

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08-Apr-2003	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W68MD9-2339-3199		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE ATTN: CENWS-CT P.O. BOX 3755 SEATTLE WA 98124-3755		CODE DACA67	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DACA67-03-R-0208
				X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 31-Mar-2003
					10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
					10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE		FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).					
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) PROJECT: Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Multiple Award Contract (MATOC) for Miscellaneous Construction, Repair and Maintenance of Facilities at Fort Lewis and Yakima, Washington. <div style="text-align: center;">(SEE ATTACHED CONTINUATION PAGE)</div>					
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		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)			BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		08-Apr-2003

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following items are applicable to this modification:CONTINUATION PAGE

- A. The purpose of this Amendment Number Three (0003) is to correct the SF 1442 and Section 00110.
- B. Standard Form 1442, dated 19 March 2003, Block 13 D is changed to read “ Offers providing less than **120** calendar days for government acceptance after the date offers are due will not be considered and will be rejected.”.
- C. Section 00110, Paragraph 4, Page 00110-7, Proposal Contents, is changed to read “The maximum number of pages in the **technical** proposal shall be 60 with font size no smaller than 10 point.” Page 00110-8, fifth line, change to read: “**Technical** proposals in excess of 60 pages may be discarded. “

***D. THE PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME REMAINS AT 17 April 2003,
2 P.M. PST.***

- E. NOTICE TO BIDDERS: Offeror must acknowledge receipt of this amendment by number and date on Standard Form 1442, in Block 19, or by telegram.
- F. All Technical Amendments are available for download this date on the Army Corps of Engineers website at <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/ct/>.

Attachments:

Revised SF 1442

Revised Section 00110

SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD <i>(Construction, Alteration, or Repair)</i>		1. SOLICITATION NUMBER DACA67-03-R-0208	2. TYPE OF SOLICITATION <input type="checkbox"/> SEALED BID (IFB) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEGOTIATED (RFP)	3. DATE ISSUED 19 March 2003	PAGE OF PAGES 1
IMPORTANT - The "offer" section on the reverse must be fully completed by the offeror.					
4. CONTRACT NUMBER		5. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUEST NUMBER W68MD9-2339-3199		6. PROJECT NUMBER	
7. ISSUED BY Seattle District, Corps of Engineers ATTN: CENWS-CT-CB-MU PO Box 3755 Seattle, WA 98124-3755		CODE W68MD9	8. ADDRESS OFFER TO Seattle District, Corps of Engineers PO Box 3755 ATTN: CENWS-CT-CB-MU / Gary Seattle, WA 98124-3755 HAND CARRY: Seattle District Corps of Engineers Contracting Division 4735 East Marginal Way South Seattle, WA 98134-2385		
9. FOR INFORMATION CALL 		A. NAME See Information Page inside Front Cover		B. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (NO COLLECT CALLS) See Information Page inside Front Cover	

SOLICITATION

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

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

Furnish all labor, materials and equipment and perform all work for Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Multiple Award Contract (MATOC) for Miscellaneous Construction, Repair and Maintenance of Facilities at Fort Lewis and Yakima, Washington, in accordance with the attached Contract Clauses, Special Clauses, Technical Specifications and Drawings.

11. The Contractor shall begin performance within _____ * _____ calendar days and complete it within _____ * _____ calendar days after receiving award, notice to proceed. This performance period is mandatory, negotiable. (See * Paragraph SC-3, 00800 .)

12A. THE CONTRACTOR MUST FURNISH ANY REQUIRED PERFORMANCE PAYMENT BONDS?
(If "YES," indicate within how many calendar days after award in Item 12B.)

YES NO

12B. CALENDAR DAYS

10

13. ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS:

A. Sealed offers in original and 4 copies to perform the work required are due at the place specified in Item 8 by 2:00 p.m. (hour) local time 17 April 2003 (date). If this is a sealed bid solicitation, offers will be publicly opened at that time. Sealed envelope containing offers shall be marked to show the offeror's name and address, the solicitation number, and the date and time offers are due.

B. An offer guarantee is, is not required.

C. All offers are subject to the (1) work requirements, and (2) other provisions and clauses incorporated in the solicitation in full text or by reference.

D. Offers providing less than 90 calendar days for Government acceptance after the date offers are due will not be considered and will be rejected.

This page was intentionally left blank for duplex printing.

**SECTION 00110
PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION**

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Your firm is invited to submit a proposal for the project entitled “Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Multiple Award Contract (MATOC) for Miscellaneous Construction, Repair and Maintenance of Facilities at Fort Lewis and Yakima, Washington. Prospective offerors are required to prepare and submit proposals that will be evaluated in accordance with this section of the solicitation.

1.1.1. Competition for this procurement is limited to eligible 9(a) firms located in Washington State and 8(a) participants in good standing, serviced by a SBA office outside of these states, but having a Bona fide branch office in this state. A Bona fide branch office is a place of business for purposes of 8(a) construction procurements located where an 8(a) participant regularly maintains an office that employs at least one full-time individual within the appropriate geographical boundary. The term does not include construction trailers or other temporary construction sites.

1.1.2. Joint Venture Agreements – Joint Venture Agreements are allowable on competitive 8(a) setasides and must be received by SBA prior to proposal due date and approved before award of a resulting contract. If you are contemplating a joint venture on this project, you must advise your assigned Business Opportunity Specialist (BOS) as soon as possible. It is also recommended that the agreement be submitted as soon as practicable to ensure compliance with established regulations. Any corrections and/or changes needed can be made only when your BOS has adequate time for a thorough review before the proposal due date. NO corrections and/or changes are allowed after time of submission of proposal or bids.

1.2. Project Description. The Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) will consist of the award to 8(a) contractors, three separate construction contracts. Use of the MATOC will provide the Government with a construction product delivery method that can accommodate quick and straight-forward projects, as well as some complex projects, and can help minimize design effort and related overhead expenditures, as well as handle compressed schedules. Task orders will include a variety of trades such as carpentry, road repair, roofing, excavation, interior/exterior elements, steam welding, asbestos and lead paint abatement incidental to construction and/or project design. The MATOC will not be used for AE services; however, incidental AE services maybe needed for some projects.

1.3. Evaluation and Award. An Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity type contract will be awarded to three 8(a) firms submitting the proposals that: a) conform to this Request for Proposal (RFP), b) are considered to offer the best value to the Government in terms of the evaluation factors, including price (seed project), and contractor's coefficient, and c) are determined to be in the best interest of the Government. The total amount of the three contracts will not exceed the cumulative value of \$6 million dollars per contract period, or \$30 million dollars over the life of the contract. See Section 00800 for details. No proposal shall be accepted that does not address all criteria specified in this solicitation or which includes stipulations or qualifying conditions. The evaluation process used to determine the most advantageous offer for the technical criteria is described in the following paragraphs. .

2. EVALUATION FACTORS. Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of two factors, TECHNICAL and PRICE (SEED PROJECT), listed in descending order of importance.

2.1. Technical Evaluation Criteria .

- 2.1.1. Relevant Experience.
- 2.1.2. Past Performance
- 2.1.3. Organizational Structure
- 2.1.4. Plan for Fiscal, Management and Technical Support by Home or Corporate Office & Subcontracting Capability

2.2. Pricing Factors:

2.2.1. Factor 1: The contractor must submit a price proposal for Seed project entitled "Closure of municipal Solid Waste Landfill . Price must be complete and accurate.

2.2.2. Factor 2: the price proposal must also include a contractor's coefficient (see Section 00800, SC-23 for further explanation and utilization of coefficient) for the purpose of pricing sole source orders. SC 23 will also further define elements which must be included in the coefficient.

2.2.3. Each pricing factor will be evaluated for reasonableness. The pricing factors will be evaluated but not rated. Financial capacity and bonding ability will be checked for responsibility during preaward survey, but not rated.

2.3. Relative Importance Definitions: For this evaluation, the following terms will be used to establish the relative importance of the technical criteria to each other:

2.3.1. **Significantly More Important:** The criterion is three (3) times more important in value to the Government than another criterion.

2.3.2. **More Important:** The criterion is two (2) times more important in value to the Government than another criterion.

2.3.3. **Equal:** The criterion is of the same value to the Government as another criterion.

2.4. Summary Of Order Of Importance For Technical Criteria:

2.4.1. Criteria 1 and 2 are equal.

2.4.2. Criteria 1 and 2 are significantly more important than criteria 3.

2.4.3. Criteria 3 is more important than criteria 4.

2.5. Technical Merit Ratings: Technical evaluation criteria will be rated using the following adjectival descriptions. Evaluators will apply the appropriate adjective to each criterion rated.

2.5.1. OUTSTANDING. The proposal **fully meets** all minimum performance, capability or qualifications standards required by the RFP **and exceeds many** of the requirements. Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and highest quality performance is anticipated. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The offeror's qualifications met 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 factor (or subfactor), the submittal very significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **VERY HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

2.5.2. ABOVE AVERAGE. The proposal **meets all** of the minimum performance, capability or qualifications standards required by the RFP **and exceeds some** of them. Has one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The offeror's qualifications are adequately responsive. 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. . Response exceeds a "Satisfactory" rating. **HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

2.5.3. SATISFACTORY (NEUTRAL). Proposal **meets all** of the minimum performance, capability or qualifications standards required by the RFP with few or no advantages or strengths. Equates to 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. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific factor (or subfactor), the offeror may satisfactorily complete the proposed tasks, but there is at least moderate risk that

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. Response exceeds a “Marginal” rating. **No significant advantages or disadvantages.**

2.5.4. MARGINAL. The proposal **meets most** of the minimum performance, capability or qualifications standards required by the RFP. Information submitted demonstrates 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 factor(s) (or subfactor(s)). The offeror’s interpretation of the Government’s requirements is superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect. 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 response demonstrates 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 weaknesses and some disadvantages.**

2.5.5. UNSATISFACTORY. **Fails to meet** performance or capability standards. 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 response has 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 proposal is so unacceptable that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable. **VERY SIGNIFICANT DISADVANTAGES.**

2.6. DEFINITIONS OF KEY EVALUATION TERMS.

2.6.1 Deficiency – A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. Examples of deficiencies include a statement by the offeror that it cannot or will not meet a requirement, an approach that clearly does not meet a requirement, or omission of data required to assess compliance with the requirement.

2.6.2. Strength – An aspect of a proposal that appreciably decreases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance or that represents a significant benefit to the Government.

2.6.3. Weakness – A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A “significant weakness” in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

2.6.4. Uncertainty – Any aspect of the proposal for which the intent of the offeror is unclear because there may be more than one way to interpret the offer or because inconsistencies in the offer indicate that there may be an error, omission or mistake, Examples include a mistake in calculation or measurement and contradictory statement.

3. TECHNICAL CRITERIA SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS.

3.1. Relevant Experience.

Provide documentation, which demonstrates the types of relevant experience for itself and for any proposed Division, subcontractor, or teaming contractor whose effort on this contract will significantly influence performance of the proposed construction and design-build effort. Data presented must include all relevant contracts held within the past five (5) years and demonstrates an ability to handle the construction of multiple projects with multiple disciplines. Relevant construction experience will be limited to performance of projects similar in size, scope, and complexity to those that may be ordered under this contract. The work to be described under this criteria shall include renovation, alteration and repair, new construction and some associated architecture and engineering work. Offerors should also explain how the information provided is relevant to the proposed acquisition. Projects submitted should be reflective of the type of work identified by this contract. Work should demonstrate multiple projects done during a period of time and show the contractor’s ability to complete multiple projects simultaneously with satisfactory results on all projects. A maximum of ten (10) projects will be evaluated. If more than ten projects are submitted, only the first ten projects will be evaluated starting with the most recent project and working back. Data presented shall be limited to two pages per contract described. Failure to provide the correct, current phone number, fax number, and email address for each point of contact (POC) listed may result in a lower rating for this criteria. Copies of industry awards, certificates, and letters of recommendation may be submitted and will not count in the page limitation. Offerors should include projects with the Federal Government, state and local government agencies, and commercial customers.

3.1.1. Using a format similar to that shown below, provide specific information on the projects listed.

Relevant Experience of Firm:

Project Title, Contract Number & Location
Project Construction Type (e.g., Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity)
Total Dollar Amount
Start & Completion Dates (Month/Year)
Role of Firm(s) (e.g., prime, sub) (address type of work performed and percentage of work, as applicable); also include any proposed team members that were directly involved in this project, including work performed, roles and responsibilities.
Brief Description of Project (address how this relates to solicitation project)
Customer Point of Contact (i.e., name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current phone no, and email address if available)
Awards or recognition received (if applicable)

3.2. Past Performance of the Prime. Past performance of the prime contractor will be evaluated using the CCASS database. All performance ratings for the past five (5) years shall be considered. If an offeror does not have past performance available in CCASS or wishes to augment the CCASS system ratings, the offerors may ask customers to submit the Customer Satisfaction Survey found at the end of this section. For each project constructed for Private Industry, provide a completed customer satisfaction survey for each applicable project within the last five (5) years. All Customer Satisfaction Surveys must be submitted to the Government from the customer or agency that is providing the information. Further instructions are found at the top of the Customer Satisfaction Survey. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an offeror's performance history, but will attribute more significance to work that was similar in nature, magnitude, and complexity to this project. 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. 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)). Surveys submitted directly by the offeror may not be considered. Please ensure envelopes containing surveys being submitted to this office do not contain the offeror's return address. As a maximum, no more than five (5) customer satisfaction surveys will be considered for the prime firm.

The Government will evaluate the relative merits of each offeror's past performance. Government databases will be checked and previous customers may be contacted as references. Offerors shall submit a list of all customers (including current Point of Contact and phone number) to whom a Customer Satisfaction Survey was provided.

(SEE THE REPRODUCIBLE FORM AT THE END OF THIS NOTICE). To be considered, the Surveys must be completed by the customers and mailed, hand-delivered, or faxed directly by the customer to the Contracting Office for receipt no later than the time and date the proposal is due.

3.3. Organizational Structure.

3.3.1. Provide an organizational chart that clearly identifies the management, design, and construction teams, and key positions to be utilized in executing task orders under the contract. Chart should show the interrelationship of the management team and the on-site project teams. Key positions should include Project General Manager (the person in the corporation that will lead all the personnel under this contract); Project Manager(s) (person(s) leading the effort on task order(s)); Site Quality Control Manager (Lead QC for the contract); Construction Superintendent (Construction super assigned to Task Order(s) under this contract); AE Project Manager (lead PM/engineer representing the supporting design firm). Identify these positions (or your company's label for these positions) on the organization chart and then provide their position qualifications and CV for those proposed to be used on this contract

3.3.2. Describe the hiring criteria for the key positions stated above to include level of education, professional licenses, technical certifications/licenses/qualifications, experience and background, skill levels and training. Provide resumes for each member of the management team citing specific relevant experience.

3.3.3. Describe overall management approach with regard to organization, coordination, monitoring, and control of construction and/or design-building projects. Describe interface with on-site, home office, subcontractor operations, design and construction teams, Government project managers, contracting officials, inspectors, and users demonstrating thorough understanding of the design building process and sound management approach.

3.3.4. Describe plan for responding to and managing multiple contract task orders of varying size and complexity issued simultaneously.

3.3.5. Demonstrate the ability to effectively team with A-E's, trade subcontractors and in-house personnel.

3.3.6. Describe the project manager's role in the organization and indicate who on the team will have the prime responsibility for total coordination of all disciplines when a design-build effort is involved.

3.4. Subcontracting Management. Describe the method and criteria to be used in selection of subcontractors. Describe policies and procedures for subcontractor management, including surveillance, quality control, scheduling, and performance. Describe the process/system for soliciting subcontractors and measures to be employed to insure appropriate level of experience and quality of work.

4. PROPOSAL CONTENTS.

4.1. Proposals shall be submitted in two parts: a technical proposal and (b) a price proposal (Seed Project). Each shall be submitted in a separate envelope or package with the type of proposal (i.e., technical or price) clearly printed on the outside of the envelope or package. The maximum number of pages in the technical proposal shall be 60 with font size no smaller than 10 point. Proposals must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this RFP. Absence of information will be deemed as if no support for that criteria is available. Offerors submitting proposals should limit submission to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and moneys are expended in preparing information required by the RFP. Proposals are to be on 8 ½ x 11 – inch paper, to the maximum extent practicable, and submitted in standard letter (8 ½ x 11-inch) hardback loose-leaf binders. Contents of binders shall be tabbed and labeled to afford easy identification from the proposal Table of Contents. No material shall be incorporated by reference or reiteration of the RFP. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation. It shall be presented in a manner, which allows it to "STAND ALONE" without need for evaluators to reference other documents. Photographs and organizational charts will not be considered a page. Technical pProposals in excess of 60 pages may be discarded. Unnecessarily elaborate brochures or other presentation materials beyond those sufficient to present a complete and effective response are not desired and may be construed as an indication of the proposer's lack of cost-consciousness. Penalty for making false statements in proposals is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

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

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (5 SETS REQUIRED (ORIGINAL + 4 COPIES))

- Technical Proposal Cover Letter, to include:
 - Solicitation Number
 - Name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the Offeror (and electronic address, if available)
 - Names, titles, and 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
 - Names, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.
 - A statement specifying the extent of agreement to furnish any and all items upon which prices are offered at the prices set opposite each item.
 - A statement that the offer has an acceptance period of 120 calendar days from the date the offer is submitted.
- Table of Contents. List all sections for the technical proposal. Any future amendments, additions and/or revisions to proposal shall include updated Table of Contents for each set.

Technical Proposal Cover Letter Continued:

- Relevant Experience
- Past Performance
- Organization Structure
- Plan for Fiscal, Management and Technical Support by Home or Corporate Office & Subcontracting Capability

4.3. **COEFFICIENT AND DESIGN SERVICES PRICE PROPOSAL**. The coefficient/price proposal shall be submitted in ORIGINAL only and must be signed by an official authorized to bind your organization. Provide, the name, address, phone and fax numbers for your bank and bonding company. Financial capability will be checked, but not evaluated. Note that SF 1442, Block 13D, provides the number of calendar days after the date of the offer which the proposal is firm.

The price proposal for the seed project, to be submitted at the same time as technical proposal, should include:

Price Proposal (Original Only)

- SF 1442, Solicitation, Offer and Award and Corporate Certificate
- Acknowledge all amendments by number and date in Block 19 on SF 1442 BACK
- Price Proposal for Seed Project, Coefficient, Section 00600, Representation, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors and Pre-award Information
- Bid Bond

5. **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, 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.

6. **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 highest rated technical 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.

7. DISCUSSIONS. Written or oral (i.e., telephonic) discussions may be conducted by the Government with 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 Revision, the date and time of which will be common to all offerors.

8. SELECTION AND AWARD. The Government intends to make award based on initial offers. If discussions are conducted, then after receipt of Final Proposal Revision, the Technical Evaluation Team will evaluate supplemental information provided by offerors, adjust technical ratings previously assigned, and provide a recommendation to the Contracting Officer. Subsequently, and after evaluation of any changes to proposed prices, the Contracting Officer will perform a best-value analysis. 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.

9. BEST-VALUE ANALYSIS

9.1. The Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical proposals, than with making award at the lowest overall price 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 cost or price and non-cost factors, and allows the Government to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror.

9.2. **You are advised that greater consideration will be given to the evaluation of technical proposals rather than price, with evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.** The best-value offers of three contractors will be selected using a tradeoff analysis of technical ratings and price. In making this determination, the Government is concerned with achieving highly qualified firms with a reasonable price. It is pointed out, however, that should technical competence between offerors be considered approximately the same, the price could become more important in determining award. Award of Task Order Number 0001 entitled "Closure of Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Cell 6, Fort Lewis, Washington", will be made to one of the three contractors awarded this MATOC contract, who represents the lowest price for this seed project.

10. DEBRIEFINGS. Upon written request to the Contracting Officer, unsuccessful offerors will be debriefed and furnished the basis for the selection decision and contract award. Debriefings will be in accordance with FAR Part 15. 505 and 15.506.

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