

## **GENERAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

The intent of this solicitation is to select one contractor for the Construction of a Power Generation Microgrid project at CCSFS. The Government will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the criteria described herein and award a firm fixed price contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforms with all the terms and conditions of the solicitation and whose proposal is determined to represent the overall best value to the Government.

The basis of award is the Tradeoff Process. All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) based on the evaluation factors.

The Offeror's proposal shall be submitted in electronic format. Files shall not contain classified data. The use of hyperlinks in proposals is prohibited.

**ALL SUBMISSIONS TO THIS ANNOUNCEMENT SHALL BE SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH PIEE, SOLICITATION MODULE. SUBMISSIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED VIA THE OPEN  
SOLICITATION ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SOLICITATION NUMBER. DO NOT SUBMIT IN THE  
“UNSOLICITED PROPOSALS” SECTION.**

Electronic proposal submission is required through the Army's electronic file sharing service, Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) (<https://piee.eb.mil/>), Solicitation module, open solicitation associated with this solicitation number. No paper copies, CDROMs, email, or facsimile submissions will be accepted.

Information regarding how to set up a vendor registration is included in this link:  
<https://piee.eb.mil/xhtml/unauth/web/homepage/vendorGettingStartedHelp.xhtml>

Information regarding role assignment during vendor registration is included in this link:  
<https://sam.gov/opp/2b0a3d5c4c454beb8fefafa3d844544a1d/view>

**File Size Limitations:** Offerors are advised to follow the PIEE instructions for uploading files. PIEE supports delivery up to 1.9 GB per file, with no limit on the number of files, as well as multiple file formats. If needed, Offerors may break the files down into smaller sections in order to upload. In such cases, please divide the sections as logically as possible and be sure to clearly name the files as specified below.

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

**W912WJ26RA003\_Company Name\_Volume I: Past Performance and Management Approach**

**W912WJ26RA003\_Company Name\_Volume II: Small Business Participation Commitment Document**

**W912WJ26RA003\_Company Name\_Volume III: Price and Other Pro Forma Information**

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

**Upload Completion and Deadline:** Interested parties shall submit proposals no later than the date and time specified on the solicitation document. The time and date of proposal receipt will be the upload completion/delivery time and date recorded within the PIEE, Solicitation module, open solicitation associated with this solicitation number. Do not assume that electronic submission will occur instantaneously. Large files (e.g., 10MB or more) will take some time to upload. Offerors should time their upload effort and not wait until the last minute to submit as there may be delays in the transmittal process. Offerors are encouraged to keep a copy of the PIEE upload confirmation for their records.

Proposals sent through proprietary or third-party file transfer sites, email, PIEE modules other than the Solicitation module (open solicitation associated with this solicitation number), or DoD SAFE WILL NOT be retrieved and evaluated. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to confirm timely receipt of proposals. All proposals received, as confirmed by the date and time recorded within the PIEE, Solicitation module after the exact time specified for receipt on the solicitation document, shall be treated as late submissions and will not be considered.

Offerors are cautioned that "parroting" of the requirements of the Plans and Specifications with a statement of intent to perform does not reflect an understanding of the requirement or capability to perform. Offerors are responsible for including sufficient details to permit a complete and accurate evaluation of their proposal. Proprietary information shall be clearly marked.

#### Proposal Submission Requirements

Each volume should be submitted in a digital format. Any pages that are changed (as a result of discussions or proposal revisions) should be of a different color and should have changed information clearly marked by a vertical line in the right margin of the page. The revised pages shall be dated. Each volume should be clearly labeled with its title.

Each volume should be single spaced. Each paragraph should be separated by at least one blank line. A standard, 12-point minimum font size applies. Arial or Times New Roman fonts are required. Tables and illustrations may use a reduced font size no less than 11-point and may be landscape oriented.

The following volumes of material shall be submitted:

VOLUME & TITLE	DIGITAL COPIES	PAGE LIMITS
Volume I: Past Performance & Management Approach	1	20
Volume II: Small Business Participation Commitment Document	1	N/A
Volume III: Price	1	N/A

**NOTE: All pages, including but not limited to cover letters, cover pages, dividers, blank pages, Table of Contents pages, tables, illustrations, and appendices, will be counted in the page calculation. Pages that exceed the above noted page limitations will be removed, not read, and not evaluated. CPARS reports and PPQs will not be counted toward the page**

**limit. Agreements or letters of commitment (including Joint Venture agreements) will not be counted toward the page limit but shall be included as an Appendix to Volume I.**

11x17 folded pages are acceptable for tables/graphic representations; however, each 11x17 page counts as two pages.

#### Proposal File Format and Packaging

Format. The submission shall be clearly indexed and logically assembled. Each volume should be clearly identified and begin at the top of a page. All pages of each volume shall be consecutively numbered and identified by the complete company name, date, and solicitation number in the header and/or footer. MS Word (doc/docx) files shall use the following page setup parameters:

Margins – Top, Bottom, Left, Right – 1”  
Gutter – 0”  
From Edge – Header, Footer 0.5”  
Page Size, Width – 8.5”  
Page Size, Height – 11”

File Packaging. All of the proposal electronic files shall be submitted in their native formats (e.g., docx, xlsx, ppt) and uploaded electronically. CDs, DVD, Zip disks or USB drives are not permitted.  
*\*\*Please note – Self extracting exe files are not acceptable.\*\**

In addition, copies of all files in PDF format shall also be provided. All price breakdown information to aid in the price evaluation shall be submitted in Microsoft Office Excel Read/Write format and viewable in Microsoft Excel 365.

#### **Volume I – Factor I: Past Performance Submission Requirements**

Provide descriptions of no more than three (3) projects which are similar to this project in scope and size and completed within the last eight (8) years from the proposal due date. All project information shall be presented in narrative form. Any charts or other graphics used to show areas of similarity (e.g., checklists) will not be reviewed by the SSEB. For all submitted projects, provide the following information:

- Project Description
- Type of Contract (e.g., Design-Build (DB) or Design-Bid-Build (DBB))
- Role on the Contract (i.e., Prime or Sub) for each member of the proposed team who participated in the project execution
- Month and year that construction started, and date construction completed
- Total cost of construction for project (if Prime) or the final cost of construction portions completed for project (if Sub)
- Specialized construction features of the project to include all relevancy requirement as detailed below

To be considered recent, projects must have been fully completed within the last eight (8) years from the date that the initial solicitation was issued.

To be considered relevant, projects must include all of the following:

- New construction or renovation of facilities or electrical services with a total construction cost of \$50,000,000 or more.
- At least three (3) of the following disciplines contributed to the project: architectural, civil/site, mechanical, life safety, structural, and telecommunications.
- Project scope included high voltage work as defined in the National Electric Code (NEC), which describes high voltage work as an electrical system having a potential difference of more than 1,000 volts nominal. (Also noted in the NEC, circuits and equipment rated at potential differences of more than 1,000 volts and up to 52 kV are also commonly referred to as medium voltage.)

Projects may be more highly rated for relevancy if they meet relevancy requirements above and any of the following:

- New construction or renovation of facilities or electrical services with construction costs of \$90,000,000 or more.
- Project was performed at an U.S. Military Installation or other Federal Facility.
- Project scope included any of the following significant schedule constraints such as user occupied facilities during construction, restricted work hours due to user operations, and/or incentive for an early finish.
- Project scope was performed in an area with constrained physical security protocols such as, but not limited to, security escort required, restricted access area, and/or DoD security clearance.
- Project scope included a battery energy storage system integrated with renewable energy technologies, such as solar or wind.
- Project scope included the installation, repair, and/or replacement of High-Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) shielding systems per MIL-STD-188-125-1A.

At least one project shall be provided for the prime Offeror (the entity signing the SF1442). If the members of a Joint Venture do not have previous experience working together in a JV, one project shall be submitted for each member of the JV (see Attachment A). The Offeror may utilize experience of another Team Member that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate experience under this evaluation factor. If an Offeror is utilizing the experience of a Team Member, then that Team Member's submitted projects(s) must show them performing recent work similar to the work they intend to perform on the upcoming contract.

A project is defined as work performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quality type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project. In this event, Offerors shall submit the work performed under a task order as a project, or it will not be reviewed. If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity.

An Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC), Design-Build-Own-Operate-Maintain (DBOOM), or any Multiple Services contracts may be submitted but shall only reflect the relevant work as described above. The price/cost associated with such project shall only reflect relevant work as described above and exclusively the construction portions of work.

Do not submit more than three (3) projects. If more than three projects are submitted, only the first three projects will be evaluated and additional projects will be excluded.

In addition to the information above, for each project, Offerors should submit past performance information as follows:

1. For Federal Government projects with a Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Evaluation, provide a copy of the CPARS report that includes the contract number, contract place of performance, and DUNS number. In the case of Indefinite Delivery type contracts, GSA contracts, and Blanket Purchase Agreements, include Task or Delivery Order Numbers.
2. For non-Federal Government projects, commercial projects, and Federal Government projects without a CPARS Evaluation: provide a Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment B). The Offeror should complete Blocks 1-4 of the PPQ and send it to the non-Federal project client or commercial project client. The client should complete Blocks 5-8 along with the two-page questionnaire. The Offeror should include the PPQ in Volume I of the proposal. See Attachment B.

If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project before the 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. The Government may make reasonable attempts to contact the client noted for that project to obtain the PPQ information. However, Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to help ensure timely submittal of questionnaires.

Alternatively, Offerors may submit a copy of the client's signed PPQ (the only format accepted will be that which is included in this solicitation) for a completed contract or task order. The Offeror may retain PPQs in its files for submission on future procurements. In cases where the validity of the completed PPQ is questioned, contracting personnel may contact the reference for verification or additional information. The standard PPQ for USACE is Form PPQ-0 (9/30/11) which is provided in this solicitation. USACE does not intend to create or maintain a database of PPQs submitted by Offerors. Therefore, it will be the Offeror's responsibility to ensure the submission of relevant PPQs in its proposal. Alternatively, the Offeror may obtain an updated/new PPQ from its client(s) for submission as provided above.

The Government may use data provided by the Offeror in its proposal, and data obtained from other sources, including data in Government files. The Government reserves the right to obtain past performance information from any source available and has the right to contact customers other than those listed by the Offeror to evaluate past performance. The Government reserves the right to verify statements the Offeror makes regarding its past performance to determine whether they are substantiated.

New corporate entities may submit data on prior contracts involving its officers and employees. However, in addition to the other requirements in this section, the Offeror shall discuss in detail the role performed by such persons in the prior contracts cited. Information on their proposed roles should be included in the project descriptions submitted in response to the solicitation requirements.

## **Volume I – Factor II: Management Approach Submission Requirements**

Provide a management plan for the project that includes, at a minimum:

- An expanded organizational chart and supporting narrative description of the Offeror's overall structure and management of the project team from the Offeror's Headquarters to the Offeror's site office(s). The chart and narrative must:
  - Identify all offices anticipated to be involved in this contract.
  - Identify job positions by title only (no specific personnel names), organization, and physical location and how they are related, to include all proposed team members, such as JV partners (where applicable), proposed subcontractors (where applicable) and consultants (where applicable), including lines of reporting and their technical areas of responsibility under the contract.
  - Clearly show the lines of authority for all job positions involved in executing the project.
- A narrative describing the Management Approach which, at a minimum, includes:
  - The planned approach to: mobilization; equipment procurement; construction administration; cost and schedule control; phased construction execution; risk mitigation; coordination and management of in-house personnel and subcontractors; and coordination with USACE and stakeholders.
  - A description of the duties, roles, major responsibilities, and authorities for all critical personnel/job titles. Please do not provide specific personnel names or resumes.
  - A description of tools and strategies to be used within the team and with USACE, the user, and the owner during construction and upon turnover of completed work.

## **Volume II – Factor III: Small Business Participation Commitment Document Submission Requirements**

This factor applies to both other than small businesses and small businesses. Offerors shall use Attachment C (Small Business Participation Commitment Document) to demonstrate its proposed approach to meeting small business goals and objectives.

Offerors shall address the planned small business usage for this requirement. Offerors will be evaluated on the level of proposed small business participation in the performance of this acquisition relative to the goals, objectives, and requirements established herein.

Other-than-small business contractors may achieve small business participation through subcontracting to small businesses. Small business contractors may achieve small business participation through their own performance/participation as a prime and through joint ventures, teaming arrangements, and/or subcontracting to other small businesses. A small business prime offerors' own participation as a prime counts towards the percentages set forth in this evaluation factor. A small business prime whose own performance accounts for equal to or more than 20% of the Total Acquisition Value and demonstrates meaningful commitment to small business participation (through self-performance, teaming, and/or SB subs) may receive a rating of "Acceptable" or higher under Factor 3. Small businesses are not required to subcontract to other small businesses to achieve small business participation.

This factor is organized into the following sections via the Small Business Participation Commitment Document:

- Section 1 – Division of Work; Small Business Goals and Corresponding Dollars.
- Section 2 – Enforceable Commitments to Small Businesses.
- Section 3 – Past Performance Compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-8 (Utilization of Small Business Concerns) (SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY).
- Section 4 – Past Performance Compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-9 (Small Business Subcontracting Plan) (OTHER-THAN-SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY).

All supporting documentation for the Small Business Participation Commitment Document shall be included within Attachment C. Documentation not within the Small Business Participation Commitment Document will not be considered. Documentation shall not be included in other volumes.

### **Volume III – Factor IV: Price Submission Requirements**

The Offeror should provide a table of contents and should number all pages consecutively. Volume III should be submitted in a separate file from Volumes I and II. Volume III should be broken down into sections defined below:

Section 1: The name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) authorized to negotiate and sign a contract. Also, provide a Certificate of Corporate Authority or other applicable documentation of authorized signature(s) for each authorized individual.

Section 2: The Offer (the SF1442) duly executed with an original signature by an official authorized to bind the company or Joint Venture.

Section 3: Acknowledgement of all amendments to the solicitation.

Section 4: Each Offeror is required to complete (in entirety) the bid schedule provided in the solicitation. All cost and pricing data supplied by Offerors will represent data other than certified cost or pricing data as defined by FAR 2. 101.

### **Joint Venture and Mentor Protégé Agreements Submission Requirements**

Small business Offerors (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone, SDVOSB, etc.) submitting a proposal as a Joint Venture or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture shall submit evidence from the Offeror's SBA Servicing Agency that the Offeror has notified and discussed the proposed joint venture for this specific project with the appropriate SBA Representative or Business Opportunity Specialist. **JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENTS AND APPROVED MENTOR-PROTÉGÉ AGREEMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL.**

### **Project Labor Agreements**

Offerors shall submit Project Labor Agreements (PLAs) in accordance with FAR 22.504(b) and FAR 52.222-34. Incomplete, nonbinding, or unsigned agreements will not be accepted. Proposals that lack PLAs or provide PLAs that are not compliant with FAR Subpart 22.5 will be ineligible for award.

## **BASIS FOR AWARD**

The award will be made based on the best value proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the four (4) evaluation factors: Past Performance, Management Approach, Small Business Participation Commitment Document, and Price. The non-price factors are in descending order of importance. ALL EVALUATION FACTORS OTHER THAN PRICE, WHEN COMBINED, ARE SIGNIFICANTLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN PRICE.

Award will be based on the best overall proposal that is determined to be the best value to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the non-price and price factors. To receive consideration for award, a confidence assessment rating of no less than "Neutral Confidence" must be achieved for Factor 1 and a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for Factors 2 and 3. Offerors should note that the award may not necessarily be made to the lowest priced offer. The resulting award will be a firm-fixed-price Construction contract.

## **Factors to be Evaluated**

### Volume I

- Factor 1 – Past Performance
- Factor 2 – Management Approach

### Volume II

- Factor 3 – Small Business Participation Commitment Document

### Volume III

- Factor 4 – Price

Evaluation of the Offeror's proposal shall address each factor as it applies to the Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria contained in the RFP. A detailed explanation of the criteria for the evaluation set forth in the "Evaluation Approach" section. During evaluations of each proposal, the Government will assign each factor an adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings.

The evaluation process essentially consists of four parts: proposal compliance review, technical evaluation, price evaluation, and price/technical trade-off analysis.

Proposal Compliance Review: This is an initial review to ensure that all required forms and certifications are complete and that both a technical and price proposal were received.

Technical Evaluation: The SSEB will evaluate and rate the technical proposals (i.e., Volume I) against the RFP requirements. Some factors will be rated using an adjectival-based system (Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, Unacceptable). Others will be rated based on confidence in performance, with the final confidence assessment rating based on the extent of recent, relevant experience, and how well the Offeror performed on that experience.

Price Evaluation: The Price SSEB Member will evaluate price proposals independent of the technical evaluation.

Price/Technical Trade-off Analysis: After the above evaluations are complete, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will compare the relative advantages and disadvantages of the technical proposals and compare prices. The SSA will then consider all factors to select the proposal offering the best value to the Government.

## **Definitions**

Deficiency. A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

Strength. An aspect of an Offerors' proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Significant Strength. An aspect of an Offerors' proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

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

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

Uncertainty. Any aspect of a non-price/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).

The Contracting Officer will award a firm fixed price contract to the responsible Offeror whom the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable, and offers the best overall value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers.

*NOTE: For submission requirements designated as "shall" or "must," failure to provide the requested information will be considered a deficiency and the specified factor will be rated red/unacceptable, and the Offer will be considered un-awardable unless revised. For submission requirements designated as "should," failure to provide the requested information will result in a lower rating for the specified factor and may result in a deficiency and unacceptable rating. Offerors are cautioned that award may be made without discussions, and Offerors may not have the opportunity to submit revised proposals.*

## **Volume I – Factor 1: Past Performance Evaluation Criteria**

Factor I will be rated using the ratings shown in the Past Performance Relevancy and Past Performance Confidence Assessment ratings tables, Table 1 and 2 below.

For Past Performance, the Government is assessing (1) the degree of how similar (relevant) the Offeror's recent past performance effort is compared to the scope, size, and level of effort and complexities this solicitation requires, and (2) how the Offeror performed on that effort.

The past performance of an Offeror's affiliate (e.g. parent company, subsidiary, or other affiliated concern) will only be considered where the Offeror's Factor I proposal establishes that the affiliate resources--its workforce, management, facilities, or other resources--will be provided or relied upon for contract performance, such that the affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. The proposal must demonstrate a connection between the affiliate's proposed role on this contract and the role of the affiliate on the past performance submitted in order to receive credit for the affiliate's past performance.

**Table 1 – Past Performance Relevancy Ratings**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
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 – Past Performance Confidence Assessments Ratings**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
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.

The SSEB will first evaluate the recency and relevancy of recent past performance identified in the proposal using the criteria identified above to determine how similar a past project is compared to the scope and size, and to the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

The SSEB will next review how well the Offeror performed on those projects. In addition to the information submitted by the Offeror, the Government may review any other sources of relevant information for evaluating past performance, including projects other than those submitted by the Offeror. The Government may review past performance information retrieved through the including Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), using all CAGE/Unique Entity Identifiers (formerly DUNS number) identified in the Offeror's proposal. Other sources of information for evaluating past performance 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.

The SSEB will assign a final, overall Performance Confidence rating to each Offeror based on the SSEB's assessment of (1) the extent of the Offeror's recent, relevant experience, and (2) how well the Offeror performed that experience.

*NOTE: The past performance of individuals (e.g. key personnel) will not be credited under the Past Performance factor.*

*NOTE: Where 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 will receive a Neutral Confidence rating. This rating is neither favorable nor unfavorable.*

#### **Volume I – Factor II: Management Approach Evaluation Criteria**

Factor II will be rated using the adjectival ratings shown in the Technical Assessment Ratings table, Table 3 below.

<b>Table 3 – Technical Assessment Ratings</b>	
<b>Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.

Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. <b>Proposal is unawardable.</b>

Comprehensive plans that demonstrate a clear understanding of the work, minimizing interruptions, maintaining access to facilities, and an ability to coordinate resources to ensure successful pursuit of the work will be considered to meet the RFP requirements. Plans will also be evaluated based on the level of involvement the Offeror will have in the management, oversight, control, and coordination of the work performed by subcontractors. The SSEB will evaluate the clarity, adequacy, capabilities, and strengths of the Offeror's organizational chart for managing a successful project. An organizational chart that clearly depicts a highly qualified on-site team supported by appropriate resources off-site and that clearly defines responsibilities will be considered to meet the RFP requirements.

A Management Plan may be more highly rated if the narrative describes the unique strategies to specifically execute and/or reduce risk of the project.

*NOTE: Any identified strengths of the Management Plan, as it relates to the unique strategies described, will be incorporated into and made part of the contract upon award.*

#### **Volume II – Factor III: Small Business Participation Commitment Document Evaluation Criteria**

Factor III will be rated using the adjectival ratings shown in the Small Business Participation Plan Ratings table, Table 4 below.

**Table 4 – Small Business Participation Commitment Document Ratings**

Adjectival Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.

Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the small business objectives.
--------------	---

All Offerors (both large and small businesses), regardless of size status, should address their planned small business usage for this requirement and will be evaluated on the level of proposed participation of Small Businesses in the performance of this acquisition (as small business prime offerors or small business subcontractors) relative to the objectives, requirements, and goals established herein. The Government will evaluate the following:

#### Section 1 - Division of Work; Small Business Goals and Corresponding Dollars

The extent of participation of small business prime offerors and small business subcontractors in terms of the percentage of the Offeror's Total Acquisition Value\*. Total Acquisition Value is defined as the proposed base plus all option price. The extent to which the Offeror meets or exceeds the Minimum Quantitative Requirement of 20% for Small Business. **There are no specific Socio-Economic Small Business Goals.** The Offeror must provide goals for other Socio-Economic Small Business Categories as follows: Small Disadvantaged Business, Woman-Owned Small Business, HUBZone Small Business, Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business, and Veteran-Owned Small Business. The goals are a percentage of the Total Acquisition Value. **Each Participation Goal is reflected off the Total Acquisition Value\*.**

Proposals that do not meet the Minimum Quantitative Requirement of at least 20% for Small Business will be rated "Unacceptable."

#### Section 2 - Enforceable Commitments to Small Businesses.

The extent of commitment to use small businesses as defined in FAR Part 19. Refer to Section 2 of Attachment C: Small Business Participation Commitment Document to understand what constitutes an enforceable commitment.

#### Section 3 - Past Performance Compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-8 (Utilization of Small Business Concerns) (SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY).

The past performance evaluation of an Offerors' compliance with the requirements of FAR clause 52.219-8. This applies only to small business Offerors. Proposing a combination of documentation showing past compliance with FAR clause 52.219-8 may be rated more favorably. Reference Attachment C for documentation information.

#### Section 4 - Past Performance Compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-9 (Small Business Subcontracting Plan) (OTHER-THAN-SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY).

The past performance evaluation of an Offerors' compliance with the requirements of FAR clause 52.219-9. This applies only to other than small business Offerors. Demonstrating past compliance with FAR clause 52.219-9 also demonstrates past compliance with FAR clause 52.219-8. Reference Attachment C for documentation information.

### **Volume III – Factor IV: Price Evaluation Criteria**

The contract will be a firm-fixed-price contract.

The Government will evaluate the price for price reasonableness.

- A price analysis will be performed by the Government to determine that the proposal prices offered are fair and reasonable, and that there is no unbalanced pricing.

- Price reasonableness will be determined in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1). Normally, competition establishes price reasonableness. Comparison of the proposed prices is expected to satisfy the requirement to perform a price analysis; however, the Government may, if necessary, analyze the Offeror's Line Item structure to establish reasonableness of an otherwise successful Offeror's price.

### **Joint Venture and Mentor-Protégé Agreements**

Joint Venture Agreements and Mentor-Protege agreements must comply with the relevant regulations in Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Failure to comply with these regulations could result in the Offeror being found ineligible for award on an acquisition set-aside for small business concerns.

### **Discussions**

The Government intends to award without discussions. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a technical and price standpoint. Proposals will be analyzed to determine which is most advantageous to the Government based upon information provided in response to evaluation factors.

The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Source Selection Authority (SSA) later determines them to be necessary. If the SSA determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, 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 rated proposals. If the Government does conduct discussions, these will be in writing.

At no time during this process, or during the debriefing, or after award, will the names of individuals providing reference information about an Offeror's past performance be revealed to the Offerors or to any other party.