demonstrating how well they manage surges in multiple work sites on separate task orders concurrently without causing undue delay of completion of these multiple task orders.

The requirement is met when: The offeror's proposal provides how they will manage surges in multiple work sites on separate task orders concurrently without causing undue delay of completion of these multiple task orders. The plan shall include sourcing for staffing and equipment during a surge.

EVALUATION: The Government's technical evaluation team will assess the technical proposals using an Acceptable/Unacceptable rating system. To be considered technically acceptable, the Contractor shall clearly address each element of the technical approach. Offerors that fail to clearly address any of the requirements will receive an "Unacceptable" rating for the relevant subfactor. A rating of "Unacceptable" in any single technical subfactor will result in the entire Volume II being rated as "Unacceptable." An overall Volume II rating of "Unacceptable" renders the entire proposal ineligible for award and excludes the offeror from further consideration in the tradeoff analysis, regardless of their proposed cost or ratings in other factors.

Acceptable/Unacceptable	
Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements of the solicitation and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation.

VOLUME III - COMPANY EXPERIENCE PROPOSAL Next, the Government company experience evaluation team will evaluate the company experience based on example project samples. A confidence assessment rating will be assigned based on the integrated assessment of recency and relevancy.

The offeror shall provide Company Experience demonstrating construction experience in *multi-trade* commercial and institutional building construction projects, renovations, alterations and repair, etc. with a total contract dollar value of at least $250,000 and have similar complexity and function, utilizing trades relevant to those required by this solicitation. 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).

- **Example Project Form, Attachment C**, provided with the solicitation may be used by offerors to demonstrate Company Experience efforts. The following information shall be provided for each project:

- Project Title and Location
- Project Owner's Name, Point of Contact, and Contact phone number
- Year Completed or Anticipated to be Completed
- If project is not yet complete, provide current percentage of construction complete and a description of work remaining to be completed
- Scope of the project, to include purpose/use of facility
- Size of the project; differentiate square footage of new construction versus renovation (if the project includes both)
- Self-performance work by firm; provide a description of type of work self-performed by your firm AND percentage of work self-performed.
- Dollar value of the project
- Whether the project was design/build or design/bid/build

The requirement is met when: The offeror's proposal provides a minimum of three (3) and maximum of ten (10) multi-trade projects with a total contract dollar value of at least $250,000 completed in the last five (5) years that demonstrate their ability to handle projects of similar size, scope and complexity, such as previous IDIQ contracts.

EVALUATION: Company Experience will be rated using a confidence assessment based on the overall record of recency and relevancy of Company Experience efforts. Both aspects must be considered for each of the contracts or requirements evaluated. The Company Experience evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements.

Recency Assessment: To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or have been completed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Company Experience information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

Relevancy Assessment: Example Project Forms will be given a relevancy rating per the table below. In determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual Company Experience contracts, the Government will only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed by the prime, teaming partner, or joint venture. The Example Project Forms will be used to establish the relevancy of Company Experience. Higher relevancy will be assigned for contracts that are most similar to the effort, or portion of the effort, for which that offeror is proposing. The Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of relevancy. The Government will only evaluate up to the 10 most current efforts that are deemed recent and relevant for each offeror. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent, relevant contracts:

Company Experience Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Company Experience effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Company Experience effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Company Experience effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Company Experience effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Confidence Assessment: An Offeror's overall confidence assessment will be impacted by Company Experience findings to include the amount and type of work proposed to be performed by each entity of the Offeror's team. More recent experience or more relevant Company Experience may have greater impact on the confidence assessment. Although the Company Experience evaluation focuses on experience that is relevant to the IDIQ, the resulting confidence assessment is made at the Company Experience factor level and represents an overall evaluation of Contractor experience and the resulting confidence level for work under this requirement. The Company Experience factor will receive one of the performance confidence assessment ratings described in the table detailed below.

Experience Confidence Assessments Rating Method	
Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant experience 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 experience record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant experience record is available, or the offeror's experience 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 Company Experience.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant experience record, the Government has low expectations that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant experience record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

VOLUME IV- PRICE PROPOSAL Lastly, the Government price evaluation team will evaluate the offeror's proposed coefficient and initial task order pricing to determine reasonableness and balance.

1. Offerors shall provide proposed Coefficients. Offerors whose proposed coefficients are determined to be unreasonable or unbalanced may not be considered for award.
   - Insert proposed coefficients in the **Coefficient Pricing Schedule, Attachment D**. Refer to the SABER Statement of Work, Section A, Part 3 for information on Coefficients.
   - Coefficient Rate Reasonableness Justification. Contractors shall provide full explanation with sufficient details for the basis for development of its coefficient.

2. Offerors shall provide pricing for the initial Task Order project. Pricing should be provided in accordance with the SABER Statement of Work, Section A, Part 4.

This requirement is met when: The Offeror's proposal includes a completed Coefficient Pricing Schedule, Coefficient Rate Reasonableness Justification, and complete Task Order estimate.

EVALUATION: The offeror's Coefficient Pricing Schedule will be evaluated for award purposes based upon the Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The TEP is the base coefficient proposed multiplied by the estimated value for the requirement. TEP will be calculated for evaluation purposes only and used to assist in determining the best value to the Government. The Government will rank all offers by the calculated TEP. Offerors whose price is determined to be unreasonable and/or unbalanced may not be considered for award.

Reasonableness: The offeror's Coefficient Pricing Schedule will be evaluated to ensure fairness and reasonableness. A price analysis will be conducted in accordance with RFO 15.404. Comparison of the proposed prices among offerors in response to the solicitation is the preferred and intended price analysis technique. Other techniques and procedures, if deemed necessary, may be used to ensure a fair and reasonable price.

Balance: Offers will be analyzed to determine if prices are unbalanced per RFO 15.404-6 Unbalanced pricing exists where prices of one or more line items are significantly overstated or understated, despite an acceptable TEP. Offers may be rejected if it is determined there is a lack of balance in the offer that poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable.