

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

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

The RFP drawings, while provided for informational purposes only, illustrate the users preferred spatial and functional arrangements and incorporate many of the users desired site design features. The geometric layout of the roads, buildings and recreational features as shown on the RFP drawings shall generally be followed. 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 expand upon in the offeror’s proposal.

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

- A. RFP Basic Design Requirements. (See paragraph 7.2.1)
- B. Desirable RFP Design Features. (See paragraph 7.2.2)
- C. Past Performance from Phase I Evaluation (See paragraph 7.2.3)
- D. Government Preferred Betterments (See paragraph 7.2.4)
- E. Schedule (See paragraph 7.2.5)
- F. Extent of Small Business Participation. (See paragraph 7.2.6)

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

- **Significantly More Important:** The criterion is two (2) times more important in value to the Government than another criterion.
- **More Important:** The criterion is one (1 ½ - 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:

- Criterion A, B, and C are equal to each other.

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

5. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS: Technical proposals will be evaluated and rated for each criterion using the following adjectival descriptions:

OUTSTANDING - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and the highest quality performance are anticipated. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The offeror convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans, and techniques that, when implemented, should result in outstanding, effective, efficient, and economical performance under the contract. Significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **VERY HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

ABOVE AVERAGE - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Have one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The areas in which the offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency or productivity or quality. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Disadvantages are minimal. **HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

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

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

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

6. DEFINITIONS OF STRENGTH, WEAKNESS, AND DEFICIENCY:

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

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

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

7. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PHASE TWO:

7.1 General Submittal Requirements for Phase Two:

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

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

7.1.1 Technical Proposal:

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

- (a) Solicitation number.

- (b) Name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the firm signing the SF 1442 (and electronic address).
- (c) Names, titles and telephone and facsimile numbers (and electronic addresses) of persons authorized to negotiate on the firm's behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation.
- (d) Name, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.
- (e) A statement specifying agreement (see also (f) below) with all terms, conditions provisions included in the solicitation and agreement to furnish any and all items upon which prices are offered at the proposed item prices.
- (f) **Deviations From The RFP:** In the cover letter, firms shall specifically identify, in a section entitled "Deviations," any deviations from the basic RFP design requirements (see paragraph 1. Introduction). All alternates shall be addressed and expanded upon in the firm's original proposal and any proposal revision.
- (g) **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).

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 shall be submitted in standard letter, hardback loose-leaf binders with a table of contents. Drawings/sketches are to be on maximum 11 X 17 inch paper and folded into the binder. 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. Drawings/sketches, required to clarify the offeror's proposal, should present basic concepts, arrangements, and layouts. Arrangements, layout plans, and notes may be combined together on

single sheets in order to simplify presentation, so long as clarity is maintained. Firms are encouraged to provide INFORMATIVE DRAWING NOTES to convey important features of their design. 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 Technical proposals will be evaluated for conformance with the basic RFP design 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 basic RFP design criteria.

7.2 Specific Submittal requirements for Phase Two:

7.2.1 Criterion A - RFP Basic Design Requirements: This criterion considers the overall value of the proposed design, including the quality of the proposed materials and equipment and the extent the proposal exceeds minimum RFP requirements.

7.2.1.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements for Criterion A:

(a) Site design narrative. Provide a basic description of the site development including grading and drainage, utility connections and distribution, landscape design including recreation/common areas, and etc.

(b) Architectural design narrative. Provide a description of how materials (both interior and exterior) are used to add pattern and definition to the housing unit designs. Discuss the sensory perception and recognition of the physical elements as they are experienced sequentially in time as one approaches, enters and moves through the order of spaces within a typical housing unit, and how the use of detailing, lighting and color influences the architectural feel and character of the housing unit.

(c) Architectural design drawings.

(1) Provide an exterior elevation of the proposer's choice which will illustrate the typical design intent, identify exterior materials and show proposed detailing.

(2) Provide an interior perspective of the proposer's choice which will illustrate the typical design intent, identify interior materials and show proposed detailing.

(3) Provide a typical wall section showing foundation, wall composition, and floor and roof system. Identify materials, finishes, thermal insulation and vapor protection.

(4) Provide proposed interior finish schedule, door and window schedules. Include ceiling heights on the interior finish schedule.

(d) Color Boards. Provide color boards to depict proposed exterior and interior materials, finishes, and colors. Submit three color schemes for the exteriors and interiors of the housing units. Color board submittal is to be bound in standard, letter-size binder.

(e) Product literature. Provide descriptive literature for all equipment and materials proposed. Include manufacturer's descriptive literature, technical data, performance charts and curves, catalog cut, etc. **Indicate specific material and equipment being proposed by highlighting model numbers and specific types and grades of materials on the manufacturer's catalog cut/literature. Organize the submittal using CSI Master Format and provide a table of contents.**

7.2.1.2 Evaluation Method for Criterion A:

The evaluation of this factor shall be as follows:

<u>FACTOR RATING</u>	<u>Number of Items</u>
Outstanding	RFP Basic Design Requirements being meet in all areas;
Above Average	Proposing less than the RFP Basic Design Requirement for any one material or design requirement.
Satisfactory	Proposing less than the RFP Basic Design Requirements for two materials/design requirements or combination thereof.
Marginal	Proposing less than minimum RFP Basic Design Requirements for three or four material/design requirements or combination thereof;
Unsatisfactory	Proposing less than minimum RFP Basic Design Requirements for more than four material/design requirements or combination thereof.

7.2.2 Criterion B - Desirable RFP Design Features : The Government has identified certain desirable design features in the Statement Of Work identified as *Preferred Items or Items Having a High Order Of Preference*, these are features which are beyond the RFP Basic Design Requirements for family housing. The Contractor's Proposal may include these features to the extent they can be provided within the funds available for the award of this project (see Section 00010 Schedule for funds available). These Desirable Design Features have been further identified and prioritized in an Attachment to the RFP as to the order of preference the Government puts on each of the items listed in the Attachment.

7.2.2.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements for Criterion B: The Offerors shall indicate on the listing those features which they propose to incorporate into the work and submit it as Criterion B. Attached to this list shall be a brief narrative description for any of the features the Contractor is proposing to incorporate into the work. Also, the Contractor shall include (for each feature proposed) any manufacturer's descriptive literature, design narratives and/or sketches as appropriate describing the material or proposed design approach the Contractor is proposing to incorporate into the project.

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

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

7.2.3 Criterion C – Past Performance from Phase I Evaluation

7.2.3.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements for Criterion C: No submittal is required for this criterion.

7.2.3.2 Evaluation Method for Criterion C: The Government will utilize performance evaluations contained in CCASS and the result of the Phase I Evaluation to evaluate this criterion.

7.2.4 Criterion D – Government Preferred Betterments: The Government has identified certain desirable design features in the Statement of Work identified as *betterments*, these are features which are beyond the RFP Basic Design Requirements for Family housing. The Contractor's Proposal may include these features to the extent they can be provided within the funds available for the award of this project (see Section 00010 Schedule for funds available). These Betterments have been further identified and prioritized in an Attachment to the Statement of Work as to the order of preference the Government puts on each of the items listed in the Attachment.

7.2.4.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements for Criterion D: The Offerors shall indicate on the listing those features which they propose to incorporate into the work and submit it as Criterion D. Attached to this list shall be a brief narrative description for any of the features the Contractor is proposing to incorporate into the work. Also, the Contractor shall include (for each feature proposed) any manufacturer's descriptive literature, design narratives and/or sketches as appropriate describing the material or proposed design approach the Contractor is proposing to incorporate into the project.

7.2.4.2 Evaluation Method for Criterion D: Technical merit will be based on the degree to which proposed design, methods, materials, and equipment satisfy functional and operational requirements and exceed minimum acceptable quality including aesthetics, durability, maintainability and reliability specified in RFP. Higher ratings will be assigned for the number and value to the Government for the desirable design features incorporated into the work.

7.2.5 Criterion E – Schedule: This criterion considers the Offeror's ability as demonstrated in the project schedule to deliver the housing units as required in the RFP.

7.2.5.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements for Criterion E: Provide an outline of the plan for construction of the FTW251/283 housing units. The schedule submitted should assume a start date based upon the issuance of NTP. The schedule shall be prepared in the form of a milestone scaled (Gantt Chart) summary network diagram and graphically indicate sequences proposed to accomplish each milestone work operation and appropriate interdependencies between various milestones events. The chart shall show the starting and completion times of all major events on a linear horizontal time scale beginning with the notice to proceed for the base contract items and indicating calendar days to completion. The Offeror must state the total number of calendar days proposed from the initial notice to proceed through completion of the construction to include clean up and final turnover of the facility to the government. Offerors should base their schedules

on the information provided throughout the RFP. Limit the activities to those critical to the timely overall completion of the project. **The schedule submitted by the selected firm in response to this criterion will be incorporated into the final contract.**

7.2.5.2 Evaluation Method for Criterion E: Schedules will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness and understanding of the work. Schedules shall illustrate a logical sequence of events and a greater understanding of the work will receive a more favorable evaluation. More consideration shall be given to schedules **demonstrating fast tracking capabilities**. Proposals that include unrealistic or unsupported schedules will be evaluated unfavorably.

7.2.6 Criterion F - Extent of Small Business Participation:

7.2.6.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion F: No submittal is required for this criterion. The Government will utilize performance evaluations contained in CCASS to evaluate this criterion.

7.2.4.2 Evaluation Method for Criterion F: 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)
RFP Basic Design Requirements
Desirable RFP Design Features
Past Performance
Government Preferred Betterments
Schedule
Extent of Small Business Participation

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 there under may be directed to him or her. In the absence of **(same name, title, and company)**, **(enter name, title, and company of alternate)** is the alternate principal representative of the joint venture.

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

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

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

10. FUNDING. The total amount of funds available for the design and construction of these projects are specified in the Schedules. Offerors should design and construct to these funding limits.

11. EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES

11.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION:

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

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

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

11.2 PRICE EVALUATION:

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

11.3 SELECTION AND AWARD:

11.3.1 Subject to provisions contained herein, the contract schedule is structured such that the two projects may be awarded either individually as separate firm-fixed price contracts or combined to be awarded as a single award of a firm-fixed price contract to the offeror or offerors providing the best value to the Government in terms of technical, price, and other pertinent factors (e.g., extent of small business participation).

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

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

discuss or revise proposals. If award is not made on initial offers, discussions will be conducted as described below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

END OF INTRODUCTORY TEXT TO SECTION 00110