



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

18 August 2004

SUBJECT: Two-Phase Design-Build Selection Procedures for Request For Proposals (RFP) Number W912DW-04-R-0042, entitled "FY05 Whole Barracks Renewal, Ft Lewis, Washington."

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. A password is required. Bidders can obtain their password by going to (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." Award of this project is **SUBJECT TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS**. 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., Sustainability, Building Aesthetics and Functionality, Building Systems, Site Design and Engineering, 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., Sustainability, Building Aesthetics and Functionality, Building Systems, Site Design and Engineering), and price proposals which will be evaluated separately, in accordance with FAR Part 15. A contract will be awarded to the firm submitting the proposal that conforms to the RFP, is considered to offer the most

advantageous offer in terms of the evaluation factors, including price, and is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. PLEASE NOTE: It is expected that the design build team presented in Phase One will be exactly the same as proposed 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 FY05 Whole Barracks Renewal at Ft Lewis, WA. The barracks buildings portion of the project is design-build; the administration buildings and site are 100% designed. The work shall consist of design and construction of 6800 square meter barracks to house 200 soldiers, that incorporates soldier community facilities. The 100% designed portion of the project includes construction of four duplex two-story company operations facilities (approximately 8040 square meters total), and one medium two-story battalion headquarters with classrooms (approximately 1900 square meters total), one brigade headquarters building (approximately 1730 square meters), and eight lawnmower storage facilities (approximately 80 square meters). Contractor(s) design and construction for the barracks buildings shall be based on completing the designs as presented in the solicitation documents.

Period of performance is 720 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.

1. PHASE 1 EVALUATION FACTORS: Offerors shall be evaluated for the following criteria, listed in descending order of importance:

1. Offeror Relevant Experience

1.a Experience of the firms proposed for the design-build team with similar projects (e.g., projects on military installations, sustainably designed and constructed projects, apartment or dormitory and administrative/office buildings).

1.b Experience of the design-build team proposed for this project working together, as a team, on projects (design-build or non-design-build).

2. Qualifications of proposed team members (e.g., education, experience, professional registration, etc.)

3. Offeror Past performance, including customer satisfaction, quality, & timely performance.

2. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE DEFINITIONS: For Phase One, the following term will be used to establish the relative importance of the criteria and sub-criteria:

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

3. SUMMARY OF ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: A summary of the order of importance for the Phase-One criteria is as follows:

- Criterion 1 is more important than criterion 2.
- Criterion 2 is equal to criterion 3.

4. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS:

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. 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.**

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.**

5. 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.

6. Submittal Requirements for Phase One:

6.1 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 45 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.

6.2 Specific Submittal Requirements for Phase One

6.2.1 Relevant Experience

6.2.1.1. Relevant experience of the firms proposed for the design-build team with similar projects (e.g., projects on military installations, sustainably designed and constructed projects, design and construction of barracks or hotel or dormitory, and construction of administrative/office buildings).

Submittal Requirements:

Provide a list of specific projects including projects for **both** the construction and the design firms that are either currently under construction or were completed within the last five (5) years. A minimum of three projects each shall be listed for both the construction firm and the design firm. List no more than a total of 10 projects for this criterion. Start with the most recent and relevant projects and work backwards in time.

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)

6.2.1.2. Relevant experience of the design-build team proposed for this project working together, as a team, on projects (design-build or non-design-build).

Submittal Requirements:

Provide a narrative describing the team’s experience working together on design-build projects. This narrative should not exceed two (2) pages.

Using the format similar to that shown above in 6.2.1.1, provide specific information on no more than five (5) design-build projects or, if applicable, (5) non-design-build projects, either currently under construction (at least 75% complete) or completed within the last 5 years, on which the team members (firms and/or individuals) have worked together as a team. Start with the most recent and relevant projects and work backwards in time.

Provide an **OVERALL SUMMARY MATRIX (GRAPH)** that is structured to show projects on which the team members have worked together.

6.2.1.3 Evaluation Method for 6.2.1.1 and 6.2.1.2

This criterion will be evaluated for the quantity (up to the project maximums specified in paragraph 6.2.1.1 and 6.2.1.2 above) and quality of experience demonstrated. The greater the relevance and recency of prior project experience, the higher the rating 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 will be evaluated 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 in the description of this project in the preceding paragraphs of this letter 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.

6.2.2 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 (if applicable), lead architect and lead design engineers (specifically mechanical, electrical, civil, structural, fire protection and communications engineers, landscape architect, and LEED accredited professional). 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 (if applicable): The design project manager shall have a baccalaureate degree in engineering, architecture or construction management 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 **or** a person in the design field with a minimum of 10 years project management experience and having

managed at least 3 projects of the similar scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation.

Design team members (lead architect, mechanical, electrical, civil, structural, fire protection and communications engineers, landscape architect, and LEED accredited professional): Lead design team members shall have a baccalaureate degree in architecture, engineering or similar construction profession and shall be licensed professionals with a minimum of 5 years as senior or lead designers. In addition each individual shall have worked on at least 3 projects of similar scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation. The LEED accredited professional shall have achieved LEED certification from the U.S. Green Building Council for a least 1 building project.

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/years as senior or lead designer, if applicable)
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)

6.2.2.1 Evaluation Method

The more recent and the greater the relevancy of the team members’ qualifications and prior project experience, the higher the value assigned for this criterion during evaluations. In addition, qualifications of key personnel that demonstrate experience and training in sustainable

design and/or construction will be considered favorably. The more recent, and the greater the extent and relevance, of the 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.

6.2.3 Past performance of the Prime

Submittal Requirements:

Past performance of the prime contractor will be evaluated using the Construction Contractor Administrative Support System (CCASS) database and customer satisfaction surveys for the prime contractor. All performance ratings in CCASS for the past 5 years shall be considered. All private industry construction projects submitted on a customer satisfaction survey must have been completed within the last 5 years. Submit no more than 5 customer satisfaction surveys. 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. Both CCASS and Customer Satisfaction Surveys will be evaluated. However, if an offeror does not have past performance available in CCASS, the customer satisfaction surveys will be evaluated 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.

The Government reserves the right to contact the evaluator on previous government or private sector work to verify the offeror's construction experience.

A reproducible customer satisfaction survey form is provided at the end of the Phase-One portion of Section 00110. Offerors shall forward these forms to customers to be completed and returned to Seattle District Contracting Division. 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.

Offerors shall submit a list of all customers (including current Point of Contact and phone number) that were sent Customer Satisfaction Surveys.

6.2.3.1 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 6.2.1. Projects involving design/build, LEED certification from the US Green Building Council, and attributes similar to those specified in the project description in the preceding paragraphs of this letter may be given more consideration. 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)).

6.2.4 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 signing the SF 1442. Financial capacity will be checked, but not rated.

6.3 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 17 September 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: Sherrye Schmahl
P.O. Box 3755, Seattle WA 98124-3755
(206) 764-6806

7. SELECTION OF FIRMS: Based on the assessment of the Phase-One evaluation, the Contracting Officer will select the most highly qualified offerors, but not more than five (5) firms, that will be requested in writing to submit Phase Two proposals. It is anticipated that firms will be notified as to whether or not they are selected on or about **25 October 2004**. **No public notice stating the names of the selected firms will be published.**

8. NOTIFICATION TO FIRMS NOT SELECTED AND DEBRIEFINGS: Offerors who are 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 selection in Phase One. The RFP package is expected to be issued on or about 1 November 2004, with proposals due on or about 16 December 2004. About 15 days after the issue date, the Government will conduct a pre-proposal 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 Sherrye Schmahl at (206) 764-6588, facsimile (206) 764-6817, or email sherrye.l.schmahl@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan K. Sherrell".

Susan K. Sherrell
Contracting Officer

Attachments
Customer Satisfaction Survey Form
Draft of Section 00110

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY (PAGE 1 OF 2)
W912DW-04-R-0042, Design-Build: FY05 Whole Barracks Renewal, Fort Lewis, WA

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

Name of Firm Being Evaluated: _____

Project Title & Location: _____

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

Year Completed: _____ **Project Manager:** _____

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

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
Attn: CENWS-CT-CB-MU (Sherrye Schmahl)
P.O. Box 3755
Seattle, WA 98124-3755

FAX: (206) 764-6817
Street Address:
4735 E. Marginal Way S.
Seattle WA 98134-2385

OVERVIEW: The firm shown above has submitted a proposal on a Seattle District Corps of Engineers project and provided your name as a customer reference. Part of our evaluation process requires information on the firm's past performance. Your input is important to us and responses are required by 2:00 PM Pacific Time on 17 September 2004 for inclusion in this evaluation. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

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

	On this project, the firm:	Satisfaction				
		Low	High	N/A		
1.	Kept You Informed & Treated You as Important Member of the Team	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
2.	Displayed Flexibility in Responding to Your Needs	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
3.	Displayed Initiative in Problem Solving	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
4.	Resolved Your Concerns	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
5.	Completed Your Major Project Milestones on Time	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
6.	Managed the Project Effectively (including adequate Cost Controls)	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
7.	Managed their Work Force Effectively (including Subcontractors)	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
8.	Effectiveness of Quality Control Program	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
9.	Provided Warranty Support	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
10.	Maintained Operational Continuity at Existing Facility During Project	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
11.	Minimized Adverse Construction Impacts on Ongoing Operations	1	2	3	4	5 N/A

**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 a proposal in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) No. W912DW-04-R-0042 entitled “FY 05 Whole Barracks Renewal, Fort Lewis, WA.” 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 award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information.** A contract will be awarded to the firm submitting the proposal that conforms to the RFP, is considered to offer the most advantageous offer in terms of the evaluation factors, including price, and is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP drawings for the barracks only, while provided for informational purposes only, illustrate preferred spatial and functional arrangements and incorporate many of the preferred items and betterments noted in the statement of work. The RFP drawings along with the statement of work will be referred to as illustrating the RFP basic design requirements. If the offeror proposes any substantial changes to the designs as depicted in the RFP drawings or as noted in the statement of work, the changes shall be specifically addressed and expanded upon in the offeror’s proposal.

2. PHASE 2 EVALUATION FACTORS:

2.1 Evaluation of the design will be for the barracks only. The administration buildings and site are to be constructed as designed. All evaluation factors as stated are related to the design and construction of the barracks only. 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. Sustainability
- B. Building Aesthetics and Functionality
- C. Building Systems
- D. Site Design and Engineering
- E. Extent of Small Business Participation

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. SUMMARY OF ORDER OF IMPORTANCE for Technical Criteria:

- Criterion A is more important than criterion B.
- Criterion B, C, and D are equal to each other.
- Criterion B, C, and D are each more important than criterion E.

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 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 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 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.

7.1.4 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.

7.1.5 Data submitted must reflect the designer's interpretation of criteria contained in the RFP. Drawing information 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.

7.1.6 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.

7.1.7 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.

7.1.8 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 - Sustainability: The Offerors shall include in their proposals a preliminary ranking of the sustainable design considerations included in the proposal. This ranking shall utilize the LEED Project Checklist as prepared by the U.S. Green Building Council. The successful offeror shall be required to complete a detailed analysis on the final design that meets or exceeds the preliminary ranking established at proposal level. Proposals must score at least a **“Silver”** LEED Level. The evaluation of this factor shall be as follows:

<u>FACTOR RATING</u>	<u>LEED Level</u>
Outstanding	Platinum
Above Average	Gold
Satisfactory	Silver
Marginal	Certified
Unsatisfactory	No Rating

7.2.1.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion A:

(a) Provide a narrative describing how sustainable design principles will be used in the design process for each discipline. The narrative shall address how environmental considerations will be integrated into the design to help conserve resources such as energy and water, reduce waste, maximize use of recovered and recycled materials, minimize the use of toxic and harmful substances in facility construction and operation, and develop safe and healthy living spaces. In addition a preliminary LEED score sheet shall be submitted indicating and justifying how the sustainability points will be realistically achieved for this project.

(b) Provide a list of recovered/recycled materials proposed for use in the performance of the contract. Recovered materials shall be used to the maximum extent practicable. Practicable is defined (per 40 CFR CH.1, 247.3) as capable of being used consistent with (a) performance in accordance with applicable specifications, and (b) availability at a reasonable price, availability within a reasonable period of time, and maintenance of a satisfactory level of competition. See Section 00800 in the RFP for list of EPA designated items and their definitions.

7.2.1.2 Evaluation Method: Evaluation will be based on the level of certification proposed for achievement, how well the design will integrate the use of sustainable design principles, the process by which the design and construction will promote the principle of responsible stewardship of the environment, the extent of use of recovered and recycled materials and ease of operation and maintenance.

7.2.2 Criterion B - Building Aesthetics and Functionality: This criterion considers the overall aesthetic value of the exterior style, appearance and finishes and the interior design and functionality of spaces within the facilities. This criterion also includes the quality of systems, products, fixtures, materials, finishes and colors proposed for the facility and overall environment created by the design proposed.

7.2.2.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion B:

(a) Design Information - The architectural design concepts for the project, as depicted on the drawings attached to this RFP and further defined in the Statement of Work, shall be used as a basis for design and for preparing the final designs for the project. Provide drawings (floor plans, elevations, single line diagrams, schedules, tables, etc.) and narratives outlining how the design development of building systems shall meet project criteria and maintain the intended architectural layout and appearance. At a minimum the following exterior and interior considerations shall be addressed to include construction techniques, assemblies and detailing as appropriate for the facilities.

1. Exterior:

- (a) Facades, roof lines, and delineation of entrances.
- (b) Proportions of fenestration in relation to elevations.
- (c) Shadow effects, materials, and textures.
- (d) Proportion and scale within the structure.
- (e) Compliance with Installation Design Guide Recommendations
- (f) Conformance to adjacent structures architectural styles
- (g) Exterior color schemes proposed.

- (h) Other aesthetic considerations.

2. Interior:

- (a) Color boards that show colors and details conducive to the mission of the facility.
- (b) Materials and finishes represent a positive working and/or living environment.
- (c) Ceiling heights, hallway widths, and other space sizes and configurations provide a workable solution to the facility mission.
- (d) Interior design package provides for an interesting and attractive environment.
- (e) Suitability of interior system and finishes for use in a facility where the primary occupants are soldiers operating in a heavy usage environment.
- (f) Space dimensions meet minimum criteria set forth in the SOW. Provide in tabular form by room type.

(b) Catalog Cuts - Provide supporting data and manufacturer's descriptive literature for products and materials proposed for this project including architectural exterior and interior finishes, hardware, doors, blinds, work counters, etc.

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.

7.2.3 Criterion C - Building Systems: This criterion includes the materials, layout, maintainability, quality, durability, and any other aspect of the proposed building operational systems. Offerors are encouraged to present energy, maintenance, and life cycle cost improvements that result in overall improvement to the final facilities consistent with sustainable design principles.

7.2.3.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion C

- (a) Design Information - Provide drawings (single line diagrams, plans, schematics, schedules, tables, etc.) and narratives for each system listed below that address materials, layout, maintainability, quality, durability, system performance, sequences of operation, systems integration and integration with existing base infrastructure (where applicable). Also include a description systems or materials which include betterments or which exceed the minimum requirements of the RFP if proposed.

1. Building Heating and Ventilation Systems. Includes the heating and ventilating and environmental control systems proposed for the buildings. Proposals should incorporate energy recovery systems, high efficiency systems, energy conservation, thermal storage systems, boiler configurations that best match the building heating profiles, and other systems and features designed to

enhance the overall performance of the facility while reducing the operation and maintenance costs.

2. Building Interior Electrical Systems. Includes the electrical power and lighting systems proposed for buildings and electrical characteristics of the building electrical system. Proposals shall include spare capacities, building power distribution and branch circuiting. Proposed lighting system should include control systems, lighting intensities and fixtures proposed for typical hallways and meeting rooms, office spaces, and living spaces.
3. Communications, Cable Television and Telephone Systems. Includes the provision of communications, cable television and telephone systems in the facilities and the materials proposed for installation.
4. Fire Protection, Suppression and Detection Systems. Includes the proposed fire protection, suppression and detection systems including design and materials proposed for installation. Proposal shall include building classification; occupancy; sprinkler zoning and densities; control and detection systems; and reporting and alarm systems.
5. Plumbing Systems. Includes the provision of plumbing systems in the facilities and the materials proposed for installation.
6. Structural Systems. Includes the structural systems and sub-systems in the facilities including the roof systems, floor systems, exterior and interior wall composition, floor/ceiling and roof assemblies lateral load resisting systems and foundation. This item also includes the integration characteristics of the structure with architectural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems and characteristics of the proposed systems with regard to fire resistance, vibration response and accommodation of total and differential settlements.

(c) Catalog Cuts - Provide manufacturer's descriptive literature identifying type/model of major pieces of equipment required for each building system, as applicable. Provide supporting data and manufacturer's descriptive literature for ancillary system components, fixtures, products and materials.

7.2.3.2 Evaluation Method: Technical merit will be based on the degree to which proposed design, construction materials, and equipment, for each of the systems listed under this criterion satisfy operational and functional requirements and exceed minimum acceptable quality, durability, maintainability, reliability and energy efficiency, specified in the statement of work. The systems proposed must meet the minimum requirements set forth in the statement of work and shall represent full and complete integration into the building structure and are fully capable of sustaining the function and operation of the buildings. Additional consideration will be given to proposals that provide novel or innovative design solutions that meet or exceed mission requirements and systems or materials that represent a lower life cycle cost to the installation.

7.2.4 Criterion D - Site Design and Engineering. This criterion includes the layout and planning and technical performance of the site utilities and various specialties that comprise a good site development plan. The quality of the system design, materials selected, maintainability, layout and accessibility shall be included. Emphasis will be placed on durability, corrosion resistance and life cycle cost of materials selected. Consideration will be given to the suitability of the chosen materials for the soil conditions present. Site engineering will consider all aspects of the proposal beyond the 1.5 m line from all new facilities.

7.2.4.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion D:

(a) Design Information – The RFP drawings depict the desired site design concept and master plan for the project and are to be followed explicitly in terms of location and layout of the buildings (with the exception of the barracks buildings). Provide plans (single line diagrams, schedules, tables, etc.) and narratives that address items of consideration for site engineering listed below. Narratives shall address quality of materials, finishes, fixtures proposed for site development, system performance and integration with existing base infrastructure. Also include a description of systems or materials which include betterments or which exceed the minimum requirements of the statement of work if proposed.

(1) Site Design

- a. Area Development Plan. Includes the overall development concept with respect to the placement and orientation of the facilities, parking areas, pedestrian ways, circulation paths, site lighting, and other aspects that comprise the overall site development.
- b. Force Protection. Includes site constraints imposed by current Force Protection requirements in the Statement of Work into the Offeror's proposal.
- c. Pedestrian Circulation. Includes the design of the pedestrian walkways and sidewalks to facilitate movement of pedestrians from one facility to another and from the buildings to the parking areas.
- d. Landscaping. Includes the design, quality, quantity, and location of all planting materials in the proposal. The design should represent a complete, integrated plan that provides a low maintenance, sustainable, and aesthetically pleasing landscape. The plant materials selected shall comply with the Statement of Work.
- e. Parking Areas. Includes the provision of adequate and fully integrated parking areas for the new facilities.
- f. Grading. Includes the grading alterations to the existing site to suit the new development. The proposal shall include the amount and type of site grading required and provisions for positive storm drainage away from the new facilities and parking areas.

g. Site Amenities. Includes the provision of site amenities to enhance the outdoor livability of the whole barracks complex. The requirements shown in the statement of work are considered minimums and Offerors are encouraged to include additional items or considerations to enhance the nature of the whole barracks complex and which foster the development of the areas as “campus like” environments:

(2) Site Engineering - Includes engineering concepts and requirements as specified in the Statement of Work for:

- a. Storm water management including drainage, erosion and sedimentation control.
- b. Sanitary sewerage
- c. Gas, water, electric and communications (TV & telephone) utilities.
- d. New roadway, widened roadway, and repaired roadway sections
- e. Pavements

(b) Catalog Cuts - Provide manufacturer’s descriptive literature identifying type/model of major pieces of equipment required for each system, as applicable. Provide supporting data and manufacturer’s descriptive literature for site furniture and ancillary system components, fixtures, products and materials.

7.2.4.2 Evaluation Method: The layout and functionality will be evaluated. Merit will be based on the degree to which the proposed design satisfies the layout and functional requirements specified in the statement of work and the quality of materials, finishes, equipment and fixtures proposed for the site. The proposed systems must meet the minimum requirements set forth in the RFP and shall represent systems that are fully integrated into the existing site infrastructure and are fully capable of sustaining the function and operation of the buildings. Proposals that reflect the design intent and direction as outlined in the statement of work will receive additional consideration during the evaluation process. Additional consideration will be given to proposals that provide systems or materials that incorporate recycled materials into the proposals, or materials that represent a lower life cycle cost to the installation.

7.2.5 Criterion E - Extent of Small Business Participation

7.2.5.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion E:

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

7.2.5.2 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. Firms without any evaluations in CCASS, or for which this item was not evaluated (i.e., N/A), 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)
Sustainability
Building Aesthetics and Functionality
Building Systems
Site Design and Engineering

9. PRICE PROPOSAL FORMAT:

9.1 The 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. DESIGN TO BUILD. The estimated design to build price for this project is \$43.25M.

11. 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.

12. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES

12.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION:

12.1.1 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.

12.1.2 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.

12.1.3 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.

12.2 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.

12.3 SELECTION AND AWARD:

12.3.1 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.

12.3.2 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.

12.3.3 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.

12.3.4 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.

12.3.5 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.

12.3.6 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.

12.3.7 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.

12.3.8 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.

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

END OF INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF TEXT TO SECTION 00110

DRAFT