SECTION 00 22 16
PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTAL AND EVALUATION OF OFFERS FOR PHASE ONE

1. **Overview.**

1.1 The intent of this solicitation is to select one contractor for Design and Construction. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District has a requirement from the Army Reserve to provide for the Design and Construction repairing a failing, 31,658 SF Area Maintenance Support Activity/Equipment Concentration Site (AMSA/ECS) vehicle maintenance facility at the Arden Hills ARC, Arden Hills, MN. This project will repair failing facility components, extend the economic life of the facility by 25 years and provide a modern maintenance facility that enables readiness for the Army Reserve units stationed there.. Building components and systems to be repaired include Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC), electrical distribution, fire alarm and suppression systems, ceilings, windows, doors, floor coverings, interior reconfiguration, and interior finishes. The project includes retrofit installation of new 10T crane with 20' hook height and raising overall building roof to accommodate new crane hook height. The project will also repair the exterior facade and finishes. All hazardous materials (HAZMAT) removed as part of the demolition will be disposed of following all state and federal guidelines. This is a two-phase design-build procurement and will follow the Two-Phase Design-Build Selection Procedures in accordance with Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) Subpart 36.101-2 and Part 15. Phase I of the two-phase selection process will be conducted under RFO Subpart 36.101-2. 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 five (5) of the most highly qualified offerors will be selected to participate in Phase II. **A site visit will be held for these selected offerors following the Phase II notification.** 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. Phase II will be conducted under RFO Part 15. Following completion of the Phase II evaluation, the Contracting Officer will award a Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) contract to the responsible offeror whom the Source Selection Authority determines conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable, and offers the best overall value to the Government, all factors considered. The basis of award is the Best Value Trade-Off Process. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers.

1.2 This project is subject to availability of funds (SAF); funds are not presently available. No award will be made under this solicitation until funds are available.

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

2. **Submittal of offers.**
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, to be effectively and equitably evaluated, the proposals must include information sufficiently detailed to clearly describe the offeror's capability for successfully completing the solicited project. Requirements stated in this 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.

2.1 Offerors shall submit their proposals electronically in accordance with the Proposal Submission Instructions in Section 00 21 00 of the solicitation. Please follow the instructions precisely as proposals must complete the upload 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. All proposals must be submitted through the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE). No emailed or hard copies of proposals will be accepted. Offerors are encouraged to save a copy of their PIEE confirmation email in the event a technical issue may require proof of on-time submittal of a proposal.

2.2 The Government is using a two-phase procurement approach for this Design/Build project. 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 electronically in accordance with the Proposal Submission Instructions in Section 0 21 00 of the solicitation. Phase I proposal sections should parallel the submission requirements identified herein.

2.3 The complete Volume I shall be submitted electronically in accordance with the Proposal Submission Instructions in Section 00 21 00 of the solicitation and include the following information:

- Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance
  - Prime Contractor
  - A/E Designer of Record (DOR)
- Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach for Design/Build

***NOTE**: Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab 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 that exceeds the specified limit(s) will not be evaluated.

2.4 Volume II shall be submitted electronically in accordance with the Proposal Submission Instructions in Section 00 21 00 of the solicitation and shall 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 and Proof of Financial Ability
- Volume II – Tab D: Pre-Award Information

***NOTE: Phase I does NOT involve pricing submission.** Failure to place the required submission information under the appropriate tab 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 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. Technical (Volume I) proposals will be reviewed and rated. The number and identities of offerors are not revealed to anyone not involved in the evaluation and award process or to other offerors. Proposals will be evaluated based on the factors described herein.

3.2 The evaluation process for Phase I essentially consists of two parts: proposal compliance / responsibility review and 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 Technical Evaluation: The SSEB will evaluate and rate the Volume I proposals against the RFP requirements. Factor I – Past Performance will be rated using Paragraph 4.5 Tables 1 and 2. The rating will be based on overall confidence in performance, with the final confidence assessment rating based on the extent of recent, relevant past performance and the quality of the offeror's performance. Factor II – Technical Approach for Design/Build will be rated using Paragraph 4.5, Table 3.

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

4.1 Phase I proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the factors below, listed in relative order of importance. Offerors are reminded to include their best technical proposal in their initial offer. The initial offer and subsequent Government evaluation will be the basis for the Contracting Officer's selection of a target of five (5) of the most highly qualified offerors to continue on to Phase II of the procurement.

4.2	**Volume I – Factor I – Past Performance**	1st
	• Prime Contractor	Approximately Equal to A/E DOR
	• A/E Designer of Record (DOR)	Approximately Equal to Prime
4.3	**Volume I – Factor II – Technical Approach For Design/Build**	2nd
4.4	**Volume II – Pro Forma Information**	
	Tab A Standard Form 1442	Not Rated
	Tab B Joint Venture Agreement	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 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 Ratings	
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

Combined Technical/Risk Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and 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 Proposal contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

4.6 **Definitions**

1. Recency. As it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the elapsed time since the past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant.

2. Relevancy. As it pertains to past performance information, a measure of the extent of similarity between the service/support effort, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and subcontract/teaming or other comparable attributes of past performance examples and the solicitation requirements; and a measure of the likelihood the past performance is an indicator of future performance.

3. Adverse Past Performance. Past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation. Adverse past performance that must be addressed with Offerors includes unfavorable comments received from sources such as those received from respondents from past performance questionnaires or interviews that have not been finalized within a formal rating system.

4. Performance Confidence Assessment. An evaluation of the likelihood (or Government's confidence) that the offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements; the evaluation is based upon past performance information.

5. Risk. As it pertains to source selection, 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.

6. Deficiency. *Deficiency* is any part of an offer that does not conform to a material requirement of a RFP. A material requirement is one that affects price, quantity, quality, or delivery, or that the RFP requires to be met at the time of proposal submission. See RFO 15.001.

7. Strength. An aspect of an offeror's proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.

8. Significant Strength. An aspect of an Offeror's proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.

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

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

11. 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).

12. Clarifications. Limited exchanges between the Government and offerors that may occur when award without negotiations is contemplated. See RFO 15.202.

5. Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance

5.1 Submission Requirements:

5.1.1 Prime Contractor:
Provide descriptions of up to three (3) projects substantially complete or completed by the Prime Contractor within the last five (5) years (from the solicitation issue date) that are similar to this project in size and scope. Projects completed more than five (5) years before the solicitation issue 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. If commissioning is not finalized, provide its current status. 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.

NOTE 1: Projects that include exclusively new construction will **NOT** be considered similar in size or scope to the solicited project.

5.1.2 Projects considered similar in size would be complete building renovation projects that include a minimum of **15,000** square feet of renovated building. If submitting projects that include both new construction and renovation, clearly delineate (in square feet) the renovation versus new construction portion of the project and percentage (%) associated with renovation and new construction.

5.1.3 Projects considered similar in scope to this project include major renovation of building(s) of: Area

Maintenance Support Activities (AMSA), Vehicle Maintenance Shops (VMS), Organizational Maintenance Shops (OMS), Equipment Concentration Site (ECS) Facilities, Commercial Fleet Maintenance Centers, Heavy Equipment Maintenance Facilities, Industrial Equipment Depots, or other facilities which are intended for ground-vehicle maintenance with include secured, paved, and illuminated parking.

Projects can also include new construction; however, project scope shall be at least 75% building renovation, measured in square footage to be considered similar in scope. If replying with projects that are combined new and renovation construction, clearly delineate (based on square feet) the renovation versus new construction portion and percent (%) of the project. Construction/ renovation of pre-engineered metal buildings does **not** count toward a project of similar scope or size.

A major renovation is described as a "complete renovation of the facility", or replacement of major building systems and components including, but not limited to: roofs, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, fire alarm and suppression systems, ceilings, windows, doors, floor covering, interior reconfigurations, and interior finishes.

5.1.4 The prime contractor must have self-performed at least fifteen (15) percent of the direct contract labor (including testing and layout personnel), exclusive of other general conditions or field overhead personnel, material, equipment, or subcontractors to be considered similar.

5.1.5 Additional consideration may be given for projects that contain the following features:

a) Established working relationship with the proposed DOR on previous Design/Build projects.

b) Experience with current (2020 or newer) USACE Design/Build Criteria.

5.1.6 The following information shall be provided for each project:

a) Project Title, Location, and Contract Number/Unique Entity ID (UEI)

b) Current percentage of construction complete (including commissioning activities) and the date it was or will be complete.
    a. For projects that are not yet complete, provide description of work remaining to be completed.
    b. If commissioning is not finalized, provide current status.

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) If the projects were Design/Bid or Design/Bid/Build.

g) Whether the project was renovation or new construction (indicate based on Square Footage the renovation versus new construction portion and percent (%) of the project).

h) Dollar Value of Project.

i) Customer primary point of contact (POC) and alternate POC (name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current and correct phone number, and current and correct email address).

5.1.7 For this factor, also include any ratings, letters, awards, etc. that 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 by the reference. For each project, the offeror may provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the offeror's respective corrective action.

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, and sister companies will not be evaluated for past performance, unless those other contractors are part of a joint venture (JV) offeror as demonstrated by a signed JV agreement. If more than one contractor is listed in Block 14, then a signed JV agreement must be submitted with the proposal and the JV shall be registered as such in the System for Award Management (SAM). However, each party of the JV must submit their own Unique Entity Identifier Number with the JV proposal. In addition to the joint venture agreement, small business offerors submitting a proposal as a Mentor-Protégé JV under the SBA Mentor-Protégé program (MPP) shall submit a copy of their SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé agreement under Volume II, Tab B of the proposal. (See Paragraph 7.2). Projects performed by other contractors than the offeror, such as teaming partners or subcontractors, will not be evaluated for past performance, unless those other contractors are part of a JV offeror as demonstrated by a signed JV agreement. If the offeror represents the combining of two (2) or more companies as a JV for the purpose of this RFP, each company in the JV may submit project examples, but the total number of projects submitted by the JV will not exceed three (3) projects.

Relevant past performance information provided for affiliates of the offeror 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.

5.1.8 <u>A/E Designer of Record (DOR):</u>

Provide descriptions of up to three (3) projects that have been completed (*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 for similar in size and scope requirements). 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 on the project. No deviations will be permitted unless approved by the Contracting Officer. Please note that the DOR is the AE firm who is under contract with the prime contractor. IF an AE submits a past performance where they were a subcontractor to the AE who held the contract with the prime then they are NOT the DOR.

Indicate any previous working relationship with the prime contractor. In addition to the above and below, provide the information requested in paragraph 5.1.6 and 5.1.7.

The offeror must affirmatively state who their proposed DOR for the project will be and provide the DOR's Unique Entity Identification (UEI) number and CAGE Code.

5.1.9 Additional consideration may be given for the DOR projects that contain the following features:

a) Experience with current (2020 or newer) USACE Design/Build Criteria.

b) LEED Silver, Gold, or Platinum certification on the submitted project, with supporting documentation demonstrating that this certification was achieved.

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 in Paragraph 4.5, Table 1.

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 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. Past performance information retrieved through CPARS, or other sources are not subject to the same evaluation criteria but will instead be reviewed for recent negative performance, trends of negative performance, and any other performance information that may negatively impact the offeror's Confidence rating.

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 in Paragraph 4.5, Table 2, based on the SSEB's assessment of (1) the degree of the offeror's recent, relevant past performance, and (2) how well the offeror performed that past performance.

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

6. Volume I – Factor II: Technical Approach for Design/Build

6.1 **Submission Requirements:** The Technical Approach narrative shall address the information described in paragraphs 6.1.1 – 6.1.2 below.

6.1.1 Collaboration**:** Provide a narrative that describes the offeror's philosophy and intended technical approach for executing Design-Build projects. Clearly and concisely describe the offeror's Design-Build team, and how key members (e.g., Construction PM, Construction Superintendent, Construction Quality Control, SSHO, Design PM, and Design Quality Control) of the team will work collaboratively to ensure timely, quality completion of the project.

6.1.2 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, 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 designer-of-record (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.

NOTE: There is a page limit of six (6) 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 Factor.

6.2 **Evaluation Criteria**:

6.2.1 Collaboration**:** The Government will review and identify the strengths, weaknesses, and any deficiencies in the proposal. The Government will evaluate the proposal based on the offeror's understanding of the USACE Design/Build process and how well it has demonstrated its ability to successfully execute design-build projects.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's capabilities and understanding of the interactions and communications required to ensure project success. The Government places value on upon continued participation by the designers of record during the construction process.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's understanding of the design process and the roles of the designers of record, construction firm, and the Government reviewers. The evaluation will be based on how well the offeror demonstrates their organizational (i.e., the structure and staffing) ability to execute design/build projects, to include 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 role of the designer in maintaining design integrity throughout the process, including its key roles during construction.

6.2.3 Quality Control**:** The Government will review and identify the strengths, weaknesses, and any deficiencies in the proposal**.** The Government will evaluate the offeror's capabilities and understanding of the contractually required quality control processes for both design and construction. The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the staffing plan to cover all required tasks and responsibilities. The Government will evaluate the strengths of the offeror's proposed system to control and track revisions to the design. The Government will evaluate the role of the designer in maintaining design integrity throughout the process, including its key roles during construction. The Government places value upon continued participation by the designer of record during the construction quality control process.

6.3 Offerors are encouraged to tailor their proposal to demonstrate their approach for successfully completing the solicited Design/Build project.

7. Volume II – Pro Forma Information

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.

***NOTE: Phase I does NOT involve pricing submission.**

7.2 Tab B – Joint Venture 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), 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 (UEI) with the proposal. A copy of the offeror's signed joint venture agreement shall be submitted with the proposal.

In addition to the joint venture agreement, small business offerors submitting a proposal as a Mentor-Protégé JV under the SBA Mentor-Protégé program (MPP) shall submit a copy of their SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé agreement.

7.2.2 Evaluation Criteria:

This information will be used for the purpose of completing the Pre-Award Survey and will not be rated. Small business joint venture 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 set-aside acquisitions and/or small business-related price preference.

7.3 Tab C – Evidence of Ability to Obtain Bonding and 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 offeror's banking institution. If the offeror is a joint venture, submit this information for all joint venture members.

B. Bonding Capability. Submit information showing offeror's ability to be bonded for this project. Include the name, address, and telephone number of the offeror's bonding company, which must be on the approved Treasury list available at https://fiscal.treasury.gov/surety-bonds/list-certified-companies.html.

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

7.4.2 Evaluation Criteria:

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