

PROPOSAL PREPARATION, EVALUATION, AND BASIS FOR AWARD

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATIONS

This part describes proposal submission instructions, description of evaluation factors, and basis for award for the “*Replace Iron Fence and Pilaster for the Golden Gate National Cemetery*”.

1. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS:

Prospective offerors must submit:

ONE (1) ELECTRONIC copy to tene.becknell@va.gov no later than time and date specified in solicitation or as amended.

Interested firms are responsible for ensuring electronic delivery of submission by the time and the date specified. It will be highly recommended interested firms confirm electronic submissions have been received by the Contracting Officer.

Prospective offerors will be advised that size limits of e-mails are restricted to 10MB.

Also prospective offerors will provide three (3) hardcopies of proposal; with, the original bid guarantee must be provided to the contracting officer. Proposal and bid guarantee should be mailed or hand carried to the following address:

Department of Veterans Affairs
National Cemetery Administration (NCA)
Contracting Service
Attn: Ms. Tené Becknell
75 Barrett Heights, Suite 309
Stafford, VA 22556

All offers shall clearly identify the procurement number, project title and subject line of their electronic submission, and will be responsible for ensuring electronic delivery of offers.

To ensure timely and equitable evaluation of proposals, offeror must follow the instructions contained herein. Proposals must be complete, self-sufficient, and respond directly to the requirement of this solicitation.

Offerors must provide all requested information for each factor and sub-factor. Proposals must separately address each element of each factor and sub-factor as applicable to be considered responsive to this RFP. Factor and sub-factors headings must be highlighted or typed in bold text for identification. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure the submitted proposal is in the proper format, the provided information is clearly understood and free of ambiguities.

Offerors proposals shall consist of both a technical and price proposal, as described below, and shall be submitted by email to: tene.becknell@va.gov.

- A. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL** - Technical proposal shall be submitted separately from the price proposal of the solicitation requirements identified below. The following format shall be used:

TAB A. General Information

- Cover Page with Solicitation Number (36C78618Q9623)
- Table of Contents
- Company information to include DUNS Number, Cage Code, Tax ID number, principal points of contact, address, phone numbers, email address, etc.

TAB B: Technical Evaluation Factors:

- Factor 1 - Technical Capabilities
- Factor 2 - Past Performance

- B. PRICE PROPOSAL** – Price proposal shall be submitted separately from the technical proposal of the solicitation requirements identified below: The following format shall be used:

TAB A: General Information,

- Cover Page with Solicitation Number, Project Title,
- Table of Contents
- SF 1442 Signed offer/Amendments – Complete Blocks 17-20C
- Vendor Information Pages (VIP) Certification
- Offer Guarantee Bond
- Acknowledgement of Amendments

TAB B: Price Offer Schedule

- Bid Schedule
- Proposal Breakdown Schedule

2. BASIS FOR AWARD

Awardee will be selected for award based on FAR Part 15.101 and VAAR 815.

This is a competitive best value trade-off source selection in which evaluation factors are price and non-priced factors will be used.

Factor 1- Technical Capabilities and Factor 2-Past/Present Performance are equal in importance;

Factor 3 Price/Cost will not be rated or scored. By submission of its offer, the offeror agrees to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete

accompanying rationale. The government intends to award a firm fixed price contract to the most highly qualified offeror. The Government reserves the right to award a contract to other than the offeror offering the lowest price. The Government's objective is to obtain the highest technical quality considered necessary to achieve the project objectives, at a realistic and reasonable cost.

3. AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The Government intends to make award without discussions. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer determines discussions to be necessary.

4. EVALUATION

The evaluation consists of the following parts:

- a. Proposal Compliance Review: The Government will review all proposals received to determine if they are responsive to the solicitation requirements. A responsive offer is one that meets all the terms, conditions, and specifications of the solicitation. Offeror shall provide all documents listed and comply with all proposal instructions for their proposal to be considered "responsive" to this solicitation. This review may eliminate offerors that fail to provide all the required information and documents in the format and detail specified.
- b. Technical Evaluation: This evaluation is accomplished by the Technical Evaluation Board (TEB) of each proposal against the factors and subfactors as stated in the solicitation.
- c. Past Performance Evaluation: This evaluation is accomplished by the TEB and Contracting Team to determine past, present, relevant performance; customer satisfaction; quality, timeliness; and compliance with local laws.
- d. Price/Cost Evaluation: Price/cost will be evaluated for reasonableness by the contracting team. Prices will not be revealed to TEB members who are conducting the evaluation of other non-price/cost factors or sub-factors until they have completed their evaluation of the factors and sub-factors.
- e. Best Value Analysis: After the completion of the technical and price/cost evaluations, the CO will consider the price and technical ratings to determine the proposal offering the most advantage to the Government.

Evaluation Factors and Sub-factors

The Government will evaluate the factors and sub-factors described below:

Evaluation factors: An offer will be selected for award based on FAR Part 15.101 and VAAR 815. This selection will be based on an integrated evaluation as described below. Factor 1 and Factor 2 are equal in importance.

A. Factor 1-Technical Capabilities

Relevant Project Experience

(a) Specialized and Technical Experience: Provide a description of relevant, recent construction and similar projects (fence, iron fence, pilaster structure construction, iron/pilaster repair, etc.) with clients, for which the team members provided a significant technical contribution. Work on these projects must have been in the last five years. Indicate how each project is relevant to this procurement described herein.

(b) Professional Qualifications: Submit a matrix of proposed team(s) members, that contain the following data about the members assignment: members' name, offeror name, proposed team assignment, percent of time to be spent on this team, education level/discipline (example: BS, mechanical engineering), state(s) of professional registration, number of years of professional experience, and number of years with the firm. At a minimum the qualification of Project Executive, Project Manager, and Superintendent. Also for project managers and superintendent, identify the number of teams they have managed over the past five years.

(c) Commitment to small business: Use of small business concerns as sub-contractor(s). Demonstrate commitment and use of small business concerns as sub-contractor(s) on this contract. (Demonstrated commitment is pre-awarded contracts and agreements (submitted with proposal) with small businesses to perform on this requirement.)

Provide a chart with each small business category; identify the proposed names of the small businesses and subcontracting the prime anticipates to subcontract. The government will also evaluate the offerors use of Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSBs) or Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSBs), 8(a), Hub-zone, Woman-owned or any other small business. Evaluation of the offeror's proposed SDVOSB or VOSB involvement will be based on the information presented in the offeror's proposal and on the registration information in the VetBiz.gov VIP database (<http://www.vetbiz.gov>) at the time of the offeror's submission.

Construction/Management Approach (Page limitation: 10 pages NOT including schedule)

(a) Construction Approach: Shall demonstrate how the proposal will:

- addresses construction activities and work elements consistent with the proposed schedule;
- support of innovative construction solutions to improve feasibility and/or overcome challenges and risks.
- demonstrates flexibility to address differing site conditions with minimal impact to cost and schedule.

(b) Proposed Progress Schedule: The proposal shall include a comprehensive narrative describing the construction activities as related to the construction work elements. The narrative shall clearly convey the Offeror's understanding of the requirement and shall

describe the work consistent with the schedule proposed. The narrative shall address any construction techniques such as sequencing, dependencies, and phasing.

The proposal shall provide a proposed progress schedule. The progress schedule will be in a time scaled bar graph format. The horizontal axis will be scaled for time beginning with the Notice to Proceed and concluding with contract completion. The vertical axis will show the milestones and major portions of the contract work. Milestones should include such items as material submissions, submittal acceptance, partial and final inspections, punch list completion, testing, etc. All schedule items will show a start date and a completion date and the critical path shall be clearly identified on the schedule.

The detailed schedule will indicate specific tasks with dates for each step of the process including: Mobilization; Demolition; Phasing; Provisions for overtime or shift work; Timing of relocation of existing utilities; Commissioning; Tests, and final inspection. Task durations shall be expressed in calendar days.

The Offeror shall specify the days of the week and the hours of construction operations during each phase of the work, and the percentage of contract completion that will be achieved at the end of each month of the contract.

(c) Organizational Structure: The Offeror shall submit an organizational chart identifies management, and construction teams as well as key positions in the organization. Lines of authority, communication, and interface within the management and construction teams as well as how the team will interface with the government.

(d) Quality Control Plan: Submit a quality control plan for review from a project relevant to this project (one from Relevant Project Experience). At a minimum the quality control plan must address the quality control structure, how and when quality control is done, and how deficiencies are identified, track, and corrected.

- C. Factor 2-Past Performance:** The offeror shall provide a description of relevant and recent projects, a minimum of three but no more than five examples of similar work completed in the past five years (projects under construction may be included). Include as a minimum, a description of the work (including role played), the project size, cost, type of contract (e.g. task order) client contact information and duration.
- D.** Additionally, provide a tabular listing of all relevant and recent projects with excellent performance ratings and letters of commendation from both private and Government clients, including VA (designate your role: prime, subcontractor, or joint venture partner). These ratings should be dated 2013 or later and include the following data: current client contacts, project due date, completion date and final cost compared to the contract award amount (note whether bid or negotiated).

Present/Past performance questionnaires will be sent to client chosen by the offeror. Past/present performance questionnaires should be sent by client directly to Ms. Tené Becknell from the clients via email to tene.becknell@va.gov.

Past/present performance questionnaires should be received via emailed before the closing date and time. Any past/present performance questionnaires received after the closing time will not be accepted. FAR 15.208(b) will apply to past/present performance questionnaires.

C. Factor 3: Cost/Price: Price/Cost will not be rated or scored, but will be evaluated for fairness and reasonableness through the use of price analysis. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b)(2) the government may use various price analysis techniques and procedures to ensure a fair and reasonable price. It shall be noted that an unrealistically low, or high proposed price may be grounds for rejecting an offeror's proposal on the basis that the offeror does not understand the requirement or has submitted an unrealistic proposal.

4.3 Evaluation Procedures

- 4.3.1 General: Proposals will be evaluated and award will be made utilizing the FAR Part 15.101 and VAAR 815. Factor 1 and Factor 2 are equal in importance. Factor 1 and any subsequent sub-factors will be assigned one of the below adjectival ratings depicting how well the Offeror's proposal exceeds, meets or fails to meet the requirements of the evaluation criteria. At the conclusion of individual ratings at the sub-factor level the TEB will arrive at a consensus rating at the Factor level.
- 4.3.2 TEB will consider qualification merits, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks associated with Factor 1. Also, the TEB will consider relevancy of experience and quality of the relevant past/present performance associated with Factor 2 in the technical evaluation.

4.4 Rating: The following technical rating definitions will be used in the assessment of Factor 1. The Government will not award to an Offeror who receives less than an "acceptable" rating at the factor level:

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
|-------------|--|
| Outstanding | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low. |
| Good | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low. |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| | or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Marginal | Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is not awardable |

A. Definitions:

1. Strength – An aspect of an offeror’s proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
2. Weakness – A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
3. 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.

B. Factor 2-Past Performance: Provide a description of relevant recent projects. The rating is an integrated assessment based on relevancy of experience and quality of the relevant contracts. The assessment process will result in an overall risk rating of substantial confidence, satisfactory confidence, limited confidence, no confidence, or unknown confidence (neutral) as described below.

There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation:

1. Relevancy of contractual work performed; and
2. How well the contractual work was performed.

To evaluate the offeror’s past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. The criteria to establish what is relevant and recent shall be unique to each source selection and shall be stated in the solicitation. In establishing what is relevant for the acquisition, consideration should be given to those aspects of an offeror’s contract history that would give the greatest ability to measure whether the offeror will satisfy the current procurement. Common aspects of relevancy include similarity of service/support, complexity; dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontract/teaming.

There are four levels of relevancy as shown in the following table. When source selections require a greater level of discrimination within the past performance evaluation, the SSET shall use all four of the relevancy ratings identified below. However, for those source selections requiring less discrimination in the past performance evaluation, the past performance evaluation team may use, as a minimum,

“Relevant” and “Not Relevant” past performance ratings. The SSP shall clearly identify the treatment of relevancy within past performance evaluation. With respect to relevancy, more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.

For Relevancy, the below ratings will be assigned using the following criteria:

| Rating | Definition |
|-------------------|---|
| 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. |

2 .How well (quality) the contractual work was performed.

| 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. |
| 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 be able to successfully perform the required effort. |
| UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL) | 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. |

Past performance information shall be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or sub-factors. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale.