

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0008			J		1 2
3. EFFECTIVE DATE 18-Nov-2003		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W68MD9-2183-1410		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE ATTN: CENWS-CT 4735 EAST MARGINAL WAY SOUTH SEATTLE WA 98134-2329		CODE W912DW	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)			X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DACW67-03-R-0001	
			X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 19-Sep-2003	
				10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).					
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) FISH PASSAGE FACILITY COFFERDAM AND EXCAVATION, HOWARD HANSON DAM, KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON The purpose of this amendment (R0008) is to incorporate the following:					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.					
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
			TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 19-Nov-2003

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

AMENDMENT NO. EIGHT

A. This amendment provides for the following changes:

- (1) Corporate Certificate page 00010-4 revised to include page number.
- (2) Revisions to Section 00110, D. Proposed Schedule, 1. Submittal Requirements.

B. The attached revised pages supersede and replace the corresponding pages. The attached revised specification sections supersede and replace the corresponding specification sections. Specification changes are generally identified, for convenience, by strikeout for deletions, and underlining of text for additions. All portions of the revised or new pages shall apply whether or not changes have been indicated.

C. The proposal submittal time and date December 2, 2003 at 2:00 p.m. LOCAL TIME **is not** extended.

D. NOTICE TO OFFERORS: Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by number and date on offer or by telegram. Please mark outside of envelope in which your offer is enclosed to show amendments received.

Encl:

Section 00110 (revised)
Corporate Certificate (revised)

IF THE CONTRACTOR IS A CORPORATION OR PARTNERSHIP, THE APPLICABLE PORTION OF THE FORM LISTED BELOW MUST BE COMPLETED. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, OTHER EVIDENCE MUST BE SUBMITTED TO SUBSTANTIATE THE AUTHORITY OF THE PERSON SIGNING THE CONTRACT. IF A CORPORATION, **THE SAME OFFICER SHALL NOT EXECUTE BOTH THE CONTRACT AND THE CERTIFICATE.**

CORPORATE CERTIFICATE

I, _____, certify that I am the _____ Secretary of the Corporation named as Contractor herein; that _____, who signed this contract on behalf of the Contractor was then _____ of said corporation; that said contract was duly signed for and on behalf of said corporation by authority of its governing body and is within the scope of its corporate powers.

(Secretary) (CORPORATE SEAL)

AUTHORITY TO BIND PARTNERSHIP

This is to certify that the names, signatures and Social Security Numbers of all partners are listed below and that the person signing the contract has authority actually to bind the partnership pursuant to its partnership agreements. Each of the partners individually has full authority to enter into and execute contractual instruments on behalf of said partnership with the United States of America, except as follows: (state "none" or describe limitations, if any)

This authority shall remain in full force and effect until such time as the revocation of authority by any cause whatsoever has been furnished in writing to, and acknowledged by, the Contracting Officer.

(Names, Signatures and Social Security Numbers of all Partners)

NAME	SIGNATURE	SOCIAL SECURITY NO.
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION 00110

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
 - A. Invitation**
 - B. Project Description**

- 2. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**
 - A. General Requirements**
 - B. Technical Proposal Format**
 - 1. Table of Contents**
 - 2. Evaluation Criteria Information**
 - C. Price Proposal Format**

- 3. EVALUATION FACTORS**
 - A. Technical Evaluation Criteria**
 - 1. Relevant Experience of the Offeror's Construction Team**
 - 2. Qualifications of Key Team Members**
 - 3. Past Performance**
 - 4. Proposed Schedule**
 - 5. Proposal for Protection of Existing Structures**
 - 6. Proposal for Water Quality Protection**
 - 7. Proposal for Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir**
 - 8. Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation**
 - 9. Past Performance in Implementing Subcontracting Plans**
 - B. Price**

- 4. EVALUATION RATINGS**
 - A. Outstanding**
 - B. Above Average**
 - C. Satisfactory (Neutral)**
 - D. Marginal**
 - E. Unsatisfactory**

- 5. MINIMUM SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHOD**
 - A. Relevant Experience of the Offeror's Construction Team**
 - 1. Definitions**
 - a. Construction Team**
 - b. Relevant Experience**
 - 2. Submittal Requirements**
 - a. Organization Chart**
 - b. Experience Examples**
 - i. Types of Work Experience Required**
 - ii. Minimum Project Information**
 - 3. Evaluation Method**

- B. Qualifications of Key Team Members**
 - 1. Definitions**
 - a. Prime Firm Project Superintendent**
 - b. Subcontractor Project Managers**
 - c. Key Technical Personnel**
 - 2. Submittal Requirements**
 - a. Resumes of Key Prime and Subcontractor Personnel**
 - b. Summary of the Duties and Responsibilities of Key Personnel**
 - c. Resume Format**
 - 3. Evaluation Method**
- C. Past Performance**
 - 1. Definitions**
 - a. CCASS**
 - 2. Submittal Requirements**
 - a. CCASS**
 - b. Customer Satisfaction Survey**
 - 3. Evaluation Method**
- D. Proposed Schedule**
 - 1. Submittal Requirements**
 - 2. Evaluation Method**
- E. Proposal for Protection of Existing Structures**
 - 1. Submittal Requirements**
 - a. Close-in Blasting Plan**
 - b. Cooperation Plan**
 - 2. Evaluation Method**
- F. Proposal for Water Quality Protection**
 - 1. Submittal Requirements**
 - a. Site Run-off Water Control Plan**
 - b. Water Pollution Control Plan**
 - c. Turbid Water Control Plan**
 - d. Sediment Control Plan**
 - e. Emergency Pollution Response Plan**
 - f. Construction Shutdown Plan**
 - g. Tacoma Public Utilities Temporary Shutdown Schedule**
 - h. Details of Boat**
 - 2. Evaluation Method**
- G. Proposal for Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir from Elevation 1070 to Elevation 1150**
 - 1. Submittal Requirements**
 - 2. Evaluation Method**

H. Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation

1. Submittal Requirements

- a. Underwater Rock Excavation**
- b. Underwater Concrete**
- c. Underwater Grouting**
- d. Embedded Metals**
- e. Structural Integrity Assurance**
- f. Watertightness of Cofferdam**

2. Evaluation Method

I. Past Performance in Implementing Subcontracting Plans

- 1. No Submittal Required for this Criterion**
- 2. Evaluation Method**

6. PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND AWARD

A. Relative Importance Definitions

- 1. Significantly More Important**
- 2. More Important**
- 3. Equal**

B. Ranking of Importance of Technical Evaluation Factors

C. Evaluation

D. Competitive Range

E. Discussions

F. Selection and Award

7. DEBRIEFINGS

A. Pre-award

B. Post Award

8. PROPOSAL EXPENSES AND PRE-CONTRACT COSTS

SECTION 00110

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION.

A. Invitation. Your firm is invited to submit a proposal for the project entitled "**Howard Hanson Dam Fish Passage Restoration Facility, Cofferdam and Excavation, King County Washington, DACW67-03-R-0001.**" Prospective offerors are required to prepare and submit proposals that will be evaluated in accordance with this section of the solicitation. This solicitation is issued as a Request For Proposal (RFP). Proposals will be evaluated based upon technical merit and cost. The Government intends to make award on initial offers. Selection will be based upon best value to the Government using the criteria herein.

B. Project Description. Howard Hanson Dam (HHD) and Reservoir is located on the Green River in western Washington and is a 230-foot-high rock fill dam. The reservoir is connected to the Green River downstream of the dam by an outlet tunnel. The tunnel is 900 ft long, with a 19 ft semi-horseshoe shaped cross section, which is concrete lined. The dam will be retrofitted with a downstream juvenile fish passage restoration facility with a collection tower and flume over the dam. The facility must be installed in an excavation behind a cofferdam due to the fluctuating reservoir levels throughout the year. This contract is for construction of a pre-cast and cast-in place 100' high cofferdam and excavation of the foundation for the fish passage facility according to the plans and specifications of this solicitation. The Cofferdam structure will become a permanent part of the fish passage facility. The work includes working under harsh conditions during part of the year because of the dam's primary mission of storing water for flood control during the rainy season. The contract includes extensive water quality maintenance requirements because the reservoir stores and releases water to the City of Tacoma diversion dam and water supply pipeline downstream of the reservoir. In addition there are extensive requirements for the protection of the existing dam structures because of the close proximity of the structures to the proposed excavation.

2. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS.

A. General Requirements. Proposals shall be submitted in two parts: (a) technical proposal, and (b) price proposal. Each shall be submitted in a separate envelope or package with the type of proposal (i.e., technical or price) clearly printed on the outside of the envelope or package. The maximum number of pages in the proposal should not exceed **150 pages** with font size no smaller than 10 point. Proposals must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this RFP. Absence of information will be deemed as if no support for that criterion was provided. Offerors submitting proposals should limit submission to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and money is expended in preparing information required by the Request for Proposals (RFP). Proposals are to be on 8 ½ x 11-inch paper, to the maximum extent practicable, and submitted in standard letter (8½ x 11-inch) hardback loose-leaf binders. Contents of binders shall be tabbed and labeled to afford easy identification from the proposal Table of Contents. No material shall be incorporated by reference or reiteration of the RFP. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation. It

shall be presented in a manner, which allows it to "STAND ALONE" without need for evaluators to reference other documents. Photographs and organizational charts will not be considered a page. Unnecessarily elaborate brochures or other presentation materials beyond those sufficient to present complete and effective responses are not desired and may be construed as an indication of the proposer's lack of cost-consciousness. Penalty for making false statements in proposals is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

B. Technical Proposal Format. Submit 5 copies, consisting of an **original and 4 copies**. As a minimum, each copy of the technical proposal should contain the information and follow the general format specified below. Pages should be numbered from beginning to end, without repeating for new sections.

1. **Table of Contents:** List all sections contained in the technical proposal. A separate section shall be provided for each evaluation criterion. Any additions or revisions to the proposal shall include an updated Table of Contents for each set.

2. **Evaluation Criteria Information.** Provide a separate tab for each evaluation criterion. Behind the tab provide all information identified in the Submittal Requirements for each criterion.

C. Price Proposal Format. Submit 1 original signed by an official authorized to bind your firm. This proposal is due at the same time as the technical proposal, but shall be submitted in a separate envelope labeled "Price Proposal." Your price proposal is firm for the number of calendar days specified on the Standard Form 1442, Block 13D. The price proposal shall contain the following:

1. Standard Form 1442, Solicitation, Offer and Award (complete the reverse side, acknowledge the number of amendments received, and sign and date the form).
2. Corporate Certificate or Authority to Bind Partnership
3. Pricing schedule (submit prices for all items in the Schedule).
4. Section 00600, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors and Pre-award information
5. Banking and Bonding information for the company signing the SF1442
6. Bid Bond
7. Small and Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Plan (Applies to Large Businesses only with proposals in excess of \$1,000,000). Award will not be made under this solicitation without an approved subcontracting plan signed by the Contracting Officer.

3. EVALUATION FACTORS – Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of two criteria: TECHNICAL and PRICE.

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria:

1. Relevant experience of the Offeror's Construction Team
2. Qualifications of key team members
3. Past Performance

4. Proposed Schedule
5. Proposal for Protection of Existing Structures
6. Proposal for Water Quality Protection
7. Proposal for Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir
8. Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation
9. Past Performance in Implementing Subcontracting Plans

B. Price: Price will be evaluated for reasonableness, but not rated. Financial and bonding capacity will also be checked, but not rated.

4. EVALUATION RATINGS. Proposals will be evaluated using the following adjectival descriptions:

A. Outstanding – Information submitted demonstrates Offeror’s potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The Offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and highest quality performance is anticipated. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The Offeror has convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans and techniques that, when implemented, should result in outstanding, effective, efficient, and economical performance under the Contract. Very significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. Very high probability of success.

B. Above Average – Information submitted demonstrates Offeror’s potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Has one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The areas in which the Offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency or productivity or quality. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Fully meets all RFP requirements and exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Response exceeds a “Satisfactory” rating. High probability of success.

C. Satisfactory (Neutral) – Information submitted demonstrates Offeror’s potential to meet performance or capability standards. Acceptable solution. Few or no advantages or strengths. Equates to Neutral. Good probability of success as there is sufficient confidence that a fully compliant level of performance will be achieved. Meets all RFP requirements. Complete and comprehensive proposal; exemplifies an understanding of the scope and depth of the task requirements and the Offeror’s understanding of the Government’s requirements. Response exceeds a “Marginal” rating. Good Probability of Success.

D. Marginal – The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific factor(s) (or criteria). The Offeror’s interpretation of the Government’s requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to leave doubt as to the offeror’s capability for satisfactory performance. The assignment of a rating within the bounds of “Marginal” indicates that the evaluator feels that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. Low probability of success although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least

acceptable. Response exceeds an “Unsatisfactory” rating. Moderate risk of unsuccessful performance.

E. Unsatisfactory – Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Unacceptable. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the submittal. The submittal does not meet the minimum requirements of the RFP. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved. Offeror’s qualifications have many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; failure to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government’s requirements; failure to meet many of the minimum requirements. High risk of unsuccessful performance.

5. MINIMUM SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHOD

A. *Relevant Experience of the Offeror’s Construction Team.*

1. Definitions.

a. The Offeror’s **Construction Team** is defined as the Prime Firm and Subcontracting Firms taken as a whole.

b. **Relevant experience** is defined as a project that has been completed within the last ten years; or has been started and is at least 50% complete; has a logical connection with the requirements in this RFP; was similar in nature, magnitude and complexity to this project.

2. Submittal Requirements.

a. Organization Chart - Offerors shall provide an organizational chart clearly showing the Construction Team and their responsibilities for this project. The Organizational chart shall show as a minimum the following items:

- i. Prime Contractor
- ii. Subcontractors
- iii. Key personnel in each firm. (See next criterion “Qualifications” for minimum positions to be shown on the organization chart)
- iv. The organization chart shall also show the features of work under this contract that each organization is responsible for.

b. Experience examples - Offerors shall demonstrate that their Construction Team has relevant experience in the following types of work by providing examples of projects completed within the past 10 years, or under construction and at least 50% complete. The offeror shall explain how the project information provided is relevant to the proposed acquisition.

i. Types of Work Experience Required:

- a. Cofferdam construction and related cofferdam excavation, foundation and in-water work
- b. Rock excavation
- c. Water Quality Maintenance during Construction
- d. Close-in Blasting (defined as blasting that must be done in such a manner as to protect nearby structures)
- e. Underwater Concrete Work

ii. Minimum Project Information:

- a. Project title and location;
- b. Dollar value of construction;
- c. Construction period (month/year start to month/year end);
- d. Brief description of how the project is relevant, and meets the requirements of this RFP;
- e. Current primary point of contact for the customer (name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city and state, phone number).

3. Evaluation Method. The evaluation team will use the Organization Chart and the Examples of relevant experience to evaluate the *relevant experience of the Offeror's construction team*. The organization chart will be evaluated for functionality, completeness and reasonableness and the degree to which the offeror demonstrates an understanding of the aspects required for successfully accomplishing the work described in the solicitation. Firms will also be evaluated on the quantity and quality of experience of their team. Experience in all of the types of work listed above is required for a satisfactory rating. The greater the number, relevance and recency of prior project experience, the higher the rating assigned during evaluations.

B. Qualifications of Key Team Members.

1. Definitions. Key Team members are defined as the following personnel:

- a. Prime Firm Project Superintendent.** The Project Superintendent shall be either a graduate engineer or experienced construction person and demonstrate relevant experience on similar projects.
- b. Subcontractor Project Managers.** The Subcontractor project managers shall have relevant experience on projects similar to the proposed responsibilities for this project.
- c. Key Technical Personnel.** Technical Personnel shall be professionally registered, if required by their profession. For this solicitation, Key Technical Personnel include:
 - Blasting
 - Environmental Coordinator

- Safety Officer
- Quality Control Officer
- Submittals Manager
- Underwater Concrete Tech

2. Submittal Requirements.

a. Résumés of Key Prime and Subcontractor Personnel. The Offeror shall submit a résumé for key construction personnel from the Prime Firm and Subcontractors that will be assigned to this project. (Note: each person should also be shown in the Construction Team Organization Chart.) The proposal should clearly present the credentials of each person. It is important that each resume include the relevant project experience mentioned in Item 5.A above. Include all relevant educational qualifications. Résumé should be no more than two (2) pages per individual and submitted in a format similar to the one below. It is expected that each key individual in your proposal will be the individual who performs work under the contract. Because selection will be partly based on this criterion, the government reserves the right to approve substitutions in personnel during the contract period.

b. Summary of the Duties and Responsibilities of Key Personnel. In addition to the résumés, the Offeror shall provide a summary of the duties and responsibilities of these individuals. As a minimum, this sub-factor should include data on the following Resume Format:

c. Résumé Format. Résumé should be no more than two (2) pages per individual and submitted in a format similar to the one below:

<i>Name</i>
<i>Title for this project</i>
<i>Summary of the Duties/Responsibilities for this project</i>
<i>Firm Affiliation/Years Affiliated</i>
<i>Total Number of Years in the Construction Industry</i>
<i>Years of Experience performing duties/functions as proposed for this project.</i>
<i>Education - Degree, Certification, Year, and Specialization</i>
<i>Active Registrations/Professional/Technical Licenses/Certifications</i>
<i>Specific Qualifications for this project (See criterion for any special instructions such as a minimum number of projects to list)</i>
<i>List of Relevant Experience. For each project listed, provide:</i>
<i>Project Title & Location</i>
<i>Year(s) constructed</i>
<i>Firm Affiliated with during this project</i>
<i>Duties/Functions</i>

3. Evaluation Method: The more recent, and the greater the extent and relevance of the team members' qualifications, prior project experience, the higher the rating assigned for this criterion during evaluations. Only one individual for each of the key personnel categories listed above will be evaluated.

C. Past Performance.

1. Definitions.

CCASS. Construction Contract Administration Support System. This system is maintained by the Corps of Engineers and contains past performance evaluations for projects completed for the Army (including Corps of Engineers), Air Force and Navy. Offerors wanting to review ratings contained in the CCASS database may request the information by submitting a fax, on company letterhead, to (503) 808-4596.

2. Submittal Requirements

a. CCASS – If a project listed under relevant experience criterion has a performance evaluation in the CCASS database, the offeror **does not** need to provide a copy of the evaluation.

b. Customer Satisfaction Survey. The reproducible Customer Satisfaction Survey form located at the end of this section will be used to provide information from your customers for the prime contractor regarding satisfaction, quality of work, and timely performance of the projects listed in the relevant experience examples. To be considered, your past customers (not the offeror) must complete the surveys and mail, hand-deliver, or fax directly to the Contracting Office, for receipt no later than the time and date the proposals are due. Customer Satisfaction Surveys should only be provided for projects constructed by the prime, listed under relevant experience, and for which a CCASS evaluation is not available. All Customer Satisfaction Surveys must be **submitted** to the Seattle District, Corps of Engineers **by the customer/agency** providing the information. Surveys submitted by the contractor will not be considered. Please ensure envelopes containing survey forms do not contain the offeror's return address. Offerors shall **submit a list** of all customers to whom Customer Satisfaction Surveys were provided, including current point of contact and phone number.

3. Evaluation Method. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an offeror's performance history. The CCASS database will be queried and copies of evaluations will be provided to evaluators for consideration. The Government may also contact previous customers as references, and will use Customer Satisfaction Surveys received from customers. Past performance for projects listed under relevant experience will be evaluated first and higher evaluation ratings will be given for relevant projects with outstanding evaluations. In descending order, lower ratings may be given to evaluations of Above Average, Average, Marginal, and Unacceptable or projects that have no relevance or connection to the scope of work anticipated under this contract. Other evaluations found in the CCASS database and other Customer Satisfaction Surveys will be considered. If an Offeror has no relevant past performance data to evaluate or no information on past performance is available, a neutral rating will be assigned. The Government may initiate exchanges with an offeror to clarify adverse past performance

information when the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to comment on the evaluation. The Government reserves the right to contact the evaluators of either the CCASS or the Customer Satisfaction Surveys submitted. The Government also reserves the right, but is not obligated, to query any Government agencies, databases, and publications for information such as performance evaluations, debarment, terminations, and litigation for evaluation purposes.

D. Proposed Schedule

1. Submittal Requirements. Offeror shall provide Work Schedule detailing how all work shall be accomplished in a contract timeline. The schedule shall be printed using professional project scheduling software and shall show all phases of work proceeding from the date of “Notice to Proceed (NTP)”. For the purposes of preparing this schedule, Offerors shall assume that NTP will be given on the 30th calendar day after the date the proposals are due. The schedule shall include:

- a. Sequence of Cofferdam erection, completion, and excavation behind cofferdam when it is completed.
- b. An indication of the average reservoir level as it relates to work operations at various times of the year.
- c. Cofferdam foundation work required to be accomplished when reservoir is at lowest yearly levels.
- d. One arbitrary emergency de-mobilization and re-mobilization cycle from elevation 1150 during the flood control season to act as a scheduling placeholder for actual flooding during the contract period. The cycle must agree with historical records as to duration and standby time.
- e. Indication of required contractor notice to City of Tacoma in advance of high turbidity events during excavation and required follow-on period of non-turbid activities.
- f. Required Diving Operations
- g. A placeholder of 4 weeks at the end of contract where the Offeror must maintain and dewater the excavation prior to the Phase 2 contractor’s assumption of the site.

2. Evaluation Method. Schedules will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness and understanding of the work. Complete schedules will include all of the tasks identified above. Schedules that illustrate a logical sequencing of events and a greater understanding of the work will receive a more favorable evaluation. Proposals that include unrealistic or unsupported schedules will be evaluated unfavorably.

E. Proposal for Protection of Existing Structures

1. Submittal Requirements. The Offeror shall provide the following two detailed plans:

a. Close-In Blasting Plan. Submit a detailed plan including the methodology to be used in determining safe blasting parameters.

b. Cooperation Plan. Submit a detailed plan indicating the cooperation required of the Offeror with the government in the interpretation of instrumentation data.

2. Evaluation Method. The Close-in Blasting Plan and Cooperation Plan will be evaluated to determine the Offeror's understanding of the strict requirements of the contract to protect existing structures that are in close proximity to the cofferdam site. The greater the understanding demonstrated by the Plans the higher the assigned rating.

F. Proposal for Water Quality Protection

1. Requirements. Offeror shall provide a detailed Water Quality Management Plan to show that the Offeror understands the strict contract requirements for the maintenance of water quality due to the upstream proximity of the construction to Tacoma's water supply pipeline. The Offeror's plan must meet all requirements of the specifications. The plan must show:

a. Site Run-Off Water Control Plan. Submit a detailed plan to control site run-off water, including use of sedimentation pond.

b. Water Pollution Control Plan. Submit a detailed plan to control water pollution due to contractor activities.

c. Turbid Water Control Plan. Submit a detailed plan to control turbid water from excavation.

d. SEDIMENT CONTROL PLAN. Submit a detailed plan to control sediments within the reservoir and project site in general.

e. Emergency Pollution Response Plan. Submit a detailed plan for emergency pollution response. Identify the firm to be used for this response plan.

f. Construction Shutdown Plan. Submit a detailed plan for construction shutdowns to manage turbidity.

g. Tacoma Public Utilities Temporary Shutdown Schedule. Submit a schedule identifying all activities requiring temporary shutdowns of Tacoma Public Utilities water supply facilities and tentative timeframes of such events.

h. Details of boat to be provided by Offeror to government for Water Quality monitoring.

2. Evaluation Method. Plans will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness and understanding of the work. The more thorough and reasonable the plan, and the more the plan demonstrates the offeror's understanding of the work requirements, the higher the assigned rating.

G. Proposal For Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir from Elevation 1070 to Elevation 1150.

1. Submittal Requirements. Submit a detailed plan that demonstrates the offeror's understanding of the harsh conditions of the reservoir during flood control season and the high reservoir storage pool during the conservation season. Include the means and methods to be employed to be most effective in accomplishing the work in spite of the fluctuating reservoir levels using the data for the period of record of the reservoir as provided in the project Hydraulics and Hydrology Baseline Report. Also include your plan for work interruptions and standby time when working in the reservoir below elevation 1150. Please note that no separate payment will be made to the Offeror for work stoppages due to the fluctuating reservoir levels below elevation 1150 during flood control season.

2. Evaluation Method. Plans will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness and understanding of the work. The more thorough and reasonable the plan, and the more the plan demonstrates the offeror's understanding of the work requirements, the higher the assigned rating.

H. Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation.

1. Submittal Requirements. The Cofferdam structure will serve as the permanent upstream portion of the Fish Passage Facility. Submit a detailed plan, including technical details, of the proposed means and methods of ensuring the integrity of the foundation and watertightness of the Cofferdam during project performance. The proposal shall include information on:

- a. Underwater rock excavation
- b. Underwater concrete
- c. Underwater Grouting
- d. Embedded metals
- e. Structural integrity assurance
- f. Watertightness of cofferdam

2. Evaluation Method. Plans will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness and understanding of the work. The more thorough and reasonable the plan, and the more the plan demonstrates the offeror's understanding of the work requirements, the higher the assigned rating.

I. Past Performance in Implementing Subcontracting Plans

1. No submittal required for this criterion. The Government will utilize performance evaluations contained in the Construction Contract Administration Support System (CCASS) to evaluate this criterion.

2. Evaluation Method. Firms will be evaluated based on the ratings received for item 16i, "Implementation of Subcontracting Plan" for performance evaluations retrieved from the

CCASS system. Firms without any evaluations in the CCASS system, or for which this item is not evaluated (N/A) will receive a neutral (Satisfactory) rating. Firms that are rated Satisfactory or higher for this item in CCASS report(s) will receive a rating of Satisfactory. Firms that receive a rating below Satisfactory for this item in one or more CCASS reports will receive a rating of Marginal for this criterion

6. PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND AWARD

A. Relative Importance Definitions: For the purpose of this evaluation, the following terms will be used to establish the relative importance of each criterion:

1. Significantly More Important: The criterion is at least two times greater in value than another criterion.

2. More Important: The criterion is one and one half times greater in value than another criterion, but less than two times greater in value.

3. Equal: The criterion is of the same value as another criterion.

B. Ranking of Importance of Technical Evaluation Factors:

1. “Relevant experience of the Offeror’s Construction Team” is more important than:

- Qualifications of key team members
- Past Performance
- Proposed Schedule

And is significantly more important than all other criteria.

2. “Qualifications of key team members”, “Past Performance”, “Proposed Schedule” are equal in value but more important than:

- Proposal for Protection of Existing Structures
- Proposal for Water Quality Protection
- Proposal for Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir
- Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation
- Extent of Small And Small and Disadvantaged Business Participation

3. “Proposal for Protection of Existing Structures”, and “Proposal for Water Quality Protection” are equal in value but are more important than “Proposal for Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir” and “Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation”.

4. “Proposal for Working in the Fluctuating Conditions of the Reservoir”, and “Proposal for Permanent Structure Foundation” are equal in value but are more important than “Extent of Small And Small and Disadvantaged Business Participation”.

C. Evaluation. Proposals will be evaluated based technical merit and cost. A firm fixed-price contract will be awarded to one firm submitting the proposal that conforms to the terms and conditions of the solicitation, provides the best value to the Government based upon

consideration of both technical merit and cost, and is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

D. Competitive Range. The Government intends to make award based on initial offers. However, if it is not possible to make award based on initial offers and the Contracting Officer determines that discussions are necessary, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range comprised of the most highly rated proposals. The Contracting Officer may elect to further reduce the number of firms in the competitive range for the purposes of efficiency. Proposals that are eliminated or otherwise removed from the competitive range will not be considered for award, and any further revisions to that offeror's proposal will not be accepted or considered.

E. Discussions. Discussions will be held only with the firms in the competitive range. If, after discussions have begun, an offeror originally in the competitive range is no longer considered to be among the most highly rated offerors being considered for award, that offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range whether or not all material aspects of the proposal have been discussed, or whether or not the offeror has been afforded an opportunity to submit a proposal revision. Discussions will normally be conducted in writing. The Contracting Officer will discuss with each offeror in the competitive range, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of its proposal that could, in the opinion of the Contracting Officer, be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award. The scope and extent of discussions are a matter of Contracting Officer judgment. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror still in the competitive range will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal revision. At this point, the Government intends to make award without obtaining further revisions.

F. Selection and Award – The Government intends to make award based on initial offers. If discussions are conducted, then after receipt of final proposal revisions, the Technical Evaluation Team will evaluate supplemental information provided by offerors, adjust technical ratings previously assigned, and provide a recommendation to the Contracting Officer. Subsequently, and after evaluation of any changes to proposed prices, the Contracting Officer will perform a best-value analysis. In determining the best value to the Government, the tradeoff process of evaluation will be utilized. The tradeoff process permits tradeoffs among technical criteria and price, and allows the Contracting Officer to consider award to other than the lowest priced offerer or other than the highest technically rated offerer. **For this solicitation, technical factors are regarded higher than the price.** Selection will be made to the responsible offer that conforms to the solicitation and represents the most advantageous offer to the Government.

7. DEBRIEFINGS.

A. Pre-award. Offerors excluded from the competition before award will receive a notice and may request a debriefing before award by submitting a written request for a debriefing to the Contracting Officer within three (3) days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the competition.

B. Post Award. Unsuccessful Offerors shall request post-award debriefing within three (3) days after the date on which the offeror received notification of contract award. Point-by-point comparisons with other offerors' proposals will not be made, and debriefings will not reveal any information that is not releasable under the Freedom of Information Act.

8. PROPOSAL EXPENSES AND PRECONTRACT COSTS. This solicitation does not commit the Government to pay costs incurred in preparation and submission of the initial and any subsequent proposals or any other costs incurred prior to execution of a formal contract.

END SECTION 00110

SEE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY FOLLOWING THIS PAGE

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

DACW67-03-R-0001, Howard Hanson Dam Fish Passage Restoration Facility, Cofferdam and
Excavation, King County Washington
Seattle District, Corps of Engineers

SECTION 1 -- TO BE COMPLETED BY THE OFFEROR AND PROVIDED TO THE CUSTOMER REFERENCE

Name of Firm Being Evaluated: _____

Project Title & Location: _____

Project Dollar Value (for design-build, list both design and construction amounts):

Year Completed: _____ Project Manager: _____

SECTION 2 -- TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CUSTOMER REFERENCE AND MAILED, HAND-DELIVERED, E-MAILED OR FAXED DIRECTLY TO: Forms submitted by other than the customer (i.e., by the offeror), will not be considered.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
Attn: CENWS-CT-CB-CU (J Alex Smith)
P.O. Box 3755
Seattle, WA 98124-3755

FAX: (206) 764-6817
Street Address:
4735 E. Marginal Way S.
Seattle WA 98134-2385
E- Mail j.alex.smith@usace.army.mil

OVERVIEW: The firm shown above has submitted a proposal on a Seattle District Corps of Engineers project and provided your name as a customer reference. Part of our evaluation process requires information on the firm's past performance. Your input is important to us and responses are required by **Bid Closing Date** for inclusion in our evaluation. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

In the blocks below, please indicate your overall level of satisfaction with the work performed by the firm shown in Section 1. Mark *Not Applicable* (N/A) for any areas that do not apply. Please include comments on page 2 of this form.

	On this project, the firm:	Satisfaction					
		Low			High		
1.	Completed Your Major Project Milestones on Time	1	2	3	4	5	N/ A
2.	Delivered Quality Construction	1	2	3	4	5	N/ A
3.	Demonstrated a Willingness to Cooperate	1	2	3	4	5	N/ A

This page intentionally blank