

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
				J	1	2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 05-Feb-2004	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W68MD9-3337-6366		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE ATTN: CENWS-CT 4735 EAST MARGINAL WAY SOUTH SEATTLE WA 98134-2329		CODE W912DW	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W912DW-04-R-0014	
				X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 24-Dec-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 <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.						
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)						
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.						
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.						
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).						
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:						
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)						
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.						
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) TITLE: Seattle District Leadership Development Program 2004 thru 2005, Seattle, Washington SEE ATTACHED CONTINUATION SHEET						
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.						
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 06-Feb-2004	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

- a. The purpose of this amendment is to change the bid opening date on the Standard Form (SF) 33, entitled, Solicitation, Offer and Award, to reflect the extension of the bid opening from Amendment 0002 as 11 February 2004, at 2:00PM, Local Time; and to incorporate a revised Section M to reflect the additional details for submitting with the price proposal.
- b. Replace the Bid Schedule with the attached revised Bid Schedule. The change is located in bid item 0002, unscheduled meetings.
- c. The Evaluation Criteria, located in Section M of this solicitation, is replaced by the revised Evaluation Criteria attached to this amendment to reflect the additional information for submission with your price proposal reflected in the revised bid schedule.
- d. There are no other changes as a result of this amendment.
- e. Acknowledgement of this amendment will be signed and submitted with the Price Proposal on 11 February 2004 at 2:00PM Local Time.

(End of Summary of Changes)

SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD			1. THIS CONTRACT IS A RATED ORDER UNDER DPAS (15 CFR 700)		RATING	PAGE OF PAGES 1 139	
2. CONTRACT NO.		3. SOLICITATION NO. W912DW-04-R-0014		4. TYPE OF SOLICITATION [] SEALED BID (IFB) [X] NEGOTIATED (RFP)		5. DATE ISSUED 7 Jan 2004	
6. REQUISITION/PURCHASE NO. W68MD9-3337-6366		7. ISSUED BY USA ENGINEER DISTRICT, SEATTLE ATTN: CENWS-CT 4735 EAST MARGINAL WAY SOUTH SEATTLE WA 98134-2329 CODE W912DW TEL: 206-764-3772 FAX: 206-764-6817		8. ADDRESS OFFER TO (If other than Item 7) See Item 7 CODE TEL: FAX:			
NOTE: In sealed bid solicitations "offer" and "offeror" mean "bid" and "bidder".							
SOLICITATION							
9. Sealed offers in original and _____ copies for furnishing the supplies or services in the Schedule will be received at the place specified in Item 8, or if handcarried, in the depository located in _____ until _____ local time _____ (Hour) (Date)							
CAUTION - LATE Submissions, Modifications, and Withdrawals: See Section L, Provision No. 52.214-7 or 52.215-1. All offers are subject to all terms and conditions contained in this solicitation.							
10. FOR INFORMATION CALL:		A. NAME SUSAN F NEWBY		B. TELEPHONE (Include area code) (NO COLLECT CALLS) 206-764-6780		C. E-MAIL ADDRESS susan.f.newby@nws02.usace.army.mil	
11. TABLE OF CONTENTS							
(X)	SEC.	DESCRIPTION		PAGE(S)	(X)	SEC.	DESCRIPTION
PART I - THE SCHEDULE				PART II - CONTRACT CLAUSES			
X	A	SOLICITATION/ CONTRACT FORM		1	X	I	CONTRACT CLAUSES
X	B	SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICES/ COSTS		2 - 3	PART III - LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS		
X	C	DESCRIPTION/ SPECS./ WORK STATEMENT		4 - 9	X	J	LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
	D	PACKAGING AND MARKING			PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS		
X	E	INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE		10	X	K	REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND
X	F	DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE		11 - 12			OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS
X	G	CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA		13	X	L	INSTRS. CONDS. AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS
X	H	SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS		14	X	M	EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
OFFER (Must be fully completed by offeror)							
NOTE: Item 12 does not apply if the solicitation includes the provisions at 52.214-16, Minimum Bid Acceptance Period.							
12. In compliance with the above, the undersigned agrees, if this offer is accepted within _____ calendar days (60 calendar days unless a different period is inserted by the offeror) from the date for receipt of offers specified above, to furnish any or all items upon which prices are offered at the price set opposite each item, delivered at the designated point(s), within the time specified in the schedule.							
13. DISCOUNT FOR PROMPT PAYMENT (See Section I, Clause No. 52.232-8)							
14. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF AMENDMENTS (The offeror acknowledges receipt of amendments to the SOLICITATION for offerors and related documents numbered and dated):				AMENDMENT NO.		DATE	
15A. NAME AND ADDRESS OF OFFEROR		CODE		FACILITY		16. NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO SIGN OFFER (Type or print)	
15B. TELEPHONE NO (Include area code)		<input type="checkbox"/> 15C. CHECK IF REMITTANCE ADDRESS IS DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE - ENTER SUCH ADDRESS IN SCHEDULE.		17. SIGNATURE		18. OFFER DATE	
AWARD (To be completed by Government)							
19. ACCEPTED AS TO ITEMS NUMBERED			20. AMOUNT		21. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION		
22. AUTHORITY FOR USING OTHER THAN FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION: <input type="checkbox"/> 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)() <input type="checkbox"/> 41 U.S.C. 253(c)()					23. SUBMIT INVOICES TO ADDRESS SHOWN IN (4 copies unless otherwise specified)		ITEM
24. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 7) CODE				25. PAYMENT WILL BE MADE BY CODE			
26. NAME OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) TEL: EMAIL:					27. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Signature of Contracting Officer)		28. AWARD DATE

IMPORTANT - Award will be made on this Form, or on Standard Form 26, or by other authorized official written notice.

This page intentionally blank

SECTION B
SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICES/COSTS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>UNIT PRICE</u>	<u>EXTENDED AMOUNT</u>
0001	Provide nonpersonal professional services to design, develop and administer a part-time leadership management development program for 10-12 Seattle District Corps of Engineers employees. Services shall begin 1 June 2004 through 30 June 2005. All work shall be performed in strict compliance with the attached Statement of Work, dated 1 December 2003, and all other terms and conditions incorporated herein. All costs associated with this line item will be inclusive of the following activities outlined in the Scope of Work:	13	Months	\$ _____	\$ _____
	(a) Administrative/overhead costs associated with program development, curriculum planning, and administration of the part time leadership management development program.		Cost	\$ _____	
	(b) Orientation/goal setting sessions to initiate program for Seattle District Corps of Engineers employees (see Section C, paragraphs 3.4.5).		Cost	\$ _____	
	(c) Orientation/goal setting retreat, two and one half (2.5) days. Session includes accommodations for retreat; living and dining expenses for all retreat participants (see Section C, paragraph 3.4.6).		Cost	\$ _____	
	(d) Provide formal Graduate Level Leadership and Management classroom training.		Cost	\$ _____	
	(e) Field Trip: One five (5) - day field trip (see Section C, paragraph 3.4.3)		Cost	\$ _____	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
 - A. Invitation
 - B. Project Description
2. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS
 - A. General Requirements
 - B. Technical Proposal Format
 1. Cover Letter
 2. Table of Contents
 3. Technical Data
 - C. Price Proposal Format
3. EVALUATION FACTORS
 - A. Technical Evaluation Criteria
 1. Organization Experience/Capability with Similar Programs
 2. Quality of Proposed Program
 3. Program Administrator
 4. Past Performance
 - B. Price
4. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS
 - A. Outstanding
 - B. Above Average
 - C. Satisfactory (Neutral)
 - D. Marginal
 - E. Unsatisfactory
5. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHOD
 - A. Organization Experience/Capability with Similar Programs
 1. Administration of Long-Term Graduate Level Training
 2. Involvement in Leadership/Management Training
 3. Provision of Back-up Person
 4. Evaluation Method
 - B. Quality of Proposed Program
 1. Effectiveness of Design
 2. Innovation
 3. Proposed Lectures
 4. Other Training
 5. Facilities
 6. Responsiveness to NWS Objectives
 7. Evaluation Method
 - C. Program Administrator
 1. Education
 2. Experience
 3. Recognition
 4. Evaluation Method
 - D. Past Performance
 1. References
 2. Evaluation Method
6. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES
 - A. Relative Importance Definitions
 1. Significantly More Important
 2. More Important

- 3. Comparatively Equal
- 4. Equal
- B. Evaluation
 - 1. Technical proposal evaluation
 - 2. Evaluation by Technical Evaluation Team (TET)
 - 3. TET Utilization of rating factors
 - 4. Consideration for Award
 - 5. Price as secondary importance
- C. Best Value Analysis

7. SELECTION AND AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

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

8. DEBRIEFINGS

- A. Exclusion of Offerors
- B. Unsuccessful Offerors

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION.

A. Invitation. Your firm is invited to submit a proposal for the project entitled "**Leadership Development Program for the Seattle District, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers**". Contractors are required to prepare and submit proposals that will be evaluated in accordance with this section of the solicitation. This solicitation is issued as a Request For Proposal (RFP). Proposals will be evaluated based upon technical merit and cost. The Government intends to procure this service requirement on a competitive basis in accordance with the provisions set forth in this RFP, and make award on initial offers, without further discussions or additional information. A Firm fixed-price contract will be awarded to the one firm submitting the proposal that: a) conforms to this request for proposals (RFP); b) is considered to offer the best value to the Government in terms of the evaluation factors, including price; and, c) is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. It is very important to read all sections of this RFP prior to assembling your proposal, in order for you to submit a successful proposal.

B. Project Description. The Seattle District Leadership Development Program is a part-time, year long, multi-faceted leadership and management development program. The program includes an analysis of one's leadership style, guided preparation of an Individual Development Plan (IDP), attendance at graduate-level classes, field visits to other Corps offices and customers, attendance at District Executive Team meetings and other forums of interest, participation on team projects, briefings by the Commander, and a mentoring relationship with a senior manager.

The Leadership Development Program was designed in direct response to the need to systematically develop the leadership and management skills of the Seattle District's current and future leaders and managers. The program is based on the premise that while some people are "born leaders", the vast majority of leaders are grown and developed. The commitment of the Commander and District executives to leadership and management development is reflected in the direct involvement of these leaders in many components of the Leadership Development Program. The transfer of the success-oriented organizational culture and interrelationships, which our current leaders have cultivated over a period of years, are facilitated through various Leadership Development Program activities.

2. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS.

A. General Requirements. Proposals shall be submitted in two parts: (a) technical proposal, and (b) price proposal. Each shall be submitted in a separate envelope or package with the type of proposal (i.e., technical or price) clearly printed on the outside of the envelope or package. Proposals must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this RFP. Absence of information will be deemed as if no support for that criterion was provided. Offerors submitting proposals should limit submission to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and money is expended in preparing information required by the Request for Proposals (RFP). Data submitted must reflect the offeror's interpretation of criteria contained in the RFP. Proposals are to be on 8 1/2 x 11-inch paper, to the maximum extent practicable, and submitted in standard letter (8 1/2 x 11-inch) hardback loose-leaf binders. Contents of binders shall be tabbed and labeled to afford easy identification from the proposal Table of Contents. Pages shall be numbered consecutively. No material shall be incorporated by reference or reiteration of the RFP. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation. It shall be presented in a manner, which allows it to "STAND ALONE" without need for evaluators to reference other documents. Arrangements, layout plans, and notes may all be combined together on single sheets in order to simplify presentation, so long as clarity is maintained. Unnecessarily elaborate brochures or other presentation materials beyond those sufficient to present complete and effective responses are not desired and may be construed as an indication of the proposer's lack of cost-consciousness. Elaborate artwork, expensive paper and bindings, and expensive/extensive visual and other presentation aids are neither necessary nor wanted. Offerors are encouraged to structure your proposal submission using guidelines presented in Section C, paragraphs 4.0 through 4.4.14, Elements to Include In Your Proposal. However, to minimize effort expended by the Offerors, other formats will be accepted so long as requested information is provided. Penalty for making false statements in proposals is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

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

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

- a. Solicitation number;
- b. Name, address, telephone and facsimile numbers of the Offeror, and electronic address, if available.
- c. Names, titles, telephone and facsimile numbers, and electronic addresses, if available, of persons authorized to negotiate on the Offeror's behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation.
- d. Names, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.
- e. A statement that the offer has an **acceptance period of 90 calendar days** from the date the offer is submitted.
- f. Deviations from the RFP: Offerors shall specifically identify, in their cover letter in a section entitled "Deviations", all deviations from the minimum RFP requirements, and if required to submit a Final Proposal Revision, all changes made to their original proposal. All alternates shall be specifically addressed and expanded upon in the proposal or Final Proposal Revision. Deviations must not result in an Offeror's proposal that does not meet minimum RFP criteria. .
- g. Identification of Items Exceeding RFP Requirements: Offerors should specifically identify in an attachment to their cover letter a list entitled "Identification of Items Exceeding RFP Requirements" all items that exceed the minimum RFP requirements and, if required to submit a Final Proposal Revision, all changes made to their original proposal that exceed RFP minimum requirements. All of these items should be specifically addressed and expanded upon in the proposal or Final Proposal Revision.
- h. Amendments: **Acknowledge all amendments** by number and date of issue **in your cover letter**.

NOTE: If discussions are held, acknowledge all amendments issued on the cover letter submitted with your revised proposals or final proposal revisions.

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

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

- a. Describe your organization's experience/capability in managing similar programs.
 - 1) Provide examples of program administration of long-term graduate-level training for working adults.
 - 2) Provide examples of involvement specifically in leadership and management training.

Address provision of backup person for the Contract Program Administrator. Specify who your proposed backup is. Provide summary biography and specify what makes this individual qualified. Indicate how the backup would be kept involved in the program.

b. Proposed Program – State specific merits and potential of the proposed program to meet Seattle District Corps of Engineers objectives as detailed in our Vision Statement and our Guide to the Future document.

1) Provide curriculum outline for 80 hours (no more than eight hours, normally, to be conducted during any single month) of formal graduate-level leadership and management classroom training. Classes have traditionally been scheduled as follows, though contractors may propose other schedules:

7:30 AM – 11:30 AM	Instruction
11:30 AM – 1:00 PM	Working Lunch
1:00 PM – 5:00 PM	Instruction

Specify progressive goals and objectives, and target dates. Actual topics will be based on the needs of the LDP class members and dates will be negotiated upon final acceptance of a program proposal. LDP class members shall not be scheduled into regularly scheduled university classes. Length of formal classroom modules will vary depending on subject coverage, time required for mastery, beneficial mix of developmental methodologies, and scheduling preferences of the LDP class members and Contract Program Administrator. Discuss the balance between lecturers and group discussions that you propose.

2) Submit a calendar of major Leadership Development Program activities using projected dates (see Section J, Appendix D, for example).

3) Give an indication of the types (or specific names) of speakers that will be utilized for the classroom sessions (i.e., which speakers will be associated with which sessions). We are particularly interested in the mix of representatives from business, government, industry, universities, as well as the specific backgrounds of the selected individuals.

Provide summary biographies of proposed speakers/lecturers. In addition, provide a summary paragraph that explains what this individual brings to the specific topic at issue.

4) Other training (readings, tests, software, trips, etc.). Provide a listing of readings and books on leadership and management (see Section J, Appendix E, for a list of readings which have traditionally been used). The Contracting Officer approves final list of readings. Discuss where and how these would be inserted into the program and what sort of group discussions would accompany such readings, etc.

5) Provide a brief description (one to two pages is adequate) of the methods you would use to assess the leadership and management development training needs of the LDP class members and to structure and administer learning activities. Identify the diagnostic tools to be used. Tools which have traditionally been used in the Leadership Development Program include:

- a) Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)
- b) Learning Styles Inventory (LSI)
- c) FIRO-B
- d) Social Styles Preference
- e) Thomas-Kilman Conflict Mode Instrument

Contractors are encouraged to propose the use of other effective diagnostic tools.

6) Describe the coaching, counseling, and advising techniques to be used.

7) Describe the approach to be used for developing Individual Development Plans for each LDP class member.

8) Provide a description of your proposal to help facilitate an effective mentoring program for the LDP class members with volunteer mentors from the leadership of the Seattle District.

9) Provide a description of the facilities to be used for meetings and meals. Address the quality of the meals you are planning to provide for each type of dining situation (i.e., retreat, lunches, dinners, graduation, etc.). Classes will be conducted at a site other than Federal Center South, Seattle, Washington.

10) Describe methods you will use to evaluate the effectiveness of Leadership Development Program activities (see paragraphs 3.4.14 and 6.3).

c. Contract Program Administrator:

1. We believe that the Contract Program Administrator is of paramount importance to the success of the program. Provide experience and credentials of the individual identified as the lead for program implementation.

2. Describe why your Contract Program Administrator would be particularly sensitive to and effective in defining and resolving the needs and deficiencies of individual LDP class members. Going beyond the basics of management and leadership, explain how the Contract Program Administrator is equipped to address issues of human resource sensitivities and dynamics, coaching/counseling LDP class members in their IDP development and achievement, dispute resolution and group interaction. Finally, describe the qualifications and experience of the contract Program Administrator in helping the LDP class members reflect and learn from their own experiences and apply management theory to their work at the Corps of Engineers.

3. State specific experience and credentials for managing long term graduate-level training programs for working adults.

4. State specific experience and credentials for understanding and addressing leadership and management issues facing governmental organizations, like the Corps of Engineers, today.

C. Price Proposal Format. The contents of your price proposal should include the Pricing Schedule with prices for all line items (original).

Provide a statement of inclusive cost for the contract period (Schedule B, line item 0001(a) through 0001(i)). This cost information should be identified and separate from the technical proposal. In developing your statement of costs, give consideration to the following.

a. Time involved in developing, planning and administering all phases of the Leadership Development Program.

b. Consulting time with the Corps of Engineers LDP Steering Committee. Allow at least four hours of consulting time with the LDP Steering Committee/District Executive Team prior to the orientation session and the initial retreat. On a monthly basis, the Contract Program Administrator is expected to meet, either in person or by telephone, with the LDP Steering Committee Chairperson for at least one hour to provide a status report on LDP activities and to address concerns, resolve problems, or obtain guidance. Three times a year, the Contract Program Administrator is expected to meet with the LDP Steering Committee/District Executive Team for two hours at the Seattle District Office to discuss LDP activities and to address concerns, resolve problems, or obtain guidance from the LDP Steering Committee/District Executive Team (see paragraph 6.8).

c. Time involved in providing coaching, counseling and advising to LDP participants and to mentors. The Contract Program Administrator will provide a minimum of two in depth confidential counseling sessions per LDP. One of those will include the LDP's supervisor to engage and involve them in the LDP's development, including review of the Individual Development Plan prepared as part of the initial retreat (see paragraph 3.4.9).

d. Time involved in planning and participating in the graduation ceremony (see paragraph 3.4.15).

e. Time involved in planning learning activities and traveling with the LDP participants on a field trip to, for example, Corps construction and operating project offices, Northwestern Division Headquarters in Portland,

Oregon, and to other Corps and public and private sector organizations located in the Pacific Northwest. The specifics of the trip will be developed by the LDP class in coordination with the Contract Program Administrator and the LDP Steering Committee Chairperson (see paragraphs 3.4.3 and 5.1).

f. Travel and per diem for the Contract Program Administrator when accompanying the LDP class members on the one-week field trip at Government-allowed travel and per diem rates.

g. Time involved providing instruction as well as costs for subcontracting of instructors, lecturers, and guest speakers for the initial orientation, initial and mid-year retreat, formal classroom training, and closing retreat.

h. Catering and space facilities fees for lunch or dinner in conjunction with classroom activities, at least once a month during August to May, for the LDP class members and invited guests, for an average of 20 meals per month.

i. Catering and space facility fees for a graduation ceremony to be conducted during June, including a graduation dinner, for a maximum of 50 people. The graduation ceremony is a planning effort of the LDP class members, the Contract Program Administrator, and the LDP Steering Committee.

j. Lodging, meals and space facility fees for the LDP class members, Contract Program Administrator and instructional staff at the initial two-day/two-night retreat and the mid-year retreat (see paragraphs 3.4.6 and 3.4.7).

k. Catering and space facility fees for lunch at the one-day, year-end closeout session (see paragraph 3.4.8).

l. All materials, books diagnostic tools and training aids. These costs should be reflected in the price of each line item in Section B.

m. Meeting space for the one-day LDP orientation / Goal Setting Session.

n. The costs of mailing, clerical, telephone, office space, facilities and any other overhead expenses associated with instruction and administration of the program.

o. Line item 0002: Administrative Coordination Meetings. Occasionally the Contract Program Administrator will be requested to meet with the LDP Steering Committee, LDP Supervisors or District Managers, or to participate in special events and meetings which are not specified in the statement of work. Eight hours of these meetings are estimated and the contractor will be paid at the specified hourly rate, as the meetings are performed.

Also, include in the price proposal the following sections and information:

_____ a. Completion and submission of Section K, Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors;

_____ b. Acknowledgement of all amendments;

_____ c. Completion of Standard Form (SF) 33, Solicitation, Offer & Award. Ensure that the form is signed by an official authorized to bind for your firm.

_____ d. Corporate Certificate located at the beginning of this solicitation.

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

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria:

1. Organization Experience/Capability with Similar Programs;

2. Quality of Proposed Program;
3. Program Administrator;
4. Past Performance.

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

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

A. Outstanding – Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The Offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timeliness and highest quality performance is anticipated. Demonstrates exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The Offeror's qualifications meet the fullest expectations of the Government. The Offeror has convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans and techniques that, when implemented, should result in outstanding, effective, efficient, and economical performance under the Contract. An assigned rating within "Outstanding" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the submittal contains essentially no significant weaknesses, deficiencies or disadvantages. Very significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **Very high probability of success.**

B. Above Average – Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Have one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The areas in which the Offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency or productivity or quality. The Offeror's qualifications are adequately responsive with minor deficiencies but no major deficiencies noted. An assigned rating within "Above Average" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), any deficiencies noted are of a minor nature that should not seriously affect the Offeror's performance. The submittal demonstrates that the requirements of the RFP are well understood and the approach will likely result in a high quality of performance which represents low risk to the Government. A rating within "Above Average" is used when there are no indications of exceptional features or innovations that could prove to be beneficial, or contrarily, weaknesses that could diminish the quality of the effort or increase the risks of failure. Disadvantages are minimal. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceed many of the RFP requirements. Response exceeds a "Satisfactory" rating. **High probability of success.**

C. Satisfactory (Neutral) – Information submitted demonstrates Offeror's potential to meet performance or capability standards. Acceptable solution. Meets minimum standard requirements. Few or no advantages or strengths. The Offeror's qualifications contain weaknesses in several areas that are not offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the Offeror may satisfactorily complete the proposed tasks, but there is at least a moderate risk that s/he will not be successful. Equates to Neutral. Good probability of success as there is sufficient confidence that a fully compliant level of performance will be achieved. Meets all RFP requirements. Complete and comprehensive proposal; exemplifies an understanding of the scope and depth of the task requirements and the Offeror's understanding of the Government's requirements. Response exceeds a "Marginal" rating. **No significant advantages or disadvantages.**

D. Marginal – Information submitted demonstrates the Offeror's potential to marginally meet performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific criterion (or sub-criterion). The Offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be Unsatisfactory. The assignment of a rating within the bounds of "Marginal" indicates that the evaluator feels that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. The Offeror's qualifications demonstrate an acceptable understanding of the requirements of the RFP and the approach will likely result in an adequate quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Low probability of success, although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least acceptable. Response exceeds an "Unsatisfactory" rating. **Significant disadvantages.**

E. Unsatisfactory– Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Unacceptable. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the submittal. The submittal does not meet the minimum requirements of the RFP. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved. Offeror’s qualifications have many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; failure to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government’s requirements; failure to meet many of the minimum requirements. The Offeror's qualifications submittals are so unacceptable that they would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable. **Very significant disadvantages.**

5. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHOD:

A. ORGANIZATION EXPERIENCE/CAPABILITY WITH SIMILAR PROGRAMS: *(Criterion A is Equally Important as criterion B, Quality of Proposed Program, and both Criterion A and B are Significantly More Important than Criterion C, Program Administrator Experience. All Sub-criteria are Equally Important under this Criterion.)*

1. **ADMINISTRATION OF LONG-TERM GRADUATE LEVEL TRAINING.** The organization has, at minimum, five (5) years of experience in administering long-term graduate level training as a core business line.
2. **INVOLVEMENT IN LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT TRAINING:** The organization has, at minimum, five (5) years of experience with leadership/management training and has accessibility/affiliation to an accredited university-level educational institution for potential speakers.
3. **PROVISION OF BACK-UP PERSON:** Back-up person with credentials similar to those described for the Program Administrator is provided and availability assured.
4. **EVALUATION METHOD:** This criterion will be evaluated for the quantity and quality of experience demonstrated. The greater the relevance and the more recent the prior project experience, the higher the rating assigned during evaluations. Demonstration of experience in completing projects that had the unique characteristics of the proposed project will be evaluated favorably. Projects involving reasonable and realistic Leadership/Management Plan similar to the one specified in Section C of the solicitation may be given more consideration.

B. QUALITY OF PROPOSED PROGRAM: *(Criterion B is Equally Important as Criterion A, Organization Experience/Capability With Similar Programs; and both Criterion A and B are Significantly More Important than Criterion C, Program Administrator Experience. All Sub-criteria are Equally Important under this Criterion.)*

1. **EFFECTIVENESS OF DESIGN:** At minimum, design employs a diversity of individual and group learning experiences in an integrated program of leadership development.
2. **INNOVATION:** At minimum, design demonstrates a customized approach to meeting the stated objectives, and is not an “off the shelf” application.
3. **PROPOSED LECTURES:** At minimum, design includes a mix of Government, Business, Industry and Academic representation for speakers and lecturers. Indications of potential speakers per session and speaker biographies are provided.
4. **OTHER TRAINING:** A diversity of other learning methods are included and demonstrate an integrated program (i.e., readings connect with and support trip agendas, projects, etc.). A reading list is provided with some indication of use of the readings in the program (see Appendix E – Readings of the RFP).
5. **FACILITIES:** Facilities provide a comfortable classroom environment; are wheel chair accessible; conveniently located in the Seattle area, and provide restrooms. Meals to be provided are nutritious and there is capability for meeting special dietary needs.
6. **RESPONSIVENESS TO NWS OBJECTIVES:** At minimum, each objective is addressed.

7. **EVALUATION METHOD:** This criterion will be evaluated by the quality of each sub-criterion proposed in meeting the Corps key factors of the leadership development program described in para. 3.0 of Section C. The greater the innovations and strengths of the proposed program design, the higher the rating.

C. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR: *(Criterion C is Significantly More Important than Criterion D. All Sub-criteria are Equally Important under this Criterion.)*

1. **EDUCATION:** The proposed Program Administrator must have a Masters-level degree in organizational development, organizational effectiveness, organization management, human behavior, counseling or related field.

2. **EXPERIENCE:**

- a. At least five (5) years experience in applying management and leadership theory to facilitate leadership development in an organization(s), demonstrating ability to customize programs to fit the particular needs of the organization.

- b. At least five (5) years experience working with teams, demonstrating the ability to apply knowledge of team dynamics, including conflict resolution, to real organizational situations.

- c. At least two (2) years experience in leadership development for Government agencies or similar programs for private sector. Description should demonstrate an understanding of the unique public service, "not for profit" and public responsibility focus that permeates leadership in the public sector and forms the foundation of Government ethics.

- d. At least three (3) years experience in counseling and coaching people in both their individual and career growth, including the application of leadership theory to their own experiences and work.

- e. At least three (3) years experience in counseling and coaching people in both their individual and career growth, including the application of leadership theory to their own experiences and work.

3. **RECOGNITION:** Evidence of recognition for achievement in the field of organizational effectiveness or related field.

4. **EVALUATION METHOD:** The more recent, and the greater the extent and relevance, of the Program Administrator qualifications, prior project experience, and recognitions, the higher the rating assigned for this criterion during evaluations.

D. PAST PERFORMANCE: *(Criteria A, B, and C are significantly more important than Criterion D.)*

1. **REFERENCES:** At a minimum, a list of references (minimum of five) shall be provided that will reflect the competency of the training program and effectiveness of the program administrator and the organization that was provided to those referenced. The Offeror must complete the "Offeror's Submission of Recent/Relevant Past Performance Information" for each reference submitted.

2. **EVALUATION METHOD:** The Government will evaluate the relative merits of each offeror's past performance. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an offeror's performance history but will first evaluate the performance of those projects listed in this section of the solicitation. Projects involving the requirements of this RFP, which includes a Leadership/Management plan, working with the Government or with a Private Sector similar to those specified in the requirements of this section of the solicitation will be assigned a higher rating. The Government reserves the right to contact three out of five evaluators on previous Government or Private Sector work to evaluate the offeror's leadership training experience and demonstration of performance based on recent, relevant contracts. In the case of an offeror without a record of past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror **may not be evaluated as favorable or unfavorable** on past performance (See FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)).

6. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES

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

- **Significantly More Important:** The criterion is at least three (3) times greater in value than another criterion.
- **More Important:** The criterion is at least two (2) times greater in value than another criterion.
- **Comparatively Equal:** The criterion is at least one and one-half (1.5) times greater in value than another criterion.
- **Equal:** The criterion is of the same value as another criterion.

B. EVALUATION.

1) Technical proposals will be evaluated for conformance with the minimum RFP criteria, and for the extent to which they exceed those criteria. While the intent is to keep the offeror's pre-award proposal effort to a minimum, proposals must provide adequate detail for evaluators to determine how the offeror's proposal meets or exceeds the RFP criteria. It must also form sufficient basis for developing a fair and reasonable price proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

7. SELECTION AND AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

A. It is the intent of the Government to make award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information. Therefore, proposals should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint. Do not assume you will be afforded the opportunity to clarify, discuss, or revise your proposal. If award is not made on initial offers, discussions will be conducted as described below.

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

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

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

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

8. DEBRIEFINGS.

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

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

END OF SECTION

This page intentionally blank