



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P.O. BOX 3755  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98124-3755

Military Unit  
Contracting Division

21 April 2004

**SUBJECT:** Two-Phase Design-Build Selection Procedures for Request For Proposals (RFP) Number W912DW-04-R-0023, entitled "Replacement Housing, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, PN 057785 FTW 251 FY04 (100 UNITS), AND PN 057074 FTW 283 FY04 94 UNITS)."

**TO:** PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS

**PHASE ONE (TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS)  
DESIGN-BUILD EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

**PAPERLESS PUBLICATION NOTICE**

<http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/ct/ebs/>

Any subsequent revisions to this notice will be reflected on this web page. Offerors are responsible for checking this web page to acquire any updates. The Government will not mail, fax, or e-mail this Pre-Qualification Notice. The Government web site is occasionally inaccessible due to maintenance. The Government is not responsible for any loss of Internet connectivity or for an offeror's inability to access or download this document. **TECHNICAL INQUIRES** (DrChecks) are to be submitted via the Internet at [www.projnet.org](http://www.projnet.org). A password is required. Bidders can obtain their password by going to ([www.projnet.org](http://www.projnet.org)), clicking on Bidder Inquiry, filling out the form provided, and then clicking Continue. Enter your question and click Submit Inquiry. You will receive acknowledgement of your question via email, followed by an answer to your question after it has been processed by our technical team.

This solicitation will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 36.3 entitled "Two-Phase Design-Build Selection Procedures." In **Phase One (Technical Qualification)**, submittals will be evaluated based on their demonstrated qualifications, experience, and past performance to determine which offerors shall submit proposals for **Phase Two (e.g., Housing Aesthetics and Functionality,; Site Design and Engineering; Schedule, and Price Proposal)**. After evaluating phase-one proposals, the Seattle District Corps of Engineers' Contracting Officer shall select the most highly qualified offerors (not to exceed five (5)), and request that only those offerors submit phase-two proposals. Phase Two will require technical (e.g., Housing Aesthetics and Functionality, Site Design and Engineering; Schedule,), and price proposals which will be evaluated separately, in accordance with FAR Part 15. The contract schedule will be structured such that the two projects may be awarded either individually as separate contracts or combined to be awarded as a single contract to the offeror or offerors providing the best value to the Government in terms of technical, price, and other pertinent factors (e.g., extent of small business participation). PLEASE NOTE: It is expected that the design build team presented in Phase One will be exactly the same as proposed

W912DW-04-R-0023

PHASE ONE DESIGN BUILD  
EVALUATION PROCEDURES

in Phase Two. If any change in this team is provided in the Phase Two proposal, the offeror is to notify the Contracting Officer in writing and demonstrate how any new individuals or firms are as qualified for this project as those submitted with Phase One of this procurement.

The successful design-build contractor will design and construct the replacement JNCO housing units at Fort Wainwright, Alaska as follows: The work shall consist of design and construction of new units and associated supporting infrastructure (utilities, roads, sidewalks, play areas and etc.) for the Taku Gardens neighborhood at Fort Wainwright, Alaska. The housing site is approximately 64 acres in size and is located in a relatively flat, undeveloped area. The new housing units will be a mixture of 3, 4 and 5 bedroom two-story duplex units with 5% of the units to be barrier-free accessible (ADA) single story units. Solicitation documents will include conceptual plans for both the site and the housing units. Contractor(s) design and construction shall be based on completing the designs as presented in the solicitation documents since the completed project is to function as a single integrated community.

Period of performance is 730 calendar days. The price range for this project is between \$25,000,000 and \$100,000,000.

The North American Industry Classification System 236116, and for the purposes of this procurement, a concern is considered a small business if its annual average gross revenue, taken for the last 3 fiscal years, does not exceed \$28.5 million. This project is open to both large and small business.

**NOTICE TO LARGE BUSINESS:** If you are a large business and your proposal will exceed \$1 million, you will be required to submit a subcontracting plan with goals for small, HUBZone, small disadvantaged, small woman-owned, small veteran-owned concerns, and veteran owned small disadvantaged business. The subcontracting goals for the Seattle District which will be considered in the negotiation of this contract are: (1) at least 70% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Small Businesses (SB); (2) at least 10% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDB) or Historically Black College or University and Minority institution; and, (3) at least 10% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB),(4) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB); (5) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Service-Disabled Veteran owned Small Business (SDVOB); and (6) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with HUB zones. This subcontracting plan is required to be submitted along with the Phase Two proposal.

**PHASE ONE EVALUATION FACTORS - SUBMISSION OF EXPERIENCE, QUALIFICATIONS, AND PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.**

**Technical Evaluation Criteria:** Offerors shall be evaluated for the following criteria, and each criterion is considered equal in value to the Government as another criterion.

- a. **Construction Experience.**
- b. **Design Experience.**
- c. **Qualifications of Proposed Team Members** (e.g., education, experience, professional registration, etc.)
- d. **Past performance**, including customer satisfaction, quality, & timely performance.

**Specific Submittal Requirements for Phase One Criteria:**

a. **Construction Experience.** For Construction Experience, the Offeror must submit information on four separate areas: 1) Experience on Similar Housing Projects, 2) Design-Build construction experience, 3) Military Construction Experience and 4) Similar Climate construction experience. Submittal Requirements: The Offeror should submit up to four (4) project examples for each experience area constructed within the past seven (7) years. Only those projects for which the Offeror or a primary teaming partner was the Prime Contractor should be submitted. The projects selected should clearly demonstrate the construction capabilities of the Offeror. Project examples that show more than one area of experience may be listed as a qualified project under each applicable area of experience. The Offeror must clearly identify for which experience area(s) each project example pertains (e.g., Project A may qualify and be listed for similar housing project, design-build, MILCON and similar climate while Project B may qualify and be listed only for similar housing project; etc.). Sample as follows:

<b>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT EXPERIENCE MATRIX</b>	<b>SIMILAR HOUSING PROJECTS</b>	<b>DESIGN BUILD CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>SIMILAR CLIMATE</b>
<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>				
<b>PROJECT A</b>	●	●		●
<b>PROJECT B</b>		●	●	
<b>PROJECT C</b>	●	●		
<b>PROJECT D</b>	●		●	●

**b. Design Experience.** For Design Experience, the Offeror should submit information on five separate areas: 1) Experience on Similar Housing Projects, 2) Design-Build Experience, 3) Military Construction (MILCON) Design Experience, 4) Similar Climate Design Experience, and 5) LEED Projects. **Submittal Requirements:** The Offeror should submit up to four (4) project examples for each experience area designed within the past seven (7) years. Only those projects for which the Offeror or a primary teaming partner performed the actual design effort should be submitted. Project examples that show more than one area of experience may be listed as a qualified project under each applicable area of experience. Provide an OVERALL SUMMARY MATRIX (GRAPH) that is structured to show projects on which the team members have worked together. On this same matrix, clearly identify for which experience area(s) each project example pertains (e.g., Project A may qualify and be listed for similar housing projects, design-build, MILCON, and similar climate while Project B may qualify and be listed only for similar housing projects; etc. Sample as follows:

<b>DESIGN PROJECT EXPERIENCE MATRIX</b>	<b>SIMILAR HOUSING PROJECTS</b>	<b>DESIGN BUILD CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>SIMILAR CLIMATE</b>	<b>LEED</b>	<b>CONSTRUCTION/ DESIGN TEAM MEMBERS WORKED TOGETHER</b>
PROJECT TITLE						
<b>PROJECT A</b>	●	●		●	●	●
<b>PROJECT B</b>		●	●			
<b>PROJECT C</b>	●	●				●
<b>PROJECT D</b>	●		●	●		●

Using a format similar to that shown below, provide specific information on the projects listed for both the construction and the design firms.

**Specialized Experience**

Project Title & Location
Project Type (e.g., design-build (DB), design (D), construction (C))
Dollar Value (design \$; construction \$)
Start & Completion Dates (Month/Year)
Role of Firm(s) (e.g., prime, sub) (address type of work performed and percentage of work, as applicable)
Brief Description of Project (address how this relates to solicitation project)
Sustainable Design Features/LEED Certification of Project
Customer Point of Contact (i.e., name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current phone no.)
Awards or recognition received (if applicable)

**Evaluation Method for Construction/Design Experience.** The more recent and the greater the relevancy of the offeror's team prior project experience to the categories listed above (similar housing projects, Design Build, MILCON, similar climate, and LEED) , the higher the value assigned for the experience during evaluations. Design-build projects will be considered more relevant than non-design-build projects. Demonstration of experience in completing projects that had the unique characteristics of the proposed project (arctic climate) will be evaluated more favorably. Projects involving design/build, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification from the US Green Building Council, and attributes similar to those specified may be given more consideration. Design-build experience working together as a team will be considered more relevant than non-design-build experience working together. NOTE: For purposes of this solicitation, a DESIGN-BUILD project is defined as a project where the successful contractor is responsible for the design and construction of a complete and usable facility in accordance with the requirements of the request for proposals. SUSTAINABLE DESIGN is defined as using an integrated design approach and emphasizing environmental stewardship, especially energy and water conservation and efficiency, use of recovered and recycled materials, waste reduction, reduction or elimination of toxic and harmful substances in facilities construction and operation, efficiency in resource and materials utilization, and development of healthy, safe and productive work environments.

c. **Qualifications of Proposed Team Members** (e.g., education, experience, professional registration, etc.) It is expected that the team presented in Phase One will be exactly the same as proposed in Phase Two and that the team will perform on the project. If any change is provided in the Phase Two proposal, the offeror shall demonstrate how any new individuals or firms are as qualified for this project as those submitted with Phase One of this procurement.

**Submittal Requirements:** Provide the qualifications of the KEY individual team members (both construction and design) proposed for this project in the form of resumes. As a minimum, provide resumes for the construction firm's project manager, project on-site superintendent, the design firm's project manager, lead architect and lead design engineers (specifically mechanical, electrical, civil, structural, geotechnical engineer, landscape architect, and LEED accredited professional), and Quality Control Systems Manager.. Individual's qualifications will be measured against the following criteria:

**Construction Project Manager:** The construction project manager shall have a baccalaureate degree in engineering, architecture or construction management with a minimum of 7 years experience managing construction projects and having managed a minimum of 2 projects that demonstrates the ability to manage construction projects similar in scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation or a person in the construction field with a minimum of 10 years managing construction projects and having managed a minimum of 2 projects of the same scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation.

**Project Superintendent:** The Project Superintendent shall have no less than 7 years of experience as a project superintendent on construction projects of similar scope, cost and complexity. The experience must demonstrate construction knowledge, the ability to manage large subcontracting teams, complex projects, and multiple buildings, and be consistent with the type of construction required in this solicitation.

**Design Project Manager:** The design project manager shall have a baccalaureate degree in architecture or engineering, with a minimum of 7 years project management experience and having managed at minimum of 3 projects that demonstrates the ability to manage projects similar in scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation.

**Design team members** (lead architect, mechanical, electrical, civil, structural, geotechnical engineer, landscape architect, and LEED accredited professional): Lead design team members shall have a baccalaureate degree in architecture and/or engineering, shall be registered/licensed to practice in the State of Alaska, and shall have a minimum of 5 years as senior or lead designers. In addition each individual shall have worked on at least one project of similar scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation

**Quality Control System Manager:** The Contractor shall identify as Contractor Quality Control System Manager (CQCSM) an individual within the onsite work organization who shall be responsible for overall management of CQC and have the authority to act in all CQC matters for the Contractor. The CQCSM shall be a graduate engineer, graduate architect, or a graduate of construction management, with a minimum of 5 years construction experience on construction similar to this contract or a construction person with a minimum of 10 years in related work. This CQCSM shall be on the site at all times during construction, shall be assigned no other duties and shall be employed by the prime Contractor.

Resumes should be no more than two (2) pages per individual and submitted in a format similar to the one shown below.

Personnel Qualifications/Experience

Name/Title
Proposed Duties/Functions (for this project)
Firm Affiliation/Years Affiliated
Years of Experience (performing duties/functions as proposed for this project)
Education (Degree, Year, Specialization)
Active Registrations (and/or Professional/Technical Licenses/Certifications)
Specific Qualifications (for this project, if any)
List of Relevant Projects Including:
Project Title & Location
Project Type (e.g., design-build (DB), design (D), construction (C))
Dollar Value (design \$; construction \$)
Start & Completion Dates (Month/Year)
Duties/Functions (address how this relates to role for solicitation project)
Brief Description of Project (address how this relates to solicitation project)
Sustainable Design/LEED Certification status
Customer Point of Contact (i.e., name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current phone no.)
Awards or recognition received (if applicable)

**Evaluation Method:** The more recent and the greater the relevancy of the team members' qualifications, registrations, and prior project experience, the higher the value assigned for this criterion during evaluations. In addition, qualifications of key personnel that demonstrate experience, registration, and training in an arctic climate, sustainable design and/or construction will be considered favorably. The more recent, and the greater the extent and relevance, of the key team members' qualifications, prior project experience, and active registrations, 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.

d. **Past performance**, including customer satisfaction, quality, and timely performance. A lack of past performance information will receive a neutral rating during evaluation. Government databases will be checked and previous customers may be contacted as references.

Submittal Requirements:

Past performance of the prime contractor will be evaluated using the Construction Contractor Administrative Support System (CCASS) database and customer satisfaction surveys. All performance ratings for the prime contractor in CCASS for the past 7 years shall be considered. If an offeror does not have past performance available in CCASS, the customer satisfaction surveys will be used exclusively. Should the offerors want to review the CCASS ratings contained in the Corps of Engineers CCASS Database, they may request the information

by fax on company letterhead at the following telefax number: (503) 808-4596. All design build projects submitted on a customer satisfaction survey must have been completed within the last 7 years. Further instructions are found at the top of the customer satisfaction survey. Only relevant projects (of similar scope, cost and complexity as this solicitation) should be included on the surveys. The Government reserves the right to contact the evaluator on previous government or private sector work to verify the offeror's construction experience.

Offerors shall submit a list of all customers (including current Point of Contact and phone number) to whom a Past Performance Survey was provided. A reproducible customer satisfaction survey form is provided at the end of this Phase-One portion. **NO MORE THAN FOUR (4) CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEYS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED FOR THE PRIME FIRM** To be considered, the surveys must be completed by the customers and mailed, emailed, hand-delivered, or faxed directly by the customer to the Seattle District Contracting Division for receipt no later than the time and date the Phase I submittals are due.

**Surveys submitted directly by offerors will not be considered. Please ensure envelopes containing surveys submitted to this office do not contain the offeror's return address.**

**Evaluation Method.** The Government will evaluate the relative merits of each offeror's past performance. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an offeror's performance history, but attribute more significance to work that was similar in nature, magnitude, and complexity to this project, and will attribute more significance in evaluating the performance of those projects listed in construction experience.

#### **Technical Merit Ratings:**

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 the highest quality performance are anticipated. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The offeror 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. 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 significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Disadvantages are minimal. **HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

c. **Satisfactory (Neutral)** - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to meet performance or capability standards. An acceptable solution is provided. Either meets all RFP requirements for the criterion or contains weaknesses in some areas that are offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the offeror has a reasonable probability of success, as there is sufficient confidence that a fully compliant level of performance will be achieved. The proposal demonstrates an adequate understanding of the scope and depth of the RFP requirements. No significant advantages or disadvantages. Equates to neutral. REASONABLE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.

d. **Marginal** – The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific criterion. The offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be considered deficient. Proposal does not meet some of the minimum requirements. The assignment of a rating within the bounds of "Marginal" indicates that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. The offeror's plans or approach will likely result in questionable quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Low probability of success although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least acceptable. Significant disadvantages. LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.

e. **Unsatisfactory** – Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Unacceptable. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the submittal. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved. The proposal contains many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; fails to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government's requirements; and/or fails to meet most or all of the minimum requirements. Very significant disadvantages. VERY LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.

#### **Definitions of Strength, Weakness, and Deficiency:**

**Strength:** A substantive aspect, attribute, or specific item in the proposal that exceeds the solicitation requirements and enhances the probability of successful contract performance.

**Weakness:** A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (i.e., meets the RFP requirements, but may have an impact on schedule or quality requirements). A weakness need not be corrected for a proposal to be considered for award, but may affect the offeror's rating.

**Deficiency:** A material failure of a proposal to meet the Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of contract performance at an unacceptable level. A deficiency must be corrected for a proposal to be considered for award.

## **General Submittal Requirements for Phase One.**

Offerors must submit information for the above criteria in sufficient detail to permit proper evaluation. Submittals must be in a format that follows the sequence of criteria set forth in the paragraphs above. Absence of information will be deemed as if no support for that criterion is available. Submittals should be on 8½ x 11-inch paper, to the maximum extent practicable, and submitted in standard letter-size, loose-leaf binders. Contents of binders should be tabbed and labeled with a table of contents for easy identification, with all pages numbered sequentially. No material should be incorporated by reference. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation.

Submittals for Phase One are not to exceed a total of 60 pages. Photographs and organizational charts will not be considered a page. However, a photograph with more than 6 lines of text (for caption purposes) counts as one page. Double-sided pages count as two pages. Excessive proposals may be construed as an indication of the offeror's lack of cost-consciousness and risk not being evaluated.

Provide the Following Additional Information with The Submittals FOR PHASE ONE:

a. An information page containing the solicitation number, and complete name, address, telephone number, fax number, e-mail address and points of contact for each firm proposed as a team member.

b. The name, point of contact, phone number, and address for the bank and the bonding company of the firm. Financial capacity will be checked, but not rated.

ONE ORIGINAL AND FIVE (5) COPIES OF SUBMITTALS ARE REQUIRED, in the format specified above, to reach the Seattle District Corps of Engineers Contracting Division Office no later than 2:00 PM, Pacific Time, on 8 June 2004. The office is located at 4735 E. Marginal Way S., Seattle, WA 98134-2385. Submittals may be mailed to:

U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Seattle District  
CENWS-CT-CB-MU, ATTN: Nancy Gary  
P.O. Box 3755, Seattle WA 98124-3755  
(206) 764-6806

Offerors who are not Pre-Qualified may request debriefing by submitting a written request to the Contracting Office within three (3) days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the most qualified list.

Copies of the Request for Proposals will be provided only to the firms selected in Phase One. The RFP package is expected to be issued on or about 25 June 2004, with proposals due on or about 26 July 2004. About 15 days after the issue date, the Government will conduct a preproposal conference and site visit for the Pre-Qualified firms. The attached draft copy of

Section 00110 **is provided for planning purposes only** by the contractor of what may be required for solicitation submittal in Phase Two, and does not require any action for this Phase One.

If you have any questions concerning this notice, please contact Nancy Gary at (206) 764-3266, facsimile (206) 764-6817, or email [nancy.gary@usace.army.mil](mailto:nancy.gary@usace.army.mil)

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan K. Sherrell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Susan K. Sherrell  
Contracting Officer

Attachments  
Customer Satisfaction Survey Form  
Draft of Section 00110

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY (PAGE 1 OF 2)**  
**DACA67-04-R-0023, DESIGN-BUILD: REPLACEMENT HOUSING, FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA**

**SECTION 1 -- TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR AND PROVIDED TO REFERENCE**

Name of Firm Being Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title & Location: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Dollar Value: \_\_\_\_\_ Year Completed: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2 - TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CUSTOMER REFERENCE AND MAILED, EMAILED, FAXED OR HAND-DELIVERED DIRECTLY TO:**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District  
 Attn: CENWS-CT-CB-MU Attn: NANCY GARY  
 P.O. Box 3755  
 Seattle, WA 98124-3755

FAX: (206) 764-6817  
 Street Address:  
 4735 E. Marginal Way S.  
 Seattle WA 98134-2329

Forms submitted by other than the customer (i.e., by the offeror), may not be considered.

OVERVIEW: The firm shown above has selected you as a customer reference to provide information on the firm's past performance. Your input is important to this firm and responses are required no later than the time and date proposals are due for inclusion in our evaluation (.

Name of Individual completing survey: \_\_\_\_\_

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Relationship to this Project: \_\_\_\_\_

The chart below depicts ratings to be used to evaluate this contractor's performance.

O	AA	S	M	U
Outstanding	Above Average	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Performance met all contract requirements and exceeded expectations. Problems, if any, were negligible, and were resolved in a timely and highly effective manner.	Performance met all contract requirements and exceeded some. There were a few minor problems which the contractor resolved in a timely, effective manner.	Performance met contract requirements. There were some minor problems, and corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory.	Performance did not meet some contractual requirements. There were problems, some of a serious nature, for which corrective action was only marginally effective.	Performance did not meet contractual requirements. There were serious problems, and the contractor's corrective actions were ineffective.

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY (PAGE 2 OF 2)**

*DACA67-04-R-0023, DESIGN-BUILD: REPLACEMENT HOUSING, FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA* In the following blocks, please indicate by circling your overall level of satisfaction with the work performed by the firm shown in Section 1. Reference the chart outlined on page 1 of this survey. For any marginal or unsatisfactory rating, please provide explanatory narratives in the remarks block. These narratives need not be lengthy; just detailed. If a question is not applicable, circle N/A. If more space is needed, then go to the end of the questionnaire or attach additional pages. Be sure to identify your continued narration with the respect line number, your name and project name.

A.	<b>Quality of Work:</b> Delivered quality construction and/or design; provided warranty support...	O AA S M U N/A
B	<b>Quality of Service/Effectiveness of Quality Control Program:</b> Completed your major project milestones on time, managed the project effectively (including adequate cost controls), managed their work force effectively (including subcontractors)	O AA S M U N/A
C.	Identification/correction of deficient work in a timely manner, displayed initiative in problem solving , resolved your concerns	O AA S M U N/A
D.	Was the project a design-build project? (A design-build project is defined as a project where the successful contractor is responsible for the design and construction of a complete and usable facility.) (If "yes", the firm was responsible for _____ % of the design.)	<b>Yes:</b> _____ <b>No:</b> _____
E	If design-build, effectiveness of communication between design and construction	O AA S M U N/A
F.	Displayed flexibility in responding to your needs, kept you informed, demonstrated a willingness to cooperate, treated you as an important member of the team.	O AA S M U N/A
G.	Was the team offered in the proposal, the same team that worked on the project? (If no, please describe below).	<b>Yes:</b> _____ N/A
H.	Was payment withheld or liquidated damages assessed?	<b>Yes:</b> _____ <b>No:</b> _____
I.	Were any features offered in the proposal not included in the completed project? (If yes to either, please describe below)	<b>Yes:</b> _____ <b>No:</b> _____
J..	Extent of participation of small business concerns as subcontractors under this contract (only for evaluation on Government Contracts)	O AA S M U N/A
K..	Overall rating for this project	O AA S M U N/A
T	Would you select this contractor again for future projects?	Yes or No (circle one)

**REMARKS: (Discuss strengths and weaknesses of the firm)**

Thank you for completing this form. Your assistance in providing this information is appreciated.

# PHASE TWO – SUBMISSION OF TECHNICAL AND PRICE PROPOSALS BY FIRMS SELECTED IN PHASE ONE

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Each of the selected firms is invited to submit proposals in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) No. W912DW-04-R-0023 entitled "Replacement Housing, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, PN 057785 FTW 251 FY04 (100 UNITS), AND PN 057074 FTW 283 FY04 (40 UNITS)." This RFP establishes project design and construction criteria and provides procedures, requirements, format, and other data to assist offerors in preparing their proposals. **It is the intent of the Government to make awards based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information.** Contracts will be awarded to the firm (or firms) submitting proposals that conform to the RFP, are considered to offer the most advantageous offers in terms of the evaluation factors, including price(s), and is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP drawings, while provided for informational purposes only, illustrate preferred spatial and functional arrangements and incorporated many of the preferred items and betterments noted in the statement of work. If the offeror proposes any substantial changes to the designs as depicted in the RFP drawings the changes shall be specifically addressed and expand upon in the offeror's proposal.

## 2. PHASE 2 EVALUATION FACTORS:

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of two criteria, **TECHNICAL** and **PRICE**. Award will be based upon evaluation of the following technical criteria listed in descending order of importance:

- A. Housing Aesthetics and Functionality. (See paragraph 7.2.1)
- B. Site Design and Engineering. (See paragraph 7.2.2)
- C. Schedule. (See paragraph 7.2.3)
- D. Extent of Small Business Participation. (See paragraph 7.2.4)

## 3. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE DEFINITIONS:

For this evaluation, the following terms will be used to establish the relative importance of the technical criteria:

- **More Important:** The criterion is (2) times more important in value to the Government than another criterion.
- **Equal:** The criterion is of the same value to the Government as another criterion.

#### **4. TECHNICAL CRITERIA ORDER OF IMPORTANCE:**

- Criterion A is more important than criterion B.
- Criteria B and C are equal in importance.
- Criteria B and C are more important than criterion D.

#### **5. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS:**

Technical proposals will be evaluated and rated for each criterion using the following adjectival descriptions:

**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 the highest quality performance are anticipated. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The offeror 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. Significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **VERY HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

**ABOVE AVERAGE** - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Have 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 significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Disadvantages are minimal. **HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

**SATISFACTORY (Neutral)** - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to meet performance or capability standards. An acceptable solution is provided. Either meets all RFP requirements for the criterion or contains weaknesses in some areas that are offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the offeror has a reasonable probability of success, as there is sufficient confidence that a fully compliant level of performance will be achieved. The proposal demonstrates an adequate understanding of the scope and depth of the RFP requirements. No significant advantages or disadvantages. Equates to neutral. **REASONABLE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

**MARGINAL** - The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific criterion. The offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be considered deficient. Proposal does not meet some of the minimum requirements. The assignment of a rating within the bounds of "Marginal" indicates that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. The offeror's plans or approach will likely result in questionable quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Low probability of success although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least acceptable. Significant disadvantages. **LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

**UNSATISFACTORY** – Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Unacceptable. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the submittal. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved. The proposal contains many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; fails to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government's requirements; and/or fails to meet most or all of the minimum requirements. Very significant disadvantages. **VERY LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

## **6. DEFINITIONS OF STRENGTH, WEAKNESS, AND DEFICIENCY:**

**Strength:** A substantive aspect, attribute, or specific item in the proposal that exceeds the solicitation basic requirements and enhances the probability of successful contract performance.

**Weakness:** A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (i.e., meets the RFP requirements, but may have an impact on schedule or quality requirements). A **weakness need not be corrected** for a proposal to be considered for award, but **may** affect the offeror's rating.

**Deficiency:** A material failure of a proposal to meet the Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of contract performance at an unacceptable level. A deficiency **must be corrected** for a proposal to be considered for award.

## **7. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PHASE TWO:**

### **7.1 General Submittal Requirements for Phase Two:**

**Proposal Contents:** Proposals shall be submitted in two parts: (a) Technical proposal and (b) Price proposal. Each part shall be submitted in a separate envelope/package, with the type of proposal (i.e., Technical or Price) clearly printed on the outside of the envelope/package.

**NOTICE TO ALL FIRMS:** The information provided for Phase One of this solicitation process regarding experience, qualifications and past performance is considered part of the firm's Technical proposal. No additional information shall be submitted for the evaluation factors listed for Phase One. For ease of evaluation, submit the proposal following the same organization and title format as specified in paragraph 8.1 Written Technical Proposal and 9. PRICE PROPOSAL FORMAT.

#### **7.1.1 Technical Proposal:**

A **cover letter** should be the **first page** of the technical proposal and should include:

- (a) Solicitation number.
- (b) Name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the firm signing the SF 1442 (and electronic address).

(c) Names, titles and telephone and facsimile numbers (and electronic addresses) of persons authorized to negotiate on the firm's behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation.

(d) Name, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.

(e) A statement specifying agreement (see also (f) below) with all terms, conditions provisions included in the solicitation and agreement to furnish any and all items upon which prices are offered at the proposed item prices.

(f) **Deviations From The RFP:** In the cover letter, firms shall specifically identify, in a section entitled "Deviations," any deviations from the minimum RFP requirements. All alternates shall be addressed and expanded upon in the firm's original proposal and any proposal revision.

(g) **Identification Of Items Exceeding RFP Requirements:** In an attachment to the cover letter, firms shall list all items exceeding the minimum RFP requirements. The list shall be entitled "IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS EXCEEDING RFP REQUIREMENTS." All items listed shall be addressed and expanded upon in the firm's original proposal any proposal revision.

(h) **Final Proposal Revision:** If required to submit a final proposal revision, the accompanying cover letter shall identify all changes made to the firm's initial proposal along with any deviations from the RFP (per (f) above). In addition, firms shall attach a list (per (g) above) of any additional items exceeding the minimum RFP requirements. This list shall also include elimination of, or revisions to, those items previously identified as exceeding the RFP.

### **7.1.2 Technical Data:**

Technical data consisting of drawings, outline specifications, and supporting data (schedules, catalogue cuts, etc.) shall be furnished as part of the formal proposal and shall meet all requirements of the RFP, design standards, technical specifications, and referenced regulations. Data shall be specific and complete, and demonstrate thorough understanding of the requirements. Data shall include, where applicable, complete explanations of procedures and the schedule the firm proposes to follow. Additionally, data shall demonstrate the merit of the technical approach offered and shall be an orderly, specific, and complete document in every detail.

### **7.1.3 Proposal Format:**

Information except for drawings shall be submitted in standard letter, hardback loose-leaf binders with a table of contents. Contents of the binders shall be tabbed and labeled to afford easy identification. Contents shall follow the order of the evaluation criteria and pages shall be numbered. No material shall be incorporated by reference or reiteration of the RFP. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation. The technical proposal shall be presented in a manner that allows it to "**STAND ALONE**" without the need to reference other documents.

**7.1.3.1** Firms submitting proposals should limit submission to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and monies are expended in preparing information required by the RFP.

7.1.3.2 Data submitted must reflect the designer's interpretation of criteria contained in the RFP. Drawing information, if required to clarify the offeror's proposal, should present basic concepts, arrangements, and layouts. Arrangements, layout plans, and notes may be combined together on single sheets in order to simplify presentation, so long as clarity is maintained. Drawings are not intended to be construction detail plans.

7.1.3.3 Unnecessarily elaborate or voluminous brochures or other presentations, beyond those sufficient to present a complete and effective response, are not desired and may be construed as an indication of the firm's lack of cost-consciousness. Elaborate artwork, expensive paper and bindings, and expensive/extensive visual and other presentation aids are unnecessary.

7.1.3.4 Firms are encouraged to prepare drawings for proposal submission using guidelines presented in Section 00810, Paragraph 5, Preparation of Project Design Documents. Proposal drawings, schedules, tables, etc. should be limited to ½ size (approximately 11" X 17"). However, to minimize effort expended by the firms, other formats will be accepted so long as requested information is provided. In either case, firms are encouraged to provide INFORMATIVE DRAWING NOTES to convey important features of their design.

**NOTE:** Technical proposals will be evaluated for conformance with the minimum RFP criteria, and for the extent to which they exceed those criteria. While the intent is to keep the pre-award design effort to a minimum, proposals must provide adequate detail for evaluators to determine how the proposals meet or exceed the RFP criteria.

## 7.2 Specific Submittal requirements for Phase Two:

### 7.2.1 Criterion A - Housing Aesthetics and Functionality:

This criterion considers the overall aesthetic value of the exterior style, appearance and finishes and the interior design and detailing of the interior environment created within the housing. This criterion also considers the quality of systems, products, fixtures, materials and finishes proposed.

#### 7.2.1.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion A

The Offerors shall provide a brief narrative description of the design aspects of the homes including a description of: 1) Exterior detailing, materials and finishes proposed. Include product literature and other descriptive material, as appropriate to convey design and quality intent for the proposed construction; 2) Interior detailing, materials, equipment and finishes proposed. Include product literature and other descriptive material, as appropriate to convey design and quality intent for the proposed construction; 3) Provide an interior perspective/elevation(s) of a typical family room kitchen area to present design intent and show proposed detailing. Identify materials shown on the perspective/elevation and key to product literature for interior materials and finishes proposed.

**7.2.1.2 Evaluation Method:**

Technical merit will be based on the degree to which proposed design, methods, materials, and equipment satisfy functional and operational requirements and exceed minimum acceptable quality including aesthetics, durability, maintainability and reliability specified in the RFP. Proposals that reflect the design intent and direction as outlined in the RFP will receive additional consideration during the evaluation process. Additional consideration will also be given for the number and value to the Government for the desirable design features incorporated into the work.

**7.2.2 Criterion B - Site Design and Engineering:**

This criterion considers the overall planning, layout, design and development of the site including utility systems, pedestrian circulation, accessibility to recreation areas (including tot lots) and night lighting provisions for walking paths and recreation areas. This criterion also considers the quality of landscape design proposed and how it defines the site amenities.

**7.2.2.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion B:**

The Offerors shall provide a brief narrative description of the basic site layout and the rationale behind the site design. Address the overall planning, layout, design and development of the site utility systems (including connections to the existing utility systems), address provisions for drainage solutions that will provide adequate protection for living units, yards and the prevention of ponding in common areas. Include a discussion of pedestrian circulation, recreation areas and landscape development. Provide a basic site layout for proposed play fields indicating location of play equipment, play field lighting and pedestrian access with typical walkway lighting. Provide an elevation of the proposed "Entry Monument" indicating materials, detailing and lighting. Include product literature and other descriptive materials, as appropriate to convey design and quality intent for the proposed construction.

**7.2.2.2 Evaluation Method:** Technical merit will be based on the degree to which proposed design, methods, materials, and equipment satisfy functional and operational requirements and exceed minimum acceptable quality including aesthetics, durability, maintainability and reliability

specified in RFP. Higher ratings will be assigned for the number and value to the Government for the desirable design features incorporated into the work.

**7.2.3 Criterion C – Schedule:**

This criterion includes the evaluation of the offeror’s planning and scheduling of the work (design, design reviews, and construction).

**7.2.3.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion C:**

Provide an outline of the plan for design and construction for the project. The schedule shall be prepared in the form of time-scaled (Gantt Chart) summary network diagram and shall graphically indicate sequences proposed to accomplish each work operation including design, design reviews and construction.

**7.2.3.2 Evaluation Method:** Merit will be based on the reasonableness of design and construction periods offered, including required Government review and comment periods, weather considerations, and identification of critical elements of design and construction which can/could delay the entire project.

**7.2.4 Criterion D - - Extent of Small Business Participation**

**7.2.4.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion E:**

No submittal is required for this criterion. The Government will utilize performance evaluations contained in CCASS or Customer Evaluation Forms to evaluate this criterion.

**7.2.4.2 Evaluation Method:** Firms will be evaluated for the success and extent of their small business participation in their subcontracting with small and disadvantaged business concerns. Firms will be evaluated based on the ratings received for item entitled “Implementation of Subcontracting Plan” on their past performance evaluations retrieved from the CCASS System or from Customer Evaluation Forms. Firms without any evaluations in CCASS or if no Customer Evaluation Forms were submitted, or for which this item was not evaluated (i.e., N/A because it was not a Government project), will be assigned a neutral rating of satisfactory. Firms that receive a rating below satisfactory for this item in one or more CCASS evaluations will receive a rating of marginal for this criterion.

**8. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FORMAT:**

**8.1 WRITTEN TECHNICAL PROPOSAL.**

As a minimum, each copy of the technical proposal should contain the following general format for the volumes specified in the following table. Pages should be numbered consecutively throughout the technical proposal.

**Technical Proposal (original and 10 copies required):**

Technical Proposal Cover Letter  
Table of Contents (List all sections of the technical proposal)  
Housing Aesthetics and Functionality  
Site Design and Engineering  
Schedule  
Extent of Small Business Participation

**9. PRICE PROPOSAL FORMAT:**

9.1 **Price Proposal** shall be submitted in **ORIGINAL** only, and must be signed by an official authorized to bind your organization. Note that the **Standard Form 1442, Block 13D** states the minimum number of calendar days after the date offers are due for Government acceptance of the offer. All amendments must be acknowledged on **Standard Form 1442 BACK** by date and number in **Block 19** or by telegram. Provide the name, point of contact, phone number, and address for bank and bonding company of firm signing **SF 1442**.

9.2 **Bid Bonds** must be accompanied by a **Power of Attorney containing an original signature from the surety**, which must be affixed to the Power of Attorney after the Power of Attorney has been generated. Computer generated and signed Powers of Attorney will only be accepted if accompanied by an original certification from a current officer of the surety attesting to its authenticity and continuing validity. Performance and payment bonds have the same requirement.

9.3 **Small Business Subcontracting. Large businesses are required to submit a subcontracting plan** (See FAR Clause 52.219-9 Alt II, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Jan 2002) with initial price proposals. Award will not be made under this solicitation without an approved subcontracting plan. See the "Notice to Large Business Firms" located in the front of this solicitation.

9.4 **Joint Ventures.** No contract may be awarded to a joint venture that is not registered in the Central Contractor Register (CCR). Joint ventures may register in the following way:

(a) The firm that will be the recipient of payments should be registered in the CCR and have a DUNS number. This firm is considered in the CCR to be the "mother firm." If no money is to go to any other firm in the joint venture, the mother firm may make the other firm in the joint venture a "child." This child will be assigned the mother firm's CCR number with an additional four (4) numbers attached. Since the child firm is not receiving any payments, they do not need to get a DUNS number. **HOWEVER**, in order to cover all possibilities, it might be advisable to have each firm registered in the CCR.

(b) Call the CCR at 1-888-227-2423, choose option "0" to get the mother-child relationship set up. DUN & Bradstreet phone number is 1-800-333-0505.

(c) If the joint venture has a newly created name, then it must have its own DUNS number and register as such in the CCR.

9.4.1 In the cover letter of your proposal, provide the complete names, addresses, and phone and fax numbers of the two firms in the joint venture.

9.4.2 Signature requirements: SF 1442, SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD (pages 00010-1 and 00010-2), Block 20 requires that the name and title of the person authorized to sign the offer for the joint venture be provided.

9.4.3 Corporate certificate: Ensure that joint-venture portion is completed by both firms.

9.4.4 In the case of a joint venture, the following is required: A contract with joint venturers may involve any combination of individuals, partnerships, or corporations. The contract shall be signed by each participant in the joint venture in the manner prescribed below for each type of participant. When a corporation is participating, the Contracting Officer shall verify that the corporation is authorized to participate in the joint venture.

**(a) Individuals. A contract with an individual shall be signed by that individual. A contract with an individual doing business as a firm shall be signed by that individual, and the signature shall be followed by the individual's types, stamped, or printed name and the words "an individual doing business as ....." [insert name of firm].**

(b) Partnerships. A contract with a partnership shall be signed in the partnership name. Before signing for the Government, the Contracting Officer shall obtain a list of all partners and ensure that the individual(s) signing for the partnership have authority to bind the partnership.

(c) Corporations. A contract with a corporation shall be signed in the corporate name, followed by the word "by" and the signature and title of the person authorized to sign. The Contracting Officer shall ensure that the person signing for the corporation has authority to bind the corporation.

9.4.5 In addition to the requirements stated above, and to assure a single point of contact for resolution of contractual matters and payments, the Contracting Officer shall obtain a certificate signed by each participant in the joint venture as follows: In the proposal include the following statement:

"The parties hereto expressly understand and agree as follows:

a. **(name, title, and company)** is the principal representative of the joint venture. As such, all communications regarding the administration of the contract and the performance of the work thereunder may be directed to him or her. In the absence of **(same name, title, and company)**, **(enter name, title, and company of alternate)** is the alternate principal representative of the joint venture.

b. Direction, approvals, required notices, and all other communications from the Government to the joint venture, including transmittal of payments by the Government, shall be directed to **(enter name, title, and company of principal)**, principal representative of the joint venture."

9.4.6 The bid bond form, Block "Principal" requires that the name and title of the person authorized to sign for the joint venture be included.

9.4.7 After award, the performance and payment bonds, and the insurance certificate(s) provided shall be in the name of the joint venture.

10. **FUNDING.** The total amount of funds available for the design and construction of this project is specified in the Schedule. Offerors should design and construct to this funding limit.

**11. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES**

**11.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION:**

11.1.1 : Technical proposals will be evaluated by a Technical Evaluation Team (TET) comprised of representatives of the Corps of Engineers and the Using Agency. Pricing data will not be considered during this evaluation. Criteria for the technical evaluation set forth in this RFP will be the sole basis for determining the technical merit of proposals.

11.1.2 The TET shall utilize the relative importance definitions and technical merit ratings described earlier in this section of the solicitation to perform their technical evaluation.

11.1.3 To be considered for award, proposals must conform to the terms and conditions contained in the RFP. No proposal will be accepted that does not address all criteria specified in this solicitation or which includes stipulations or qualifying conditions unacceptable to the Government.

**11.2 PRICE EVALUATION:**

Price is of secondary importance to the technical criteria. Pricing will be independently evaluated to determine reasonableness and to aid in the determination of the firm's understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract. Financial capacity and bonding ability will be verified.

**11.3 SELECTION AND AWARD:**

11.3.1 Subject to provisions contained herein, award of a firm-fixed price contract shall be made to a single firm. The Government will select the best value offer based on technical merit and price.

11.3.2 **Best Value Analysis.** The Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical features than with making award at the lowest overall cost to the Government. In determining the best value to the Government, the tradeoff process of evaluation will be utilized. The tradeoff process permits tradeoffs between price and technical criterion, and allows the Government to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror. You are advised that greater consideration will be given to the evaluation of technical proposals rather than price. It is pointed out, however, that should technical competence between offerors be considered approximately the same, the cost or price could become more important in determining award.

11.3.3 **Selection And Award Without Discussions:** It is the intent of the Government to make award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information. Therefore, initial proposals should be submitted based on the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint. Do not assume there will be an opportunity to clarify, discuss or revise proposals. If award is not made on initial offers, discussions will be conducted as described below.

**11.3.4 Competitive Range:** If it is not in the Government's best interest to make award on initial offers, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range of one or more offers and conduct discussions with those firms. When determining the competitive range, the Contracting Officer will consider the technical ratings and prices offered.

**11.3.5 Discussions:** Discussions are usually conducted in writing, but may also be by telephone or in person. Discussions are tailored to each offeror's proposal and are only conducted with offeror(s) in the competitive range. The primary objective of discussions is to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value, based on the requirement and the evaluation criteria set forth in this solicitation. If a firm's proposal is eliminated or otherwise removed from consideration for award during discussions, no further revisions to that firm's proposal will be accepted or considered. Discussions will culminate in a request for Final Proposal Revision the date and time of which will be common to all remaining firms.

**11.3.6 After Discussions:** Revisions to the proposals submitted during discussions, if any, will be evaluated by the TET and, if warranted, an adjustment made to the rating previously assigned. The Contracting Officer will then perform a best value analysis based on the final prices and technical proposals. Selection will be made on the basis of the responsive, responsible firm whose proposal conforms to the RFP and represents the most advantageous offer to the Government, subject to availability of funds.

**11.3.7 Debriefings:** Upon written request, unsuccessful firms will be debriefed and furnished the basis for the selection decision and contract award in accordance with FAR 15.505 and FAR 15.506.

**11.3.8 Proposal Expenses And Precontract Costs:** This solicitation does not commit the Government to pay costs incurred in preparation and submission of initial and subsequent proposals or for other costs incurred prior to award of a formal contract.

**11.3.9 Release Of Information:** After receipt of proposals and until contract award, source selection information will not be furnished to any firm.

END OF INTRODUCTORY TEXT TO SECTION 00100

DRAFT