Design Build Contract for: Carl B. Stokes U.S. Courthouse Fire Alarm Replacement, Cleveland, OH.

The Solicitation, Phase 1 – Request for Qualifications

Design Build Contract for: Carl B. Stokes U.S. Courthouse Fire Alarm Replacement

The Solicitation, Phase 1 – Request for Qualifications

Table of Contents

I. General Information
- A. The Project
- B. The Solicitation and Contract
- C. List of Phase 1 Solicitation Documents
- D. Authorized Representatives
- E. Pre-Proposal Conference
- F. Estimated Price Range
- G. Questions Regarding Phase 1
- H. Receipt of Qualifications

II. Proposals
- A. Proposal Contents
- B. Proposal Format
- C. Technical Proposal
- D. Other Requirements
- E. Requirements of Joint Venture Offerors

III. General Provisions
- A. Availability of Funds
- B. Requests for Clarification or Interpretation
- C. Notice to Small Business Firms
- D. Information Concerning the Disclosure of Solicitation Results
- E. Notice Concerning Preparation of Proposals
- F. Bond Requirements (Phase 2 Requirements)
- G. Contractor Performance Information
- H. Safeguarding and Dissemination of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Building Information
- I. INFORM

IV. FAR/GSAR Solicitation Provisions
To be issued in Phase 2

V. Additional Solicitation Provisions and Instructions
To be issued in Phase 2

VI. Method Of Award
- A. Evaluation of Phase 1 Proposals
- B. Evaluation of Phase 2 Proposals
- C. Determination of Responsibility
- D. Price Reasonableness/Price Realism
- E. Unbalanced Price
- F. Total Evaluated Price
- G. Non Price Factors

H. Evaluation of Joint Ventures

I. General Information

I.A. The Project

The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) requires a Design-Build contractor to modernize the primary life safety infrastructure at the Carl B. Stokes U.S. Courthouse. Located in downtown Cleveland, Ohio, this 23-story high-rise encompasses approximately 767,000 gross square feet, including three lower levels and an integrated parking garage.

As a high-profile federal facility, the courthouse supports continuous operations for critical tenants. These include the 6th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals, the U.S. District Court and Clerk of the Court, the U.S. Attorneys, the U.S. Marshals Service, and U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services. The building also houses the office of Senator Bernie Moreno, the Executive Office of Immigration Review, and the Circuit Court Library.

The primary objective of this project is to develop and execute a Preferred Alternative that brings the building's fire alarm and life safety systems up to current codes while ensuring zero disruption to daily federal operations.

The Design-Build contractor will be responsible for the engineering, procurement, installation, and testing of the following components:

- Main Control Panel Replacement: Replace the existing main Fire Alarm Control Panel (FACP) with a modern, fully supported system.
- Device Modernization: Replace all building-wide smoke detectors to comply with current code requirements, and install new devices where coverage gaps exist.
- System Remediation: Identify and rectify all system deficiencies, component obsolescences, and hardware vulnerabilities.
- Complete Recommissioning: Recommission the entire building fire alarm system, verifying all initiation inputs and notification outputs.
- As-Built Documentation: Deliver a complete, certified set of updated as-built documents for the entire fire alarm system.

Because the courthouse must remain fully occupied and functional throughout the project, the contractor must adhere to strict operational guidelines:

- Phased Continuity: Plan all construction, cutovers, and testing to maintain continuous life safety coverage without gaps.
- Scheduled Disruptions: Coordinate any temporary system impairments or noisy work outside of standard operational hours.
- Tenant Security: Maintain strict adherence to federal building security protocols given the sensitive nature of the tenant agencies.

I.B. The Solicitation and Contract

(1) This procurement is being conducted using the two phase selection process found in FAR 36.101-2 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-36). Qualification proposals will be evaluated in Phase One to determine which offerors will submit proposals for Phase Two. One contract will be awarded using competitive negotiation. In Phase 1, GSA will select a short list of the most highly qualified offerors and request that those offerors submit Phase 2 proposals. All responsible sources may submit a Phase 1 proposal. A maximum of 3 firms will be selected to submit Phase 2 proposals. Only those selected offerors are authorized to submit Phase 2 proposals. Those offerors not selected for participation in Phase 2 will be notified in accordance with FAR 15 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15). With regard to Phase 2 of the procurement, in consideration for the preparation of a technical proposal including a design concept meeting the minimum requirements described in the solicitation, GSA will pay a stipend of $22,390.00 to Phase 2 Offerors not selected for award of the resulting contract. Offerors that submit incomplete or unacceptable proposals are not eligible for a stipend.

(2) This Solicitation sets forth requirements for Phase 1 qualifications proposals and the evaluation factors for Phase 2 proposals for a Contract to construct the Project. Proposals conforming to the Solicitation requirements will be evaluated in accordance with the Method of Award set forth herein. The Government will award the Contract to the selected Offeror, subject to the conditions set forth herein.

(3) Neither the Solicitation nor any part of an Offeror's proposal shall be part of the Contract except to the extent expressly incorporated therein by the Contracting Officer.

I.C. List of Phase 1 Solicitation Documents

The Solicitation Documents are comprised of:

(1) The Solicitation - Phase 1

(2) Offeror Representations and Certifications

(3) Standard Form (SF) 1442 – Solicitation Offer and Award

(4) Draft of the Agreement

(5) Past Performance Questionnaire

I.D. Authorized Representatives

The following individuals are designated as the authorized GSA representatives under this Solicitation:

Authorized Representative Information:
Contracting Officer’s Information

Authorized Representative Information:
Name: Neal Deodhar
Address: 230 South Dearborn Street, Suite 3600, Chicago, IL 60604
Telephone: 312-550-4097
Email: neal.deodhar@gsa.gov

I.E. Pre-Proposal Conference

Interested parties must notify the Contracting Officer for further information about attendance and to confirm location, time, and date. Only those parties who have notified the Contracting Officer and provided necessary information in advance of the meeting will be allowed to attend. To request a reasonable accommodation due to a disability, contact the Contracting Officer.

Date: July 28, 2026
Time: 1:30 PM Central Time
Location: Virtual

I.F. Estimated Price Range

The estimated price range for the Project is between $10 Million and $20 Million.

I.G. Questions Regarding Phase 1

Submit all questions regarding the Phase 1 to the Contracting Officer on or before July 31, 2026. Any responses provided by GSA will be posted on the Governmentwide Point of Entry (GPE) as an Amendment to the Solicitation.

I.H. Receipt of Qualifications

(1) In order to be considered for Phase 2 and award, Phase 1 qualifications proposals conforming to the requirements of the Solicitation must be received via email at the following address no later than 4:00 pm Central Time on the following date:

• Date: August 21, 2026
• Address: neal.deodhar@gsa.gov

II. Proposals

II.A. Proposal Contents

Proposals shall consist of the following documents, completed and executed in accordance with this Solicitation:

- Form 1442
- Technical Proposal
- Representations and Certifications
- Proof of Bonding to $20m.
- Proprietary Information Agreement
- VETS registration confirmation
- Acknowledgement of Amendments (if any)
- Other Documents as Required

II.B. Proposal Format

Firms having the capability to perform the services will be invited to submit Phase 1 qualifications in response to the solicitation posted on the SAM.gov website.

Offerors who then wish to submit an offer will be required to submit one digital copy of their Phase I Proposal. The subject line of the email shall include “47PB5226R0013

- Stokes USCH Fire Alarm Replacement Phase I” followed by the firm(s) name. Emails, including message body, headers, and attachments are limited to 25MB. Zip files are acceptable, but the following attachment type/extensions are not permitted in any email incoming to GSA, including inside zip files: ade, adp, asx, bas, bat, BHx, cer, chm, cmd, com, cpl, crt, dbx, dll, exe, hta, htp, inf, ins, isp, js, jse, lnk, mda, mde, mdz, msc, msi, msp, mst, nch, pcd, pif, prf, reg, scf, scr, sct, shb, shs, url, vb, vbe, vbs, wms, wsc, wsf, wsh, htm, 7z.

The Phase I Proposal shall not contain more than 35 numbered pages total, inclusive of the table of contents, charts, exhibits, and any other materials the Offeror deems required for each evaluation factor listed herein for which the offeror is addressing. Pages beyond the limit will not be evaluated.

Excluded from the page limit: the SF1442, SAM registration verification, acknowledgement of any amendments, and verification of the firms’ VETS-4212 compliance.

II.C. Technical Proposal

Proposals must address the technical qualifications and the other Phase 1 evaluation

factors stated herein. Any proposal not meeting the following criteria may result in not being further considered for award.

See section VI.G. Non-Price Factors, for additional information.

Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1: Technical Qualifications of the Firm (40%)

This evaluation factor considers the extent of the past experience of the General Contractor and A/E members of the Offeror's Design Build (DB) team. For purposes of this evaluation factor, the term A/E is defined as an individual, firm, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity permitted by law to practice the profession of architecture and engineering in the State of Ohio, that will have responsibility for developing detailed design and construction documents. Specifically, this factor considers the specialized experience, technical competence and capability of the Offeror's Firm and Designer of Record (DOR) to perform similar work. For this factor, Offerors must identify by name both the General Contractor (GC) and the DOR. If an Offeror consists of more than one GC and/or more than one DOR, then the Offeror must identify by name its lead GC and its lead DOR and ratings will be averaged.

Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 2: Approach to Design Build (20%)

This factor considers the Offeror's approach to establishing a design-build team that will proactively and collaboratively work together to satisfy the Government's objectives, including the realization of Design Excellence. For purposes of this evaluation factor, "Design Excellence" refers to GSA's Design Excellence (DE) Program which seeks a holistic approach (incorporating expertise in many areas, including but not limited to architecture, engineering, historic rehabilitation, sustainability, and construction) that delivers value by producing high quality, high performance facilities on budget and on time. DE further seeks to commission our nation's most talented constructors, designers, and artists to design, construct, and modernize federal buildings of outstanding quality and value. These projects are to demonstrate the value of integrated design that balances aesthetics, cost, functionality, constructability, and reliability; creating environmentally superior workplaces for federal employees; and giving contemporary form and meaning to our democratic values.

Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 3: Lead Designer (25%)

This factor considers the Lead Designer's portfolio in the context of Design Excellence in engineering and design and considers the extent of the lead designer's past experience and the quality of the lead designer's past performance on comparable projects. This factor also considers the Lead Designer's philosophy and design intent which considers their flexibility and attitude towards design. For purposes of this evaluation factor, the term "Lead Designer" means an individual who will have the primary responsibility to develop the concept and the project design. For purposes of this evaluation factor, "Design Excellence" has the same meaning as stated in Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 2.

Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 4: Past Performance of the Offeror's Team (15%)

This factor considers the Offeror's Past Performance for the similar projects submitted under Phase 1 Evaluation Factor number 1, Technical Qualifications of the Firm. This factor considers the extent to which the Offeror's team has a successful and satisfactory track-record on similar projects. The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on the information provided on the past performance questionnaires and any other sources the Government uses to obtain such information, such as CPARs/FAPIIS and other institutional knowledge of past performance. In the case of the Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.

A Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) (included in the solicitation as an attachment) must be completed by the applicable client/reference for each project included in the proposal for Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1, "Technical Qualifications of the Firm." Completed PPQs should be submitted by the reference to the contracting officer at neal.deodhar@gsa.gov, and must be received by the due date of the proposal. Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submission of completed questionnaires. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project before proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information for the project. Offerors may resubmit questionnaires previously submitted with other proposals but must ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs.

Also include performance recognition documents received within the last 10 years, such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition. In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary/affiliate) identified in the Offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), previously submitted PPQ information, and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror. While the Government may elect to consider data from a variety of sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror. GSA will not maintain a database of PPQs submitted by Offerors. If the offeror is a joint venture, information submitted for a party to the joint venture will not be evaluated to the extent that the terms of the joint venture agreement limit such party's performance or financial obligations as a party to the Contract contemplated by this Solicitation.

II.D. Other Information to be Submitted with Proposals

(1) Representations and Certifications

Offerors are reminded their SAM registration status must be “Active”, at the time their offer is submitted, to be considered for award (see 52.204-7 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-04)). Offerors submitting a proposal in response to this Solicitation shall complete electronic Annual Representations and Certifications in conjunction with required Entity registration in System for Award Management (SAM), accessed via System for Award Management. In accordance with FAR 52.204-90 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-04), if an Offeror will not have an active Federal Government contracts registration in SAM when submitting its offer, it shall complete paragraphs (c) and (d) of FAR 52.204-90 and include its responses with its offer.

(2) Proof of Bonding to $20 million.

(3) Proprietary Information Agreement(s)

Offerors are advised that employees of the firm(s) identified below may require access to your firm’s proprietary information in performing advisory and assistance services for the Government under separate contract. These individuals will be authorized access only to such information that is necessary to enable them to perform their respective duties. Such firm(s) are expressly prohibited from competing on the subject acquisition.

Procon Consulting
1800 Tysons Blvd, Suite 620, McLean, VA 22102
Attention: Shelley E. Markle, PMP
Project Executive
smarkle@proconconsulting.com
mobile 773.617.8968, main office 703.527.7059

Pursuant to FAR Part 9.505-4(b) (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-09), a contractor that gains access to proprietary information of other companies in performing advisory and assistance services for the Government must agree with the other companies to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished. The contracting officer must obtain copies of these agreements and ensure that they are properly executed.

To expedite the evaluation process, each offeror must contact the above-listed firm to effect execution of such an agreement prior to the submission of proposals. Each offeror must submit copies of any such agreement(s) with their proposal.

II.E. Requirements of Joint Venture Offerors

(1) All offers submitted by joint ventures must include a copy of an executed joint venture agreement (with original signatures) which fully discloses the legal identity of

each member of the joint venture, the relationship between the members, the form of ownership of each member, and any limitations on liability or authority for each member.

(2) An authorized representative of each member of the joint venture must sign the SF 1442 accompanying an offer regardless of any agency relationship established between the members.

(3) In the case of corporations that are joint venture members, the corporation secretary must certify that the corporation is authorized to participate in the joint venture, either by so certifying in the joint venture agreement, or by submitting a separate certification to the Government. The joint venture must also provide a certificate that identifies a principal representative of the joint venture with full authority to bind the joint venture.

(4) Representations and certifications, financial information, and past performance information must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.

III. General Provisions

III.A. Availability of Funds

Issuance of this Solicitation does not warrant that funds are presently available for award of a Contract. Award of the contract shall be subject to the availability of appropriated funds, and the Government shall incur no obligation under this Solicitation in advance of such time as funds are made available to the Contracting Officer for the purpose of contract award.

III.B. Requests for Clarification or Interpretation

The Government will attempt to answer all requests for clarifications or interpretations of the Solicitation Documents prior to the date set for receipt of offers, but do not warrant that all such requests will be answered within 15 calendar days. Prospective Offerors should make such requests not less than 15 calendar days prior to the date set for receipt of offers.

III.C. Notice to Small Business Firms

A program for the purpose of assisting qualified small business concerns in obtaining certain bid, payment, or performance bonds that are otherwise not obtainable is available through the Small Business Administration (SBA) (Small Business Administration). For information concerning SBA's surety bond guarantee assistance, contact your SBA District Office.

III.D. Information Concerning the Disclosure of Solicitation Results

In accordance with FAR 3.104 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-03), after receipt of proposals, no information regarding the identity of those submitting offers, the number of offers received, or the information contained in such offers will be made available until after award.

III.E. Notice Concerning Preparation of Proposals

Offerors are cautioned to carefully read the entire Solicitation and the Agreement to be included in the Contract contemplated by the Solicitation in order to be fully aware of all requirements and clauses in the contemplated Contract. Verify that all blanks requiring information to be supplied in an Offer have been properly filled out, that all pricing and other numerical data is accurately calculated, and that all copies of the Offer contain the same information.

III.F. Bond Requirements (Phase 2 Requirements)

If a bid guarantee is required to be submitted with your offer, any contract awarded will require a performance bond and payment bond as specified in the Agreement. Offerors who utilize individual sureties should note the requirement for a certified, audited, financial statement for each person acting as an individual surety under clause FAR 52.228-1 Bid Guarantee and the requirements of clause FAR 52.228-11 Individual Surety-Pledge of Assets.

III.G. Contractor Performance Information

(1) *Evaluating Contractor Performance:* The General Services Administration is using the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) module as the secure, confidential, information management tool to facilitate the performance evaluation process. CPARS enables a comprehensive evaluation by capturing comments from both GSA and the contractor. The website for CPARS is Contractor Performance Assessment

Completed CPARS evaluations may then be used by the Federal acquisition community for use in making source selection decisions. CPARS assists acquisition officials by serving as the single source for contractor past performance data.

(2) *CPARS Registration:* Each award requiring an evaluation must be registered in CPARS. The contractor will receive several automated emails. Within thirty days of award, the contractor will receive an e-mail that contains user account information, as well as the applicable contract and order number(s) assigned. Contractors will be granted one user account to access all evaluations.

(3) *Contractor CPARS Training:* Contractors may sign up for CPARS training. A schedule of classes will be posted to the CPARS training site (CPARS Training) and updated as needed.

(4) *Contractor Representative (CR) Role*: All evaluations will be sent the Contractor Representative (CR) named on your award. The CR will be able to access CPARS to review and comment on the evaluation. If

your CR is not already in the CPARS system, the contracting officer will request the name and email address of the person that will be responsible for the CR role on your award.

Once an evaluation is ready to be released the CR will receive an email alerting them the evaluation is ready for their review and comment. The email will indicate the time frame the CR has to respond to the evaluation; however, the CR may return the evaluation earlier than this date.

GSA shall provide for review at a level above the contracting officer (i.e., contracting director) to consider any disagreement between GSA and the contractor regarding GSA's evaluation of the contractor. Based on the review, the individual at a level above the contracting officer will issue the ultimate conclusion on the performance evaluation.

Copies of the evaluations, contractor responses, and review comments, if any, will be retained as part of the contract file.

III.H. Safeguarding and Dissemination of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Building Information

Certain information contained in the Solicitation Documents may have been designated as Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) building information. With respect to such information, Offerors shall agree to the terms for receipt of such information, as set forth in the provision "Administrative Matters" in Section III of the Agreement, as a condition of receipt of such information.

III.I. INFORM

A. Overview of the IN-depth Feedback through Open Reporting Methods (INFORM) Process

This solicitation is part of GSA's post award communication process called INFORM. The process is designed to enhance the quality and usefulness of **post-award** communications by providing greater transparency and openness into the procurement process. INFORM seeks to increase GSA-industry communication by providing clearer and more complete information to explain the award decision.

Through the INFORM process, GSA will seek to share additional information with offerors in writing and/or through an oral feedback meeting[1] that is not required by statute or regulation. For Part 15 including mandatory debriefs and Part 16, and in addition to any information required by FAR 15.503 and 15.506, GSA is providing each offeror with the opportunity to participate in the INFORM process as further discussed below.

B. Detailed Description of the INFORM Process

[1] The oral feedback meeting may be held in person or via an electronic means.

B.1. Component 1 - Notification of Award

After award and in accordance with any post-award notification timeframes required by regulation (i.e., FAR Parts 15.207-2(b) (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15) and 16.507-5(c) (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-16)), the contracting officer will issue written notices to the successful and unsuccessful offerors (the Notification Letter and Evaluation Statement (NLES)). The notices will contain:

- All information required by statute or regulation;
- An unredacted copy of the complete technical evaluation for that particular offeror that includes a full description of the unsuccessful offeror's strengths, weaknesses, risks, and deficiencies;
- An overall technical evaluation summary for that particular offeror and the successful offeror that includes evaluated price; overall technical ranking, rating, or score.

B.2. Component 2 - Request for Oral Feedback Meeting or Written Questions

Within three business days after receipt of the NLES, an offeror may, but is not required to:

- submit a written request to the contracting officer for an oral feedback meeting;
- submit a list of written questions to the contracting officer; or
- take no further action.

If the offeror timely elects to request an oral feedback meeting or submit a list of written questions, GSA will consider any such request to constitute a required debriefing pursuant to FAR 15.301 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15). If an offeror does not request an oral feedback meeting or submit a list of written questions within the three day time period, the receipt of the NLES concludes the INFORM process and satisfies the FAR requirement for debriefs pursuant to FAR 15.301 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15).

If the offeror submits a list of written questions in lieu of the oral feedback meeting, the contracting officer will attempt to respond within five business days of receipt of the written questions. Unless otherwise stated, the contracting officer's response to the written questions will conclude the INFORM process and any corresponding post-award debriefing as further set forth at FAR 15.301 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15).

If the offeror requests an oral feedback meeting, the offeror should provide the following information:

- Primary point of contact;
- List of participants with titles (e.g., Senior Vice President);
- List of topics to assist GSA better prepare for the oral feedback meeting; and
- Preference for in-person, telephone, or web-based conferencing (if available).

B.3. Component 3 - Oral Feedback Meeting

During the oral feedback meeting, GSA's objectives are to provide:

- Reasonable responses to written questions submitted by the offeror;
- Explanations for the evaluation conclusions and contract award decisions;
- Any additional information about the fairness and impartiality of the evaluation and why the award decision was rational;
- Reasonable responses to additional questions raised during the meeting;
- Additional transparency into the underlying competition process; and,
- A greater understanding of the evaluation and award process.

GSA will not provide any information that is prohibited by law or regulation.

B.4. Component 4 - Post Oral Feedback Meeting Questions

Within two business days after the conclusion of the oral feedback meeting, the offeror may submit a list of written questions to the contracting officer. The contracting officer will provide a written response within five business days and, unless otherwise noted by the contracting officer, the INFORM process and any corresponding post-award debriefing as further set forth at FAR 15.301 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15) will have concluded.

If the offeror elects not to submit a list of written questions within two days after the oral feedback meeting, the INFORM process and any corresponding post-award debriefing as further set forth at FAR 15.301 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15) is concluded.

IV. FAR/GSAR Solicitation Provisions

To be issued with Phase 2 solicitation.

V. Additional Solicitation Provisions and Instructions

To be issued in Phase 2 solicitation.

VI. Method of Award

VI.A. Evaluation of Phase 1 Proposals

The Government will evaluate Phase 1 proposals based on the following evaluation factors and short list a maximum of three offerors to submit Phase 2 proposals.

(1) Technical Qualifications of the Firm (40%)

(2) Approach to Design Build (20%)

(3) Lead Designer (25%)

(4) Past Performance of the Offeror's Team (15%)

VI.B. Evaluation of Phase 2 Proposals

The Government will award a contract resulting from this Solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to the Solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, Total Evaluated Price and other factors considered. In addition to Total Evaluated Price, the following Phase 2 non-price factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

(1) Quality of Design Concept (50%)

(2) Qualifications, Experience and Past Performance of Key Personnel (25%)

(3) Management Plan (25%)

VI.C. Determination of Responsibility

In order to be considered responsible, an Offeror must demonstrate that it meets the requirements of FAR 9.104-1 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-09). The Contracting Officer's determination of an Offeror's responsibility or non-responsibility may be based upon any information obtained by the Contracting Officer, and is independent of the evaluation of offers set forth herein.

VI.D. Price Analysis and Price Realism Analysis

(1) The Contracting Officer will use Price Analysis to analyze the Offeror's proposal to ensure that the final agreed-to-price is fair and reasonable. In performing Price Analysis, the Contracting Officer may use, singly or in combination with others, the analytical techniques described in FAR 15.404-1 (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15), to ensure that the final price is fair and reasonable. The Contracting Officer may request the advice and assistance of other experts to ensure that appropriate Price Analysis is performed.

(2) In addition, the Contracting Officer will use Price Realism Analysis in conjunction with the evaluation of the offeror's Quality of Design Concept to measure an Offeror's understanding of the requirements and to assess the risk inherent in an Offeror's proposal. Accordingly, Offerors are advised that a business decision to submit significantly low pricing will be considered as reflecting on their understanding or the risk associated with their proposals. Price Realism Analysis will **not** be used for the purpose of determining the probable cost to the Government.

VI.E. Unbalanced Prices

Offers must include balanced prices. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and could result in payment of unreasonably high prices. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. All offers with separately priced line items or subline items shall be analyzed to determine if the prices are unbalanced. If price analysis techniques indicate that an offer is unbalanced, the contracting officer shall: (i) Consider the risks to the Government associated with the unbalanced pricing in determining the competitive range and in making the source selection decision; and (ii) Consider whether award of the contract will result in paying unreasonably high prices for contract performance. An offer may be rejected if the contracting officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

VI.F. Total Evaluated Price

Total Evaluated Price shall be calculated using the prices indicated in the Phase 2 Price Proposal using the formula in the Phase 2 Solicitation.

VI.G. Non-Price Factors

PHASE 1 EVALUATION FACTOR #1: Technical Qualifications of the Firm (40%)

This evaluation factor considers the extent of the experience of the General Contractor and A/E members of the Offeror's Design Build (DB) team. For purposes of this evaluation factor, the term A/E is defined as an individual, firm, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity permitted by law to practice the profession of architecture and engineering in the State of Ohio, that will have responsibility for developing detailed design and construction documents. Specifically, this factor considers the specialized experience, technical competence and capability of the Offeror's Firm and Designer of Record (DOR) to perform similar work. For this factor, Offerors must identify by name both the General Contractor (GC) and the DOR. If an Offeror consists of more than one GC and/or more than one DOR, then the Offeror must identify by name its lead GC and its lead DOR and ratings will be averaged.

<u>Submittal Requirements</u>

Offerors shall address the following in the technical submissions for this evaluation factor: Similar Projects - Offerors shall provide a list of at least 4 projects, (2 from the DOR and 2 from the GC) but not to exceed a combined total of 6 similar projects that are ongoing (at least 75% construction completion) or have been completed within the last 10 years of this solicitation issue date. The list shall include projects performed by both the proposed GC and the proposed DOR; the provided projects do not need to be jointly performed but need to represent the experience of the GC and DOR. Of this group of similar projects, the General Contractor must have served as the prime contractor of at least one project and the A/E must have had the responsibility for developing the detailed design and construction documents for at least one project. More favorable consideration will be given to those offerors that have similar projects that were completed by teams using the same GC and DOR as proposed for this solicitation. (The Offeror is defined as the team that serves as the GC and the DOR). Similar Design Phase Services and Construction Phase Work can be represented by a single project or multiple projects; multiple projects may be submitted that when combined, demonstrate the contractors aggregate experience demonstrating similar experience to the solicited project. The contractor is responsible for detailing how the projects submitted under this evaluation factor are similar to the project for which they are submitting a proposal.

In addition to the definition above, for purposes of evaluation, “similar projects” are those that are similar in size, scope, and complexity. Projects will be considered more similar if they exhibit some or all of the following characteristics:

- The project was a design-build or bridging design build in which the owner or developer contracted with a single Offeror to provide all, or substantially all, of the design and construction services for that project. Design-Build means combining design and construction in a single contract; the prime contractor could be a single entity, including a Joint Venture consisting of a General Contractor and A/E
- Fire alarm repair, renovation or replacement was a major component of the project.
- The project included installing, replacing, maintaining, and integrating testing of fire alarm and voice evacuation emergency communication systems in a high-rise building.
- The project included installing new, replacing, maintaining, and integrated testing of smoke control systems in a high-rise building (e.g., stair pressurization and atrium smoke control).
- The project included installing, replacing, and maintaining automatic fire protection sprinkler systems.
- Phased construction in an occupied or partially occupied building
- Has reached substantial completion in the past 10 years or if ongoing has reached at least 75% construction completion
- Contract value at award in excess of $10,000,000
- Constrained construction site
- Public building use

Provide the following information for each “similar” project:

- Companies performing the project (offeror, GC, DOR)
- Project title and location of the project
- Contract type and Contractor's Responsibilities (Scope of Work)
- Name, current telephone number and email address of the owner’s representative most knowledgeable of the project
- Owner and/or Occupant(s)/Tenant(s)
- Contract number for Federal Government projects
- Contract Cost at Award and Contract Cost at Completion
- Cost of fire alarm repair/renovation/replacement work
- Roles of Offeror’s team members on the project (prime or subcontractor/subconsultant)
- Facility details, including type of facility, tenant mission and population, square footage, security level, LEED certification, etc.
- Special Features (Historic Consideration, etc)
- Contract Award Date, Scheduled Contract Completion, actual Date of Substantial Completion, and the Date of Final Completion
- Modifications - number and total amount that are attributable to unforeseen conditions and/or design deficiencies
- A narrative explaining how the characteristics of the submitted project relate to the characteristics of the project described in this solicitation
- Images of completed work referenced

<u>Standard for Evaluation</u>
Offerors must provide all required information and describe the similarities of the projects submitted under this factor to the Government’s proposed project.

The standard is met when:

a. Offeror provides a minimum of 4 similar projects, 2 each for the DOR and GC, of similar size, scope, and complexity;
b. All the required information is provided for each project submitted for review.

PHASE 1 EVALUATION FACTOR #2: Approach to Design-Build (20%)

This factor considers the Offeror’s approach to establishing a design-build team that will proactively and collaboratively work together to satisfy the Government’s objectives, including the realization of Design Excellence. For purposes of this evaluation factor, “Design Excellence” refers to GSA’s Design Excellence (DE) Program which seeks a holistic approach (incorporating expertise in many areas, including but not limited to architecture, engineering, historic rehabilitation, sustainability, and construction) that delivers value by producing high quality, high performance facilities on budget and on time. DE further seeks to commission our nation’s most talented constructors, designers, and artists to design, construct, and modernize federal buildings of outstanding quality and value. These projects are to demonstrate the value of integrated design that balances aesthetics, cost, functionality, constructability, and reliability;

creating environmentally superior workplaces for federal employees; and giving contemporary form and meaning to our democratic values.

Submittal Requirements

Each Offeror must submit a written narrative (not to exceed 10 pages) concerning its approach to the DB process. An Offeror may allocate the 10 pages in any manner it chooses. Pages beyond the limit will not be evaluated.

Standard for Evaluation

The narrative must discuss each of the subjects set forth below; the bullets are not subfactors; rather, they are elements the Government will consider when evaluating the Offeror's proposal.

a. Philosophy and Design Intent: The Offeror's philosophy and design intent as related to the project that is described in the solicitation. Such a discussion may include such topics as the parameters of an overall design philosophy. The Offeror's philosophy and design intent should be characterized by clarity, standard grammar, and the absence of clichés or jargon. The Government expects clear, thoughtful phrases that demonstrate the ability of the team to communicate ideas. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror's philosophy and design intent is suitable for this project.

b. Management Process: The Offeror shall describe their overall management approach to DB and should discuss topics such as: planning, decision making; the lines and methods of communication; interaction with consultants; the means to integrate client and community input; the physical location of major design and production work vs project location; the role of specialty contractors; uses of technology and innovation, cost management, and their ability to control and ensure the maintenance of design quality during design execution and construction. The Government will evaluate the probability that the Offeror's management process will result in a cohesive and collaborative team effort.

c. Design Excellence in engineering and design: The Offeror's approach to supporting and collaborating as a cohesive team in order to realize Design Excellence as it relates to the scope of this project and the definition of a comparable project. The Government will evaluate the probability that the Offeror will realize Design Excellence in engineering and design on this project.

The standard is met when:

a. The Offeror's philosophy and design intent is suitable for this project;
b. There is a satisfactory probability that the Offeror's management process will result in a cohesive and collaborative team effort; and
c. There is a satisfactory probability that the Offeror will realize Design Excellence on this project.

Additional favorable consideration may be given for any of the following:

- Clearly demonstrated and defined compatible corporate values and corporate philosophies;
- The proven, successful implementation of the Management Process on any of the projects listed under Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1;
- Entities that have developed a patented process or unique product on which the design-builder intends to rely in performing the project identified in the RFP.

PHASE 1 EVALUATION FACTOR #3: Lead Designer (25%)

This factor considers the Lead Designer's portfolio in the context of Design Excellence in engineering and design and considers the extent of the lead designer's past experience and the quality of the lead designer's past performance on comparable projects. This factor also considers the Lead Designer's philosophy and design intent which considers their flexibility and attitude towards design. For purposes of this evaluation factor, the term "Lead Designer" means an individual who will have the primary responsibility to develop the concept and the project design. For purposes of this evaluation factor, "Design Excellence" has the same meaning as stated in Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 2.

<u>Submittal Requirements</u>
Each Offeror must submit the information requested below. The following are not subfactors, but, rather, are elements the Government will consider when evaluating the Offeror's proposal.

a. Submit a portfolio representative of the Lead Designer's ability to provide Design Excellence and ability to demonstrate innovation and creativity. Address his or her participation in each project.
    i. Submit a portfolio of up to three projects completed in the last 10 years (maximum of (5) five pages per project; pages beyond the limit will not be evaluated).
    ii. Each project must include a narrative that addresses the design approach with salient features and discuss how the client's program, functionality, image, mission, economics, schedule, and operational objectives were satisfied by the overall design/planning solution. Include tangible evidence such as certificates, awards, or peer recognition demonstrating Design Excellence.
    iii. In addition to the page limits above, each Offeror may include:
        1. One of the following for each project: a representative floor plan, a site plan, a rendered 3D model, a building section, or other appropriate drawing, and
        2. Two pages of photographs for each project; pages beyond the limit will not be evaluated.
    iv. Identify and describe areas of responsibility and commitment to each project.

<u>Standard for Evaluation</u>

The standard is met when:

a. The submission demonstrates an understanding of the design issues to be addressed in the project identified in the RFP as evidenced by the projects that the Offeror chose to submit for this evaluation factor; and
b. The submission portrays creative and appropriate responses to client criteria and needs, demonstrates design leadership, and clearly exemplifies Design Excellence.

Additional favorable consideration may be given for any of the following:

- Lead Designer has a track record of delivering superior quality;
- Lead Designer demonstrates history of dedication to clients with complex building projects;
- Designs demonstrate a consistently high level of exploration, rigor, and personal commitment to Design Excellence;
- The portfolio includes a project that is of the same size, scope, and complexity as defined in Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1.

PHASE 1 EVALUATION FACTOR #4: Past Performance of the Offeror's Team (15%)

This factor considers the Offeror's Past Performance for the similar projects submitted under Phase 1 Evaluation Factor number 1, Technical Qualifications of the Firm. This factor considers the extent to which the Offeror's team has a successful and satisfactory track-record on similar projects. The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on the information provided on the past performance questionnaires and any other sources the Government uses to obtain such information, such as CPARS/FAPIIS and other institutional knowledge of past performance. In the case of the Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.

<u>Information Required</u>
Past Performance Questionnaires:

Offerors are responsible for initiating a request for at least one questionnaire for each of the projects submitted under Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1. (The Past Performance Questionnaire is included as a separate attachment to this RFP.) The Offeror shall follow the instructions for completing and submitting the Past Performance Questionnaires, which are due no later than the Phase I proposal due date and time. Past Performance can be described as how an Offeror performed on a job. The questionnaire information relates to ratings of the Offeror's timeliness of performance, cost control, quality of product, business relationship, continuity of personnel, qualification of personnel, etc. Offerors are responsible for ensuring the references provided are willing and available to complete the questionnaires on time, and also willing to be contacted by the Government.

The Government intends for the contractor to contact their references directly, and that the references respond with a completed Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) to be submitted directly to the Contracting Officer (CO) prior to the due date of the proposal. The CO also reserves the right to contact those individuals who provide references for the Offeror to verify that the services provided comply with the similarity requirements of this RFP and to assist with the assessment of the quality of those services provided through a Past Performance Questionnaire. FAR 15.202(c)(1) (GSA Class Deviation RFO-2025-15) states, "An Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance." The Government is not required to conduct or complete reference checks on more than the required references for each Offeror. In addition to the references provided by the Offeror, the Government may solicit other sources to find references for other relevant, similar work performed by the Offeror.

The Government also reserves the right to use other government data available in its assessment of the offeror. The quality of the reference information supplied will be considered. In accordance with FAR 15.202, Offerors may be given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of proposals (e.g.,the relevance of an offeror's past performance information and adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond) or to resolve minor or clerical errors.

Submittal Requirements

The Offeror must ensure submission of:

At least one but no more than two Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) (included in the solicitation as Attachment) for EACH project submitted under Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1: Technical Qualifications of the Firm. References must have thorough knowledge of the details of the Offeror's performance (such as the Project Manager, Building Owner, or Contracting Official associated with the project) for the majority of the contract performance period, so that the reference may sufficiently respond to the questionnaire.

Offerors should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ for each reference, which will provide contract and client information for the project in the event the PPQ is not received by the Contracting Officer at the time proposals are due.

Completed PPQs should be submitted directly to the Contracting Officer. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submission of questionnaires. All completed Past Performance Questionnaires shall be submitted via email to neal.deodhar@gsa.gov prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs.

Offerors may also include performance recognition documents received within the last 10 years, such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition. In addition to the

above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), including Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary/affiliate) identified in the Offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), previously submitted PPQ information, and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror. While the Government may elect to consider data from a variety of sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror. GSA will not maintain a database of PPQs submitted by Offerors.

If any problems were encountered on the identified contracts for which the Offeror has submitted references, the Offeror may provide a brief narrative describing the nature of the problems and the corrective action taken.

Standard for Evaluation
The standard is met when:

Responses are provided by at least one reference for each similar project outlined in Phase 1 Evaluation Factor 1: Technical Qualifications of the Firm, and provide favorable evaluations indicating that the projects have met or exceeded the customer's requirements as set forth in the construction contract documents (drawings and specifications) in a timely manner, and within established budgets.

VI.H. Evaluation of Joint Venture Offerors

In the evaluation of responsibility and non-price factors, information submitted for a party to the joint venture will only be evaluated to the extent that the terms of the joint venture agreement do not limit such party's performance or financial obligations as a party to the Contract contemplated by this Solicitation.