

INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND OTHER STATEMENTS TO BIDDERS/OFFERORS

2.0 EVALUATION OF OFFERS

The Government is issuing this Request for SF330s in accordance with FAR 36.602-1 and VAAR 836.602-1 and the Short-List Criteria Utilizing the SF 330 Form. The VA will evaluate contractor offers in the descending order of importance below. The contractor must address all the different evaluation factors below, or the proposal will not be evaluated. The government is interested in proposals that offer the best value in meeting the requirements with acceptable risk at a fair and reasonable price. All of the following different evaluation factors will be rated equally with the exception of 2.0 g, which is solely a request to provide evidence of small business status.

All offers must include information in their offers which address the following evaluation criteria:

2.0 a. Specialized experience and technical competence of the firm –Describe in detail the technical expertise of the firm, and how it relates to the project listed in the scope of work (see attached). Emphasize any specialized experienced the firm has in providing design services to enhance physical security, preferably within the VA, or a government facility.

2.0 b. Specialized experience and qualifications of personnel proposed for assignment to the project and record of working together as a team – Describe the education, training, and experience of your architectural and engineering design team, and supervisor as it relates to their ability to perform a job of this size and scope. All proposed team members and supervisor shall have the minimum education, training and experience as is normally expected of a company actively providing the required services and should have demonstrated experience to perform a project such as this within a VA Medical Center Hospital.

2.0 c. Professional capacity of the firm in the designated geographic area of the project to perform work (including any specialized services) within the time limitations. Unusually large existing workload that may limit A/E's capacity to perform project work expeditiously – Describe how the firm has the professional capacity to meet the VA time frames listed in the scope of work. Also, if relevant, highlight any potential limitations due to the firm's geographic location. If such geographic limitations exist, demonstrate how the firm intends to overcome those limitations. In addition, describe the firm's current workload, and any impact that may have on taking on absorbing a new project the scope of this Physical Security project. And if that workload would adversely impact a new project the scope of this Physical Security design, then demonstrate how the firm intends to increase its work load capacity to complete this project.

2.0 d. Past Performance/References – All offerors shall provide the names, addresses and phone numbers of at least three previous customers on jobs of similar size and scope within the past 2 years in order that the VA may assess the level of competence demonstrated on these jobs. All three references must provide a favorable reference check to the Government.

2.0 e. Geographic location and facilities of the working office(s) which would provide the professional services and familiarity with the area in which the project is located – Describe any advantages that the geographic location of the firm's working offices would offer in terms of familiarity with the area.

2.0 f. Demonstrate success in prescribing the use of recovered materials and achieving waste reduction and energy efficiency in facility design – Submit the firm’s policy as regards to waste reduction/energy efficiency in terms of design. Provide past examples where designs (preferably Physical Security designs) included reduction/energy efficiency.

2.0 g. Small business / socio- economic status – provide the applicable certifications of the firms business size standard. The official source of record for small service disabled veteran owned business (SDVOSB) or veteran owned business (VOSB) is the VA’s CVE site. All offerors must be certified by the VA CVE, or the offer will be rejected with no consideration.

Each evaluation factor above will be rated using the following adjectival ratings/definitions, except for past performance, which will have the additional factor of “Neutral - No criteria information was provided, or inconclusive”:

Technical Ratings	
Rating	Description
Excellent	SF330 demonstrates <i>excellent</i> understanding of the requirement and significantly <i>exceeds</i> performance standards. SF330 has several <i>strengths that will benefit the government</i> . SF330 has <i>no weaknesses</i> .
Very Good	SF330 demonstrates a <i>very good</i> understanding of the requirement and has 2 or more <i>strengths</i> that will benefit the government and <i>any proposal weakness</i> has very little potential to cause disruption of schedule.
Good	SF330 demonstrates a <i>good</i> understanding of the requirement and has 1 or more <i>strengths</i> that will benefit the government and <i>any proposal weakness</i> has little potential to cause disruption of schedule.
Satisfactory	SF330 demonstrates an <i>acceptable</i> understand of the requirement the proposal has <i>no strengths</i> that will benefit the government and <i>no material weaknesses</i> .
Neutral	No past performance.
Marginal	SF330 demonstrates a <i>limited</i> understand of the requirement the approach only marginally meets performance standards. SF330 has <i>minor omissions</i> and demonstrates a <i>misunderstanding</i> of the requirement.

Unsatisfactory	SF330 demonstrates a <i>misunderstanding</i> of the requirement and the <i>approach fails</i> to meet performance standards. SF330 has <i>major omissions</i> and <i>inadequate</i> details to assure evaluations offeror has understanding of requirement.
----------------	---