

EVALUATION FACTORS

- I. Submissions of completed Standard Form 330 (SF 330) received in response to this notice will be evaluated by a government evaluation board in accordance with The Brooks Act, Public Law 92-582, the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 36, and VA Acquisition Regulation (VAAR) 836.6. Evaluation of past performance and experience may include information provided by the offeror, customer inquiries, government databases, and publicly available sources. Failure to provide requested data, accessible points of contact, or valid phone numbers may result in a firm being considered less qualified. Offerors are responsible for collecting and submitting past performance questionnaires with their final packages to stephen.clabough@va.gov before the closing date of this pre-solicitation.
- II. Selection Criteria: Each firm must demonstrate their (including subcontractors') qualifications with respect to the selection criteria listed below. SF-330s will be evaluated to determine the most highly qualified firm/team based on submitted SF-330 responses. Failure to provide requested data or comply with the instructions in this synopsis and SF-330 instructions could result in a firm being considered less qualified or eliminated from consideration. Specific evaluation criteria include:
 1. Professional qualifications necessary for satisfactory performance of required services.
 2. Specialized experience and technical competence in the type of work required, including, where appropriate, experience in energy conservation, pollution prevention, waste reduction, and the use of recovered materials.
 3. Capacity to accomplish work in the required time.
 4. Past performance on contracts with Government agencies and private industry in terms of cost control, quality of work, and compliance with performance schedules.
 5. Location of the A/E Firm and professional familiarity working in the project location.
 6. Reputation and standing of the firm and its principal officials with respect to professional performance, general management, and cooperativeness.
 7. Record of significant claims against the firm because of improper or incomplete architectural and engineering services.
 8. Specific experience and qualifications of personnel proposed for assignment to the project and their record of working together as a team.

III. **EVALUATIONS**

The following adjectival ratings will be used to evaluate the documentation submitted:

Excellent	The firm's proposal demonstrates excellent understanding of the requirement and significantly exceeds performance standards. The firm has several strengths that will benefit the government. The proposal submitted has no weaknesses.
Good	The firm's proposal demonstrates a good understanding of the requirement and has 1 or more strengths that will benefit the government and any weakness of the proposal has little potential to cause disruption to the schedule.
Satisfactory	The firm's proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the requirement, and the firm's proposal has no major strengths that will benefit the government, but also no material weaknesses.
Marginal	The firm's proposal demonstrates a limited understanding of the requirement, and the firm only marginally meets performance standards. The firm's proposal has minor omissions and demonstrates a misunderstanding of the requirement.
Unacceptable	The firm's proposal demonstrates a misunderstanding of the requirement and the approach fails to meet performance standards. The firm's proposal has major omissions and inadequate details to assure evaluators that the offeror has an understanding of requirement.