

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
				J	1	2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 27-May-2004	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W68MD9-4086-1703		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) <b>See Item 6</b>		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W912DW-04-R-0025	
				X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 10-May-2004	
					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 <u>1</u> 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.) TITLE: Laboratory Analytical Services and Related Efforts in Support of the U.S. Army corps of Engineers (USACE), Seattle, District  SEE ATTACHED CONTINUATION SHEET						
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 27-May-2004	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

- a. The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate the revised Evaluation Criteria located in Section M of this said solicitation.
- b. Delete the Evaluation Criteria and replace with the attached revised Evaluation Criteria.
- c. There are no other changes as a result of this amendment.

(End of Summary of Changes)

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
  - A. Invitation**
  - B. Project Description**
- 2. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**
  - A. General Requirements**
  - B. Technical Proposal Format**
    - 1. Cover Letter**
    - 2. Table of Contents**
    - 3. Technical Data**
  - C. Price Proposal Format**
- 3. EVALUATION FACTORS**
  - A. Technical Evaluation Criteria**
    - 1. Organization Experience/Technical Capability with Similar Services**
    - 2. Quality of Management Approach**
    - 3. Past Performance**
  - B. Price**
- 4. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS**
  - A. Outstanding**
  - B. Above Average**
  - C. Satisfactory (Neutral)**
  - D. Marginal**
  - E. Unsatisfactory**
- 5. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHOD**
  - A. Organization Experience/Technical Capability with Similar Services**
    - 1. Organizational Chart and Key Personnel**
    - 2. Reporting and Detection Limits for the Analytical Parameters**
    - 3. Availability of Results from Laboratory Information Management System**
  - B. Quality of Management Approach**
    - 1. Internet Access**
    - 2. Same-Day Services**
    - 3. Quality Control Manual**
  - C. Past Performance**
- 6. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES**
  - A. Relative Importance Definitions**
    - 1. Significantly More Important**
    - 2. More Important**
    - 3. Comparatively Equal**
    - 4. Equal**

**B. Evaluation**

- 1. Technical proposal evaluation**
- 2. Evaluation by Technical Evaluation Team (TET)**
- 3. TET Utilization of rating factors**
- 4. Consideration for Award**
- 5. Price as secondary importance**

**C. Best Value Analysis**

**7. SELECTION AND AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS**

- A. Government's Intent**
- B. Competitive Range**
- C. During Discussions**
- D. After Discussions**
- E. Selection and Award**

**8. DEBRIEFINGS**

- A. Exclusion of Offerors**
- B. Unsuccessful Offerors**

## PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION

### 1. INTRODUCTION.

**A. Invitation** Your firm is invited to submit a proposal for the project entitled "**Analytical Laboratory Services for Environmental Sample Analysis in the states of Washington, Idaho and Montana for the Seattle District, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers**". Contractors 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 procure this service requirement on a competitive basis in accordance with the provisions set forth in this RFP, and make award on initial offers, without further discussions or additional information. Up to three Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Firm fixed-price contract will be awarded to the firms submitting the proposal that: a) conforms to this request for proposals (RFP); b) is considered to offer the best value to the Government in terms of the evaluation factors, including price; and, c) is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. The award will result in a contract that consists of a Base plus four (4) Option Periods. It is very important to read all sections of this RFP prior to assembling your proposal, in order for you to submit a successful proposal.

**B. Project Description** The Analytical Services support for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, is for the chemical analysis of soil, air, soil vapor, dredge materials, treatment system process streams, sediment, sludge, ground water, surface water, and other environmental samples. These samples have typically been collected from various hazardous and toxic waste site cleanup projects. Others may typically be collected from various hazardous and toxic waste site cleanup projects. Others may be emergency operations samples for characterization of unknowns including chemical and biological agents. Chemical analysis and reporting services will be performed by the Contract Laboratory in support of the hazardous waste investigations, remediation programs, and emergency operations conducted by, or on behalf of the Seattle District (NWS). The purpose of this project is to enable the performance, under a single contract mechanism, of analytical services for various projects as needed. Individual task orders will be issued for each analytical services scope under this contract. Each task order will contain specific scope-related information such as number and type of analyses required, test method references, project deliverable requirements, project timing, applicable shipping information, etc. (Attachment 1). Upon receipt of a project scope of work, the contractor laboratory will develop and submit a cost estimate to the USACE point of contact. Following USACE approval of this cost estimate, a task order will be issued to the contract laboratory for the project work.

### 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.

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). Data submitted must reflect the offeror's interpretation of criteria contained in the 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. Pages shall be numbered consecutively. 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. Arrangements, layout plans, and notes may all be combined together on single sheets in order to simplify presentation, so long as clarity is maintained. 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. Elaborate artwork, expensive paper and bindings, and expensive/extensive visual and other presentation aids are neither necessary nor wanted. Offeror's are encouraged to structure their proposal submission using guidelines presented in Paragraph B below, of this Section. However, to minimize effort expended by the Offeror's, other formats will be accepted so long as requested information is provided. Penalty for making false statements in proposals is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

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

1. **Cover Letter:** The Technical Proposal Cover Letter, including deviations and betterments, should be the first page of your technical proposal and must show the following:

- a. Solicitation number;
- b. Name, address, telephone and facsimile numbers of the Offeror, and electronic address, if available.
- c. Names, titles, telephone and facsimile numbers, and electronic addresses, if available, of persons authorized to negotiate on the Offeror's behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation.
- d. Names, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.
- e. A statement that the offer has an **acceptance period of 90 calendar days** from the date the offer is submitted.
- g. Deviations from the RFP: Offerors shall specifically identify, in their cover letter in a section entitled "Deviations", all deviations from the minimum RFP requirements, and if required to submit a Final Proposal Revision, all changes made to their original proposal. All

alternates shall be specifically addressed and expanded upon in the proposal or Final Proposal Revision. Deviations must not result in an Offeror's proposal that does not meet minimum RFP criteria. .

h. Identification of Items Exceeding RFP Requirements: Offeror's should specifically identify in an attachment to their cover letter a list entitled "Identification of Items Exceeding RFP Requirements" all items that exceed the minimum RFP requirements and, if required to submit a Final Proposal Revision, all changes made to their original proposal that exceed RFP minimum requirements. All of these items should be specifically addressed and expanded upon in the proposal or Final Proposal Revision.

i. Amendments: **Acknowledge all amendments** by number and date of issue **in your cover letter**. NOTE: If discussions are held, acknowledge all amendments issued on the cover letter submitted with your revised proposals or final proposal revisions.

2. **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.

3. **Technical Data:** Consisting of outline specifications and supporting data shall be furnished as part of the formal proposal and shall meet all requirements of the RFP, technical specifications and referenced regulations. It shall be specific and complete, and demonstrate thorough understanding of the requirements. It shall include, where applicable, complete explanations of procedures and the program you propose to follow. Additionally, it shall demonstrate the merit of the technical approach offered and shall be an orderly, specific, and complete document in every detail, and should demonstrate a thorough understanding of the requirement. It should include, where applicable, diagrams, charts, ;and complete explanations of the schedules or procedures you propose to follow.

**C. Price Proposal Format.** The contents of your price proposal should include the Pricing Schedule with prices for all line items (original). To include, completion and submission of Section K, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors, acknowledgement of all amendments, Standard Form (SF) 33, Solicitation, Offer & Award, and the Corporate Certificate located at the beginning of the solicitation. Ensure that the SF 33 is signed by an official authorized to bind for your firm.

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

**A. Technical Evaluation Criteria:**

1. Organization Experience/Technical Capability with Similar Services;
2. Quality of Management Approach;
3. Past Performance.

**B. Price:** Price will be evaluated for reasonableness, but not rated. Price will be a factor in establishing the competitive range prior to discussions and in making the final determination for award.

**4. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS.** Proposals will be evaluated using the following adjectival descriptions below. Evaluators will apply the appropriate adjective to each criterion (and sub-criterion) rated. The evaluator's narrative explanation must clearly establish that the Offeror's proposal meets the definitions established below:

**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 timeliness and highest quality performance is anticipated. Demonstrates exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The Offeror's qualifications meet the fullest expectations of 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. An assigned rating within "Outstanding" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the submittal contains essentially no significant weaknesses, deficiencies or disadvantages; demonstrate the least level of risk. 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. 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 Offeror's qualifications are adequately responsive with minor deficiencies but no major deficiencies noted. An assigned rating within "Above Average" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), any deficiencies noted are of a minor nature that should not seriously affect the Offeror's performance. The submittal demonstrates that the requirements of the RFP are well understood and the approach will likely result in a high quality of performance which represents low risk to the Government. A rating within "Above Average" is used when there are no indications of exceptional features or innovations that could prove to be beneficial, or contrarily, weaknesses that could diminish the quality of the effort or increase the risks of failure. Disadvantages are minimal. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceed 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. Meets minimum standard requirements. Few or no advantages or strengths. The Offeror's qualifications contain weaknesses in several areas that are not offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the Offeror may satisfactorily complete the proposed tasks, but there is at least a moderate risk that s/he will not be successful. 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. **No significant advantages or disadvantages.**

**D. Marginal** – Information submitted demonstrates the Offeror's potential to marginally meet performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific criterion (or sub-criterion). The Offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be Unsatisfactory. 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. The Offeror's qualifications demonstrate an acceptable understanding of the requirements of the RFP and the approach will likely result in an adequate 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. Response exceeds an "Unsatisfactory" rating. **Significant disadvantages.**

**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. The Offeror's qualifications submittals are so unacceptable that they would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable; demonstrates an unacceptable level of risk. **Very significant disadvantages.**

## **5. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHOD:**

**A. ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCE/TECHNICAL CAPABILITY WITH SIMILAR SERVICES:** *(Criterion A is Significantly More Important than Criterion B, Quality of Management Approach; Criterion B is Comparatively Equal to Criterion C, Past Performance. Sub-criterion 1 is Equally Important to Sub-criterion 2 and 3 under this Criterion.)*

### **DEFINITIONS:**

**LABORATORY PROJECT MANAGERS (PMs):** Laboratory Project Manager(s) are responsible for preparing the requirements are met by the laboratory, and advising internal personnel and customers of variances. The PM will provide technical guidance and necessary laboratory related information to the lab personnel and to the client, and provide peer review of the final document to ensure accuracy of the information and data. These individuals shall have a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in chemistry or any related scientific/engineering discipline. A minimum of three years of laboratory project management experience shall be required.

**QUALITY MANAGER:** The Quality Manager or Quality Control/Assurance (QC/QA) Manager or similar will be responsible for overseeing the QC/QA aspects of the data and serve as the focal point for QA/QC. This individual shall have a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in chemistry or any related scientific/engineering discipline. A minimum of three years of laboratory experience, including at least one year of applied experience with QC/QA principles and practices in an analytical laboratory, shall be required.

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST:** The Information Technology (IT) Specialist responsibilities will be to oversee the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS). This individual is responsible for performing checks of the EDD and to resolve all discrepancies prior to delivery.

#### **REPORTING LIMITS AND METHOD DETECTION LIMIT STUDIES:**

The proposed analytical laboratory must provide reporting and detection limits for the analytical parameters to be used in this contract as part of the proposal. The detection and reporting limits should be consistent with the best currently available technology and instrumentation in the industry using the test methods. If lower detection limits are available for certain parameters by using extra sample volume (for example using 25-mL purge sample rather than 5-mL purge sample for aqueous VOCs), or other adjustment, this should be noted.

USACE typically uses federal and state regulations from states where NWS typically performs work in, such as Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana. Depending on the project, one or more of the following types of federal or state criteria listed below are employed:

- MTCA
- Federal/State drinking water standards
- Groundwater and surface water quality standards
- TCLP criteria
- Residential or non-residential soil cleanup standards
- Sediment quality standards

Applicable regulatory criteria vary depending on the task order. USACE typically will supply these criteria in the task order scope and require that the reporting/detection limits are capable of meeting these applicable criteria.

The laboratory must also submit the most recent method detection limit (MDL) studies and Method Quantitation Limits (MQLs) for all analyses list in Tables 3-1 and 3-2.

#### **Sub-criterion 1: Organizational Chart and Key Personnel**

a. Organizational Chart: Offerors shall provide an organizational chart clearly showing the Laboratory Staff, as the personnel who will be utilized in the project's required services in accordance with the Statement of Work; and their responsibilities for this project. The

Organizational Chart for the proposed Laboratory Analysis Team shall include sufficient personnel with appropriate education, current training and experience to fulfill their assigned duties, stated in the Statement of Work, paragraph 4.3.

b. Project Manager: The Project Manager shall have a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in chemistry or any related scientific/engineering discipline; must have a minimum of three years laboratory project management experience, and a minimum of three projects that demonstrates relevant laboratory experience within the last three years on projects similar to the proposed responsibilities for this project.

c. Quality Manager: The Quality Manager, Quality Assurance Manager or similar shall have a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in chemistry or any related scientific/engineering discipline; and a minimum of three projects that demonstrates relevant laboratory experience and at least one year of applied experience within the last three years with Quality Control principles and practices in an analytical laboratory.

d. Information Technology (IT) Specialist – The IT Specialist must have a minimum of three years in laboratory information systems (LIMS) management, and a minimum of three projects that demonstrates relevant laboratory information systems management within the last three years on projects similar to the proposed responsibilities for this project. Experience must include: 1) The ability to generate a well-formed SEDD XML file and validate it against DTDs or schemas that will be provided; 2) Skill in interfacing instrument systems with LIMS. The IT specialist is also required to perform checks of the EDD for contract compliance and resolve all discrepancies prior to delivering the EDD to the Corps at the required turn-around-time.

#### **SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:**

a. In addition to resumes for the above personnel, Offerors shall submit resumes for at least three personnel that will report to the PM and at least three personnel that will report to the Quality Manager on typical sample analysis projects. The proposal should clearly present the credentials of each person. It is important that each resume include the relevant project experience mentioned in the previous criterion, above. Include all relevant educational qualifications. Resume 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 this potential 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 resumes, 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:

#### **Name/Title of Project:**

1. Summary of the Duties/Responsibilities for this project;
2. Firm Affiliation/Years Affiliated.

**Years of Experience (performing duties/functions as proposed for this project):**

1. Education (Degree, Year, and Specialization);
2. Active Registrations/Professional/Technical Licenses/Certifications;
3. Specific Qualifications for this project, (see criterion for any special instructions such as a minimum number of projects to list).

**List of Relevant Experience, for each project listed, provide :**

1. Project Title and Location;
2. Year(s) of experience;
3. Firm Affiliated with during this project;
4. Name of Employing Firm;
5. Duties/Functions (address how this relates to role for solicitation project);
6. Brief Description of Project (address how this relates to solicitation project).

**EVALUATION METHOD:** The Organizational 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 services described in the solicitation. The more recent experience, and the greater the extent and relevance, of the team members' qualifications, and prior project experience, the higher the rating assigned for this criterion during evaluations.

**Sub-criterion 2:** Reporting and Detection Limits for the Analytical Parameters

Offerors shall demonstrate the organization's capability that has relevant experience to perform the analytical services in accordance with the Statement of Work, by providing a the most current MDLs and MQLs for the analytical parameters listed on the bid schedule. The offeror shall explain how the project information provided is relevant to the proposed acquisition.

**SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS :**

a. **Types of Work Experience Required:** Specifically experienced and regularly engaging in the analytical services in accordance with the Statement of Work.

b. **Minimum Project Information:**

1. Project title & Location;
2. Dollar value of project;
3. Performance Period (month/year start to month/year end);
4. Brief Description of the laboratory analysis that meets the requirements of this criterion (explicitly state type of analysis, materials utilized and complexity and special conditions related to the reporting and detection limits required in this criterion.

5. Current Primary POC for the customer (name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city and state, phone number);
6. The firms on the proposed teams that performed this project; and
7. Work plan used that will demonstrate sufficient detail on how the services of the described analysis compare in complexity to the requirements in this project.

**EVALUATION METHOD:** This criterion will be evaluated for the quantity and quality of experience demonstrated. The greater the relevance and the more recent the prior project experience, the higher the rating assigned during evaluations. Demonstration of experience in completing projects that had the unique characteristics of the proposed project will be evaluated favorably. Projects involving reasonable and realistic Work Plan similar to the one specified in the Statement of Work of the solicitation may be given more consideration.

**Sub-criterion 3:** Availability of Results from Laboratory Information Management System:

The laboratory must indicate whether it is capable of providing data results in electronic format directly from a Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) as opposed to manual entry. A list will be provided as part of the proposal that describes parameters for which data results can be generated from the LIMS, as well as parameters for which data results cannot be generated from the LIMS (i.e., manual entry is required).

The laboratory must indicate whether it is capable of using a Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) to track the status of samples throughout the entire operation sequence of sample handling, analysis, and reporting by the lab. Specifically, the lab should provide a description of how the LIMS is used to control the following major functions:

- Sample receipt and login
- Sample scheduling
- Data acquisition
- Data processing and data approval
- Quality Control data processing
- Final reporting
- Electronic deliverables

**SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:**

The offeror must submit relevant experience in demonstrating the extent of human manipulation required in each of the above functions, and demonstrate their capability of providing data results in electronic format directly from the LIMS, for a minimum of three years with three projects that demonstrates the relevant experience.

**EVALUATION METHOD:** The more recent experience, and the greater the extent and relevance, of this offeror's relevant experience, the higher the rating assigned for this criterion during evaluations.

**B. QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT APPROACH:** *(Criterion B is Comparatively Equal to Criterion C, Past Performance; and Criterion A is Significantly More Important than Criterion B and C. All Sub-criteria are Equally Important under this Criterion.)*

1. Internet Access: The offeror must demonstrate their capability of providing access to data electronically and provide a summary description and information regarding any internet access capabilities that are available to USACE immediately; to include, maintaining and retaining the information for five (5) years following date of analyses. If external data validation is potentially required for any samples analyzed during this 5-year period, USACE will specify the comprehensive (fully data validatable) data package in the task order. The electronic format must have the following specific information:

- Sample status information
- Access to chain of custody forms
- Timely access to analytical results
- Access to historical data
- Generation of analytical reports
- Generation of electronic deliverables

2. Same-Day Courier Services: At a minimum, the offeror must demonstrate a minimum of two (2) instances where relevant experience was performed in responding to emergency situations; and the offeror provided the same-day delivery and/or pickup services when required. The offeror must demonstrate the type of delivery services provided in an emergency situation.

3. Quality Control Manual: The offeror must provide a Quality Control (QC) Manual. The manual shall be in accordance with the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference (NELAC) Quality Systems requirements. The Manual must contain the following items:

- a. A quality policy statement, including objectives and commitments, by top management;
- b. The organization and management structure of the laboratory, its place in any parent organization and relevant organizational charts;
- c. The relationship between management, technical operations, support services and the quality system;
- d. Procedures to ensure that all records required under this contract are retained, as well as procedures for control and maintenance of documentation through a document control system which ensures that all standard operating procedures (SOPs), manuals, or documents clearly indicate the time period during which the procedure or document was in force;
- e. Job descriptions of key staff and reference to the job descriptions of other staff;

- f. Identification of the laboratory's approved signatories; at a minimum, the title page of the Quality Control Manual must have the signed and dated concurrence, (with appropriate titles) of all responsible parties including the Quality Manager(s), technical director(s), and the agent who is in charge of all laboratory activities such as the laboratory director or laboratory manager;
- g. The laboratory's procedures for achieving traceability of measurements;
- h. A list of all test methods under which the laboratory performs its accredited testing;
- i. Mechanisms for ensuring that the laboratory reviews all new work to ensure that it has the appropriate facilities and resources before commencing such work;
- j. Reference to the calibration and/or verification test procedures used;
- k. Procedures for handling submitted samples;
- l. Reference to the major equipment and reference measurement standards used as well as the facilities and services used by the laboratory in conducting tests;
- m. Reference to procedures for calibration, verification and maintenance of equipment;
- n. Reference to verification practices which may include inter-laboratory comparisons, proficiency testing programs, use of reference materials and internal quality control schemes;
- o. Procedures to be followed for feedback and corrective action whenever testing discrepancies are detected, or departures from documented policies and procedures occur;
- p. The laboratory management arrangements for exceptionally permitting departures from documented policies and procedures or from standard specifications;
- q. Procedures for dealing with complaints;
- r. Procedures for protecting confidentiality (including national security concerns), and proprietary rights;
- s. Procedures for audits and data review;
- t. Processes/procedures for establishing that personnel are adequately experienced in the duties they are expected to carry out and are receiving any needed training;
- u. Reference to procedures for reporting analytical results;

v. A Table of Contents, and applicable lists of references and glossaries, and appendices.

**SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS:** Provide the proposed laboratory's plan to execute, schedule and control project progress and resources to ensure high quality material, methods, and maintainability. The offeror must demonstrate the capability to (1) provide adequate quantities and types of equipment units to accomplish the laboratory analysis within specified time periods and (2) coordinate and manage the work with an adequate team of individuals (i.e., team members).

Describe by written narrative your management approach to accomplish the work including a description of your quality control program. Discuss your capability and approach to (1) Review and complete the analysis for contract requirement; (2) Perform activities when requirements are submitted one after another; (3) Protect the samples for a clear analysis; (4) Conform to safety and housekeeping requirements; (5) Coordinate with the Government on delivery of analysis in emergent situations; (6) Coordinate and manage the work of team members.

**EVALUATION METHOD:** As a minimum, the offeror must demonstrate that the firm has sufficient equipment and personnel to execute the proposed plan. Better ratings will be assigned for technical completeness, specificity, and likelihood of success.

C. **PAST PERFORMANCE:** At a minimum, a list of references (minimum of five) shall be provided that will reflect the competency of the Laboratory Analysis program and effectiveness of the organization that was provided the reference.

**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 will first evaluate the performance of those projects listed in this section of the solicitation. Projects involving the requirements of this RFP, which includes a Leadership/Management plan, working with the Government or with a Private Sector similar to those specified in the requirements of this section of the solicitation. The Government reserves the right to contact the evaluators on previous Government or Private Sector work to verify the offeror's construction experience. In the case of an offeror without a record of past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror **may not be evaluated as favorable or unfavorable** on past performance (See FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)).

## 6. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES

A. **RELATIVE IMPORTANCE DEFINITIONS:** For the purpose of this evaluation, the following terms will be used to establish the relative importance of the criteria:

- **Significantly More Important:** The criterion is at least three (3) times greater in value than another criterion.
- **More Important:** The criterion is at least two (2) times greater in value than another criterion.

- **Comparatively Equal:** The criterion is at least one and one-half (1.5) times greater in value than another criterion.
- **Equal:** The criterion is of the same value as another criterion.

## B. EVALUATION.

1) 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 offeror's pre-award proposal effort to a minimum, proposals must provide adequate detail for evaluators to determine how the offeror's proposal meets or exceeds the RFP criteria. It must also form sufficient basis for developing a fair and reasonable price proposal.

2) All technical proposals will be evaluated by a Technical Evaluation Team (TET). Pricing data will not be considered during this evaluation. Criteria for the technical evaluation are set forth elsewhere in the solicitation and will be the sole basis for determining the technical merit of proposals. Culmination of the technical evaluation will be assignment of a technical rating for each offer.

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

4) To be considered for award, proposals shall conform to the terms and conditions contained in the RFP. No proposal shall be accepted that does not address all criteria requested in this section of the solicitation or which includes stipulations or qualifying conditions unacceptable to the Government.

5) Price is of secondary importance and will be considered of lower importance than technical factors. Pricing will be independently evaluated to determine reasonableness and to aid in determination of the Offeror's understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract.

C. **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 among price and non-price factors, 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.

## 7. SELECTION AND AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

A. It is the intent of the Government to make award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information. Therefore, proposals should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint. Do not assume you will be

afforded the opportunity to clarify, discuss, or revise your proposal. If award is not made on initial offers, discussions will be conducted as described below.

**B. Competitive Range.** After initial evaluation of proposals, if the Contracting Officer determines that discussions are to be conducted, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range comprised of all of the most highly rated proposals, unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency (i.e., the Contracting Officer may determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted). Discussions may be held with firms in the competitive range.

**C. During Discussions.** Written or oral (i.e., telephonic) discussions may be conducted by the Government and all offerors in the competitive range. As a result of discussions, offerors may make revisions to their initial offers. If an offeror's proposal is eliminated or otherwise removed from the competitive range during discussions, no further revisions to that offeror's proposal will be accepted or considered. Discussions will culminate in a request for Final Proposal Revisions, the date and time of which will be common to all offerors.

**D. After Discussions.** If discussions are conducted, then after receipt of final proposal revisions, the TET will evaluate supplemental information provided by offers, adjust technical scores previously assigned, and provide a recommendation to the Contracting Officer. Subsequently, and after evaluation of any changed to proposed prices, the Contracting Officer will perform a best-value analysis. Selection will be made on the basis of the responsible offer, which conforms to the RFP and represents the most advantageous offer to the Government, subject to availability of funds.

**E. Selection and Award.** The Government intends to make award based on initial offers. Award of a firm fixed-price task order will be based upon a tradeoff analysis among technical and other pertinent factors (i.e., past performance) and price to determine the best value to the Government in terms of technical factors and price, and the best balance between technical factors and price.

## **8. DEBRIEFINGS.**

A. 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. Unsuccessful Offerors shall request post-award debriefing within three (3) days after the date on which the offeror received notification of task order 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.

**END OF SECTION**