

SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD (Construction, Alteration, or Repair)	1. SOLICITATION NUMBER	2. TYPE OF SOLICITATION	3. DATE ISSUED	PAGE OF PAGES
	36C26118R0065	<input type="checkbox"/> SEALED BID (IFB) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEGOTIATED (RFP)	09-13-2018	1 136

IMPORTANT - The "offer" section on the reverse must be fully completed by offeror.

4. CONTRACT NUMBER TBD	5. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUEST NUMBER	6. PROJECT NUMBER 0
7. ISSUED BY Department of Veterans Affairs VA Sierra Pacific Network (VISN 21) VA Pacific Islands Health Care System 459 Patterson Rd Honolulu HI 96819-1522	CODE 459	8. ADDRESS OFFER TO Department of Veterans Affairs VA Sierra Pacific Network (VISN 21) ATTN: Timothy Bertucco 201 Walnut Avenue Mare Island, CA 95492
9. FOR INFORMATION CALL:	a. NAME Nicole Do (nicole.do@va.gov)	b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (NO COLLECT CALLS) (808) 539-1301

SOLICITATION

NOTE: In sealed bid solicitations "offer" and "offeror" mean "bid" and "bidder".

10. THE GOVERNMENT REQUIRES PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK DESCRIBED IN THESE DOCUMENTS (Title, identifying number, date)

36C26118R0065, Design-Build/Design-Bid-Build Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) Multiple Award Construction Contract (DB/DBB SDVOSB MACC), Various Locations, Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN) 21

The proposed contract is limited to Vendor Information Pages (VIP) verified SDVOSB concerns. Vendors must be VIP verified at the time of submission of the proposal and at the time of award. This is a source selection procurement requiring both technical and price proposals. The procurement consists of one solicitation and two contract groups (Group 1 and Group 2) with the intent to award multiple Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts for each Group. The Government anticipates awarding a minimum of ten contracts for each Group as a result of this solicitation.

SYSTEM FOR AWARD MANAGEMENT (SAM): Offerors shall comply with FAR 52.204-7, System for Award Management to receive an award. Lack of registration in the SAM database will make an Offeror ineligible for award.

VENDOR INFORMATION PAGES (VIP): Offerors shall comply with VAAR 852.819.7003, Eligibility, to receive an award. Lack of registration in the VIP database at the time of submission of the proposal will make an Offeror ineligible for award and the Government will NOT evaluate the proposal. Lack of registration in the VIP database at the time of award will make an Offeror ineligible for award.

PROJECT(S): To be identified in Phase 2.

Please submit all questions regarding the solicitation and supporting documentation in writing and submitted via email to nicole.do@va.gov and felicia.demita@va.gov.
Phase I RFIs will be accepted until October 11, 2018 at 4:30 PM PT.

All offerors are responsible for monitoring and downloading attachments and amendments from FedBizOpps (<http://www.fbo.gov>).
Phase I proposals are due October 18, 2018 by 1:00 PM PT.

11. The Contractor shall begin performance within <u>15</u> calendar days and complete it within <u>30</u> calendar days after receiving <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> award, <input type="checkbox"/> notice to proceed. This performance period is <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> mandatory <input type="checkbox"/> negotiable. (See <u>52.211-10</u>).	
12a. THE CONTRACTOR MUST FURNISH ANY REQUIRED PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS? (If "YES," indicate within how many calendar days after award in Item 12B.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	12b. CALENDAR DAYS 14

13. ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS:

- Sealed offers in original and 5 copies to perform the work required are due at the place specified in Item 8 by 1:00 PM Pacific (hour) local time 10-18-2018 (date). If this is a sealed bid solicitation, offers must be publicly opened at that time. Sealed envelopes containing offers shall be marked to show the offeror's name and address, the solicitation number, the date and time offers are due.
- An offer guarantee ☒ is, ☐ is not required.
- All offers are subject to the (1) work requirements, and (2) other provisions and clauses incorporated in the solicitation in full text or by reference.
- Offers providing less than 220 calendar days for Government acceptance after the date offers are due will not be considered and will be rejected.

SOLICITATION 36C26118R0065, SECTION 00110 REVISED TO:

00110 EVALUATION OF OFFERORS

PART I – GENERAL

1. CONTRACT SCOPE

The MACC will be utilized to execute a broad range of maintenance, repair and minor construction projects on real property at sites located within VISN 21. The work may consist of multiple disciplines of construction, and shall include but not be limited to the following categories of work: construction, repair and alteration of facilities, interior and exterior renovations, heating and air-conditioning, HVAC controls, plumbing, fire suppression, interior and exterior electrical and lighting, fire and intrusion alarms, communications, limited utilities, site-work, landscaping, fencing, masonry, roofing, concrete, asphalt paving, painting, storm drainage, limited environmental remediation, concrete and asphalt paving, demolition of facilities, construction of new facilities, and other construction-related work.

2. PREFERENCE FOR MAKING MULTIPLE AWARDS

This acquisition is being advertised as a competitive Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) set-aside and is a source selection procurement requiring non-cost/price, past performance and price proposals. This procurement consists of one solicitation with the intent to award multiple Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts in two separate Groups. Group 1 will include multiple awardees, and the scope of Group 1 includes task orders ranging from \$2,000 to the SAT as defined by FAR 2.101(b) (currently \$250K). The maximum order amount (SAT) is determined by the IGE and not by the amount of the resultant award. Group 2 will include multiple awardees, and the scope of Group 2 includes task orders ranging from \$2,000 to \$10M. The Government intends to award a minimum of ten IDIQ contracts per Group.

3. MAGNITUDE OF THE ACQUISITION

A minimum of \$2,000.00 is guaranteed for each IDIQ contract awarded. Individual TOs shall have an estimated magnitude of \$2,000.00 to the SAT (currently \$250,000.00) for Group 1 and \$2,000.00 to \$10,000,000.00 for Group 2. The Government makes no representation as to the number of TOs or actual amount of work to be ordered in excess of the minimum guarantees specified herein. The contract maximum for each awarded MACC contract is \$50 million.

Upon contract award, simultaneous task orders will be awarded to satisfy the contract minimum guarantee. The task order will require the awardees to submit their Safety Plan, Security Plan, Fire Safety Plan, Infection Control Plan, Green Purchasing Plan, and insurance certificates.

4. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

- a. This is a two-phase procurement. In Phase 1, the Offerors will submit and the Government will evaluate the Administrative volume and Factors 1 through 3 (see Part II below). The Government will then short list the most qualified Phase 1 Offerors to compete for the Multiple Award Construction Contracts in Phase 2. The short list is not to be construed as discussions nor will the remaining offerors be considered a competitive range. Those Offerors that do not make the short list will be notified.

- b. In Phase 2 of the two-phase selection procedure, the short-listed offerors will submit Factor 4 (see Part II below). In making the best value award decision after Phase 2, the Government will consider price.
- c. The Government intends to evaluate all complete and conforming proposals received and award multiple contracts without conducting discussions; therefore, your initial proposal shall conform to the solicitation requirements and should contain the best offer. However, the Government reserves the right to clarify certain aspects of the proposals, or may conduct discussions if it is deemed necessary to obtain the best value for the Government.
- d. If discussions are deemed necessary to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value, discussions will be held with those Offerors within the competitive range. The Government 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, considering price and technical merit.
- e. Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions. Significant weakness or multiple weaknesses may impact the individual factor rating(s) for the proposal. Any proposal with a rating that is less than acceptable for a factor will require correction before being considered for award of a contract.
- f. The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contracts.
- g. The distinction between corporate experience and past performance is corporate experience pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work covered by this requirement, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past performance pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well a contractor has performed on the contracts.

5. ENFORCEABILITY OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposals must set forth full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of the contracts. By submission of the offer, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., key personnel, designers, subcontractors, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract and any substitutions will be equal or better than as proposed and accepted for contract award and shall require prior Contracting Officer's approval.

PART II – EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. BASIS OF AWARD:

- 1.1 Upon receipt of offers, the Government will conduct a preliminary review of all offers to determine whether the proposal contains sufficient information, as required in the OFFEROR INSTRUCTIONS/SUBMISSION, to allow the Government to perform a meaningful evaluation. If the results of the preliminary review indicate the offer lacks sufficient information to allow a meaningful evaluation to be conducted, the Government may eliminate the proposal from further evaluation and consideration for award. As one part of the preliminary review, the Government will determine whether the offeror is a verified SDVOSB in the Vendor Information Pages (VIP) at www.vip.vetbiz.gov. An offeror that is not verified in VIP at the time of proposal submission will not be evaluated and will not be considered for award. An offeror with less than 220 days for acceptance will not be evaluated and will not be considered for award (refer to Instructions to Offerors).

- 1.2 The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contract(s); to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contract(s) to the offeror(s) submitting the proposal(s) determined to represent the best value—the proposal(s) most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.
- 1.3 As stated in the solicitation, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. In addition, if the Contracting Officer 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 Contracting Officer 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.
- 1.4 The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror.
- 1.5 As stated in the solicitation, the relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is that technical factors are equal to each other and when combined are equal importance to the performance confidence assessment (past performance). The combined non-cost/price factors are approximately equal to price.
- 1.6 Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions. Proposals may be found to have either a significant weakness or multiple weaknesses that impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal. The evaluation report must document the evaluation board's assessment of the identified weakness(s) and the associated risk to successful contract performance resulting from the weakness(s). This assessment must provide the rationale for proceeding to award without discussions.

2. EVALUATION FACTORS:

- 2.1 The solicitation requires the evaluation of price and the following non-cost/price factors and subfactors:

- Factor 1 – Safety
 - Subfactor – EMR rating
 - Subfactor – Certification
 - Subfactor – Technical Approach
- Factor 2 – Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm
- Factor 3 – Past Performance on Recent, Relevant Projects
- Factor 4 – Seed Project (price)

The distinction between experience and past performance is that experience pertains to the volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work described under the definition of recent, relevant projects, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past performance pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well a contractor has performed on the contracts.

- 2.2 The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is the technical factors: Factors 1 and 2 are of equal importance to each other and, when combined are equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment factor, Factor 3. When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factors and past performance/performance confidence

assessment factor combined (i.e., the non-cost/price evaluation factors) are approximately equal to price.

The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-cost/price proposals are considered essentially equal in terms of overall quality, or if price is so high as to significantly diminish the value of a non-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered.

2.3 Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.

(a) Non-cost/price Factors:

(1) Factor 1, Safety

(i) Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each Contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture; however, only one safety narrative is required. Experience Modification Rate (EMR) Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR)

For the three (3) previous complete calendar years, submit your EMR (which compares your company's annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a three (3) year period). If you have no EMR for any particular year, affirmatively state so and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the EMR and upward or downward trends shall be addressed as part of this element. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) Certification

Provide a certification that you have no more than three (3) serious, or one (1) repeat or one (1) willful OSHA or any EPA violation(s) in the past three years. If the number exceeds the criteria listed, provide an explanation.

The certification should be written on company letterhead and signed by the principal of the company. If submitting a proposal as a JV, please insure the certification is signed by the principal of each company that is a member of the JV. JVs with less than 3 years of experience from the date of the proposal submission should submit certifications from each company that is a member of the JV and signed by a principal of each company.

(3) Technical Approach for Safety

Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety narrative shall be limited to **three (3)** pages.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures for itself and its subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall safety record, the Offeror's plan to select and monitor subcontractors, and any innovative safety methods that the Offeror plans to implement for this procurement.

The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. The Government's evaluation of safety may also include data from other sources, such as CCASS, OSHA/BLS databases, clients/customers, safety awards, or other related databases. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete safety information regarding these submittal requirements rests with the Offeror. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- Certification
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government (if applicable)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact this rating. Lower EMRs will be more highly rated in the evaluation.

(2) Certification:

Certifications where the offeror has no more than three serious or one repeat or one willful OSHA or any EPA violation(s) will be more highly rated in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety:

The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovate methods to enhance a safe working environment may be more highly rated in the evaluation.

(4) Other Sources of Information Available to the Government (if applicable):

The Government may evaluate if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices. Those that demonstrate a history of safe work practices may be more highly rated.

(2) Factor 2, Recent, Relevant Experience of the Firm

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

(1) Construction Experience:

Submit a maximum of five (5) construction projects in which the Offeror (or JV Partner) was the Prime Contractor that best demonstrates the Offeror's experience on recent relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. Out of the maximum of five (5) construction projects, at least 2 projects shall be new construction and 1 project shall be repair or alteration or related demolition of existing infrastructure. For purposes of this evaluation, a recent relevant project is defined as new construction and/or repair, alteration and related demolition of existing infrastructure completed within the past five years of the proposal issue date for this RFP. Infrastructure is defined as: 1) construction of a healthcare facility; 2) construction for industrial buildings and warehouses; 3) nonresidential buildings, other than industrial buildings and warehouses; or 4) improvements such as utilities, landscaping, and roadways. "New Construction" is defined as construction that provides for new or expanded facilities or infrastructure. New construction does not include repair and/or modernization of an existing facility nor does it include replacement or upgrade to an existing infrastructure. Also, the Offeror (or JV Partner) must have been a Prime Contractor for the projects and each project shall be \$25,000 or more in dollar value for Group 1 offerors and \$800,000 or more in dollar value for Group 2 offerors and be completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors shall submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

The attached Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information.

Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Do not alter the Construction & Design Experience Project Data Sheet (Attachment A) with the exception of expanding the individual blocks on this form; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed two (2) double-sided pages (or four (4) single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods). In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features.

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV) or a participant of Small Business Administration (SBA) Mentor-Protégé Program, recent relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity or SBA Mentor-Protégé. If the JV or SBA Mentor-Protégé does not have shared experience, recent relevant projects shall be submitted for each JV partner or for the Mentor and Protégé. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all JV partners or Mentor and Protégé may be rated lower. Offerors are still limited to a total of five (5) projects combined.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing recent relevant construction and design projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror's recent relevant experience will be used as a means of

evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The Government will only review the first five (5) recent relevant projects from the prime contractor. Any projects submitted in excess of the first five (5) for Construction Experience will not be considered.

Recent and relevant projects that demonstrate design-build experience may be considered more favorably than those that do not have design-build experience.

Recent and relevant projects that demonstrate experience in working in constrained sites (i.e., minimal space) that require innovative solutions may be considered more favorably.

Recent and relevant projects that demonstrate experience in design/construction of healthcare facilities (active occupied buildings) may be considered more favorably than those that do not demonstrate experience in design/construction of healthcare facilities.

Recent and relevant projects that demonstrate timely completion of projects may be rated more favorably.

Recent and relevant projects where the Offeror performed major or critical aspects of the project may be considered more favorably than major or critical aspects of the project performed by a subcontractor or design subcontractor.

Recent and relevant projects that the JV entity completed may be considered more favorably than those projects that were completed by only one JV partner.

Recent and relevant projects completed in the geographic locations defined in the Statement of Work Section 3.0 may be rated more favorably.

(3) Factor 3, Past Performance

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

(1) References should submit Past Performance Questionnaires (Attachment B) for each project included in Factor 2. Evidence of customer satisfaction shall be from the owner and/or their representative responsible for the construction contract administration of construction projects. For construction contractors, it shall not be from the designer on a design build project nor shall it be from a prime construction contractor for a subcontractor. The Offeror's references should provide completed Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) directly to Network Contracting Office 21. This does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

If a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 2 for construction experience.

(2) Adverse Information

Offerors shall provide any adverse information they or the teaming partner received in the past 3 years, such as Letters of Concern, Cure and or Show Cause Notices, Terminations for Cause/Default and a narrative explaining the circumstances resulting from its receipt and corrective actions taken, if applicable. This may include a discussion of efforts accomplished by the Offeror to resolve problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk.

Merely having problems does not automatically equate to a limited or no confidence rating, since the problems encountered may have been on a more complex program, or an Offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered. The Offeror shall clearly demonstrate management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions, in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified. This may allow the Offeror to be considered a higher confidence candidate. Submittal of quality performance indicators or other management indicators that clearly support that an Offeror has overcome past problems is required.

If you have no adverse information, please explicitly state in your proposal response that you do not have any adverse information. JVs with less than 3 years of experience from the date of the proposal submission should submit adverse information from each company that is a member of the JV.

(3) Organizational Structure Change History

Many companies have acquired, been acquired by, or otherwise merged with other companies, and/or reorganized their divisions, business groups, subsidiary companies, etc. In many cases, these changes have taken place during the time of performance of relevant past efforts or between the conclusion of recent past efforts and this source selection. As a result, it is sometimes difficult to determine what past performance is relevant to this acquisition. To facilitate this relevancy determination, Offerors shall include a "roadmap" describing any/all such changes in their organization. A pamphlet or other commercial document describing such reorganizations may suffice. As part of this explanation, show how these changes impact the relevance of any efforts identified for past performance evaluation/ performance confidence assessment. Since the Government intends to consider past performance information provided by other sources as well as that provided by the Offeror(s), the "roadmap" should be both specifically applicable to the efforts identified, yet general enough to apply to efforts on which the Government receives information from other sources.

If this section is not applicable, please explicitly state in your proposal response that this section is not applicable.

(4) The Offeror shall submit, along with the information required in this paragraph a Consent Letter (Attachment C), executed by each teaming partner and/or joint venture partner authorizing release of adverse past performance information to the Offeror so the Offeror can respond to such information. For each identified effort for a non-government customer, the Offeror shall also submit a Client Authorization Letter (Attachment D) authorizing release to the Government of requested information on the Offeror's performance.

There is no page limitation.

The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the references unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor. Performance award or additional information submitted will not be considered.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

This evaluation focuses on how well the Offeror performed on the recent relevant projects submitted under Factor 2 – Experience and past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources. In addition to the above, the Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any and all sources including sources outside of the Government.

Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of Contractors who are part of a partnership or joint venture identified in the Offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror.

The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, the source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the Contractor's performance. This evaluation is separate and distinct from the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination. The assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the Offeror's probability to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP.

Offerors that fail to disclose Adverse Information (subsection (2)) where such information is later found may be rated less favorably.

Offerors lacking recent relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance and will receive an Unknown Confidence rating.

(4) Factor 4, Seed Project Technical Solution (Provided via Amendment to the short listed Offerors)

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Group 1 and Group 2 will have different seed projects. Details and specifications about each seed project will be distributed to the short-listed offerors for each Group via an Amendment to the solicitation.

Technical Solution - Provide a narrative describing the technical solution to the project that meets the RFP requirements. As a minimum, the narrative shall address the following:

- Mobilization and Site Access
- Project Phasing
- Project Scheduling – How do you propose to start the field work within 30 calendar days of task order award and complete all work, to include Basis Of Design and final acceptance within the allotted contract time?
- Procuring Long Lead Time Equipment and Materials
- How the work will be executed
- Environmental issues on this project
- Safety oversight and enforcement on this project
- Key Personnel Experience/Qualifications – complete the information shown in Attachment E for Key Personnel (Project Manager, Site Superintendent, QC). The Key Personnel shall be employees of the Offeror's firm. If the proposed Key Personnel is not an employee of the Offeror's firm at the time of the proposal submission, the Offeror shall obtain a letter of intent to be employed by the Offeror, signed by the Key Personnel (wet signature) and the Offeror (wet signature) and shall submit it with the proposal.
- Process for the consistent, effective, and expedient documentation and resolution of quality problems

Do not exceed four (4) double sided pages (or eight (8) single-sided pages). The page limitation does not include Attachment E.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will award to the low-priced offeror. However, the Government reserves the right not to make award. Some or all of the content proposed in the Technical Solution may be incorporated into the resultant order and will become material and binding terms to the order.

(b) Cost/Price Factor

PRICE PROPOSAL FOR THE SEED PROJECT (which may or may not be awarded) – Project Title: TBD.

(i) Submission Requirements:

With regards to price, Offerors shall complete the Proposal Schedule line item for the seed project (which may or may not be awarded)

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The price proposal for the seed project (which may or may not be awarded) will be evaluated to determine the reasonableness of the Offeror's proposal. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors combined.