

SECTION 00 22 16
EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS OF AWARD
UPDATED 22 DECEMBER 2025

1.0 OVERVIEW

This is a competitive best value solicitation for a construction contract for the F35: 3-Bay Hangar at Ebbing Air National Guard Base in Fort Smith, AR. The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with the criteria described herein and award a firm fixed-price contract to the responsible firm whose proposal conforms to all the terms and conditions of the solicitation and is determined the overall best value to the Government.

1.1 WHO CAN SUBMIT

1.1.1 Firms formally organized as construction contractors, firms associated specifically for this project, consortia of firms, or any other interested parties may submit proposals. Associations may be as joint ventures as a partnership in accordance with FAR 9.601, or as key team subcontractors. To qualify, the requirements of Paragraphs 5.1.3 and 6.5.14 below must be met.

1.1.2 Organization Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Disclosure: The Offeror shall provide a disclosure statement with its proposal which concisely describes all the relevant facts concerning past or present organizational conflicts of interest relating to work on this project. In the same statement, and if applicable, the Offeror shall provide information to assure the Government that the conflicts of interest have been mitigated and/or neutralized to the maximum extent possible. If a conflict of interest is discovered after award of this contract, the Contracting Officer will decide whether to terminate the contract.

2.0 EVALUATION PROCEDURES

2.1 SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD (SSEB)

The SSEB will evaluate proposals received in response to this solicitation. The evaluation will be based on the content of the proposals and any subsequent discussions required, as well as information obtained from other sources, e.g. past performance information. The SSEB will not consider any information incorporated by reference, except as expressly allowed by this solicitation.

2.2 EVALUATION

2.2.1 The SSEB will evaluate proposals and assign a consensus rating for each evaluation factor, except that performance risk ratings are assigned to past performance (see below).

2.2.2 The Government does not intend to enter discussions with offerors prior to making an award. Offerors are encouraged to present their best technical proposal and prices in their initial proposal submission; however, in accordance with FAR Part 15.306, should discussions become necessary, the Government reserves the right to hold them.

2.2.3 In order to conduct discussions, the Contracting Officer will establish a "Competitive Range," based on the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria and comprised of all the most highly rated proposals, unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency (IAW) FAR Part 15.306(c)(2). If this occurs, a competitive range will be determined, and Offerors notified. Discussions are tailored to each offeror's proposal and must be conducted by the Contracting Officer with each Offeror within the competitive range. The primary objective of discussions is to maximize the Government's ability to obtain best value, based on the requirement and the evaluation factors set forth in the solicitation.

2.2.4 During discussions, the Government may engage in a broad give and take with firms in the competitive range, in accordance with FAR 15.306(d). The Government will provide each firm an advance agenda for the discussions. During discussions, the Government may ask each firm to further explain its proposal and to answer questions about it. If, after discussions have begun, an offeror originally in the competitive range is no longer considered to be among the most highly rated

offerors, that offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range whether or not all material aspects of the proposal have been discussed, or whether or not the offeror has been afforded an opportunity to submit a proposal revision

2.2.5 Upon conclusion of discussions, the firms still considered the most highly rated will be afforded an opportunity to submit revisions to their proposals for final evaluation and selection.

2.3 DEFINITIONS

- 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.
- Significant Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- Strength: An aspect of an offeror's proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.
- Significant Strength: An aspect of an Offeror’s proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.
- Deviation: Proposal implies or specifically offers a deviation below the specified criteria. The firm may or may not have called the deviation to the Government’s attention. **A deviation is a deficiency.** The proposal must conform to the solicitation requirements for award.

2.4 EVALUATION RATING SYSTEM

2.4.1 General: The Government will review the proposals and rate the quality of each evaluation factor and subfactor (if any). The SSEB will rate each proposal against the specified evaluation criteria in the Solicitation requirements. They will not compare proposals at this time. After all proposals are rated, the Government will compare the ratings and relative advantages and disadvantages of proposals against all source selection criteria.

2.4.2 Review Write-Up: The Government will support each rating with a narrative, separately listing all strengths, significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and required clarifications.

2.4.3 Rating System: After listing proposal strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies, the SSEB will assign an adjective rating of *outstanding*, *good*, *acceptable*, *marginal*, or *unacceptable* to each factor and subfactor (except those factors rated as *acceptable/unacceptable*), which reflect the Government's confidence in each firm's ability, as demonstrated in its proposal, to perform the requirements stated in the RFP. The adjectival ratings shall be assigned using the following criteria, which incorporate a proposal risk assessment:

COMBINED TECHNICAL RISK RATING METHOD (Table 3 in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, dated 20 August 2022)	
Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

2.4.4 Past Performance Evaluation System.

2.4.4.1 The Government will conduct a performance confidence assessment of the offeror's probability of successfully meeting the contract requirements. Each proposal will receive a single rating for this factor based on past performance and the following adjectival ratings:

PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS RATING METHOD (Table 5 in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, dated 20 August 2022)	
Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

3.0 BASIS OF AWARD

The Contracting Officer intends to award a single firm fixed-price contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal the Source Selection Authority determines conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable, and offers the best overall value to the Government considering all non-price factors described herein, and price. **All evaluation factors, other than price, when combined, are considered significantly more important than price.** The intent of this solicitation is to obtain the best proposal for the required work.

The non-cost factors, when combined, are significantly more important than cost/price. Refer to Paragraph 5.0 below for the relative weight of technical criteria and price. Price will be evaluated and considered in the overall best value determination. The Government is concerned with achieving the most advantageous balance between technical merit (quality) and price. The degree of importance of price could become greater depending upon the equality of the technical proposals. If competing technical proposals are determined to be essentially equal, price could become the controlling factor.

The Government will not award a contract if the proposal contains a deficiency, as defined in FAR 15.001. The Government reserves the right to reject any offer if the offer is not in the best interest of the Government. If awarded the contract, the Offeror shall construct the project in accordance with the plans and specifications.

The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers.

Offerors may request a debriefing in accordance with FAR 15.505, Preaward Debriefing of Offerors, or FAR 15.506, Post Award Debriefing of Offerors.

4.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

4.1 REQUIREMENT FOR SEPARATE TECHNICAL, SBPCD, PRICE PROPOSAL, and SUBCONTRACTING PLAN.

4.1.1 Each Offeror shall submit a Technical Proposal, SBPCD, Price Proposal and Subcontracting Plan (if other than small business). The Technical Proposal, SBPCD and Price Proposal must be submitted as separate files. Ensure that each file is clearly marked to indicate its contents, and the identity of the Offeror.

4.1.2 The Price Proposal, SBPCD and Technical Proposal must be received by the closing date and time set for receipt of proposals.

4.1.3 No dollar amounts from the Price Proposal shall be included in the Technical Proposal.

4.1.4 All information intended to be evaluated as part of the Technical Proposal must be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal (Volume I). Do not merely cross-reference similar material in the Price Proposal or vice versa. Also, do not include links to websites in lieu of incorporating information into your proposal.

4.1.5 DEVIATIONS, EXCEPTION AND ASSUMPTIONS

Deviations and exceptions to the terms and conditions of the solicitation in either the technical or price are neither encouraged nor desired. Should the offer include any standard company terms and conditions that conflict with the terms and conditions of the solicitation, the offer may be determined “unacceptable” and, thus, ineligible for award. Should the Offeror have any questions related to specific terms and conditions, these must be resolved prior to submission of the offer.

4.2 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

4.2.1 Submit only the electronic files specifically authorized and/or required elsewhere in this section. Do not submit excess information, to include audio-visual materials, electronic media, etc. All pages should be numbered and include working bookmarks.

4.2.2 Proposal materials shall be submitted through the Solicitation Module of the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) suite at <https://piee.cb.mil/>. Proposals submitted by mail or hand carried will not be evaluated. Proposals sent through proprietary or third-party File Transfer Protocol (FTP) sites or DoD SAFE will not be retrieved. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to confirm receipt of proposals. All proposals received after the exact time specified for receipt shall be treated as late submissions and will not be considered except under facts and circumstances allowed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). For instructions on how to post an offer, please refer to the Posting Offer demo: https://picetraining.cb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf.

It is the Offeror’s responsibility to obtain written confirmation of receipt of all electronic files of the full proposal by the Tulsa District Contracting office. If the Solicitation Module is down, the alternate method for proposal submission is via email to:

melissa.d.hyslop@usace.army.mil

brian.j.welch@usace.army.mil

The Offeror must obtain prior approval from the Contracting Officer to use the alternate submission method. Offerors are responsible for ensuring electronic copies are virus-free and shall run an anti-virus scan before submission.

Electronic copies of each volume shall be compatible with the following software products: Adobe Acrobat Reader 11 and Microsoft Office Suite 2016. Narrative portions of the proposal shall be in Adobe Acrobat portable document file (pdf) searchable text format. The Offeror shall not embed sound or video (e.g., MPEG) files into the proposal files. Electronic files shall be clearly identified for each volume, section, and items.

4.2.3 Sheet size of the proposal contents shall be 8-1/2 inches x 11 inches where sheets are prepared specifically for this proposal, unless another paper size is specifically authorized elsewhere in this section for a particular submission. Do not use alternative paper sizes (e.g., 11” x 14” or 11” x 17” sheets) unless specifically authorized in this section for a particular

submission. Do not use a font size smaller than 10, an unusual font style such as script, or condensed print for any submission. All page margins must be at least 1 inch wide but may include headers and footers. Proposals shall not exceed page limitations as defined in the individual Factor limitations noted in the paragraphs below, excluding the cover sheet and Table of Contents. A page is defined as text or information on one side of the paper. The Government will not evaluate any information beyond the total page limitations noted in the individual Factor limitations noted in the paragraphs below. The Government will not review any information submitted in an appendix or to the proposal. The Offeror shall not submit verbatim sections of this solicitation as part of their proposal. Offers that do not meet these requirements may be subject to rejection.

4.2.4 “Confidential” projects cannot be submitted to demonstrate capability unless all of the information required for evaluation as specified herein can be provided to the Government as part of the Offeror’s technical proposal. Proposals containing information that is not to be disclosed to the public for any purpose, or used by the Government except for evaluation purposes, must be clearly marked in accordance with the instructions at FAR 52.215-1, “Instructions to Offerors— Competitive Acquisition,” paragraph (e), “Restriction on disclosure and use of data.”

4.2.5 For submissions with page limitations: Where authorized, fold-out pages (11" x 14" or 11" x 17") will count as one page. Tables of content, proposal cover letters, and tabs between proposal information do not count toward any page limitations in the proposal.

4.2.6 Proposal Revisions: A revised copy of the entire proposal in .pdf format shall be provided. Revisions shall have replacement pages with revised text readily identifiable, e.g., bold- face print, underlined, or different color text. The source of the revision, e.g., error, omission, or clarification, or amendment shall be included and be annotated for each revision. Proposal replacement pages shall be numbered, shall be clearly marked “REVISED”, and shall show the date of revision. Offers that do not meet these requirements may be subject to rejection.

4.3 SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (VOLUME I)

4.3.1 Technical Proposal. Proposals shall contain the entire proposal in .pdf format using Adobe Acrobat software to print to a .pdf file; do NOT scan the document(s) into a .pdf file. The text portion of the complete proposal shall be contained as a single .pdf file and shall be searchable. Sections of the proposal shall be bookmarked (linked to the index) in logical order.

4.3.2 Format and Contents of the Technical Proposal and List of Tabs. The technical proposal will be appropriately organized using the tabs specified in the chart below. The proposals shall contain a detailed table of contents. A cover sheet identifying the Offeror (name, address, point of contact), project description, and solicitation number shall be provided. The second sheet shall be a Table of Contents. Offers that violate these rules unnecessarily delay the evaluation process and may be rejected by the Government after the initial evaluation without receiving any further consideration. The Government will not evaluate any information beyond the page limitation noted.

4.3.3 The following page limitations are established for each Factor:

- **Factor 1 – Technical Approach – Limited to 15 pages**
- **Factor 2 – Past Performance – No page limit**

4.4 SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT (SBPCD) (VOLUME II)

- **Factor 3 – Small Business Participation Commitment Document - No page limit**

4.5 SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRICE PROPOSAL (VOLUME III)

- **Factor 4 – Section 00 11 00 Pricing Schedule - No page limit**
 - All technical factors, when combined, are more important than price

4.5.1 Price Proposal. Submit the Price Proposal in read-only PDF files.

4.5.2 Size Restrictions and Page Limits. The following are established for each factor:

Proposal materials shall be submitted in PDF file. Do not use a font size smaller than 10, an unusual font style such as script, or condensed print for any submission. Each page shall be identified with the appropriate page number centered at the bottom of the page. Sheet size of the proposal contents shall be 8-1/2 inches x 11 inches. There are no page limits set for the Price Proposal. However, limit your response to information required by this solicitation. Excess information will not be considered in the Government’s evaluation.

4.5.3 Format and Contents of the Price Proposal and List of Tabs.

The Price Proposal shall be tabbed and labeled in a manner to afford easy identification from a Table of Contents, as indicated in the following chart. Note: If the Offeror is not required to submit any information under a listed Tab (such as a JV Agreement) in accordance with the instructions below, that tab can be omitted. However, do not renumber the subsequent tabs.

4.6 ONLY REQUIRED OF THE APPARENT AWARDEE, IF OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS (VOLUME IV)

- **Factor 5 – Small Business Subcontracting Plan**

5.0 PROPOSAL CONTENTS AND RELATED EVALUATION FACTORS

VOLUME I – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL			
Factor/Subfactor	Location	Description	Relative Importance
FACTOR 1	VOL I TAB A	Technical Approach	2nd Most Important Factor
FACTOR 2	VOL I TAB B	Past Performance	Most Important Factor

VOLUME II – PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS PROPOSAL			
Factor/Subfactor	Location	Description	Relative Importance
FACTOR 3	VOL II TAB A	SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT	3rd Most Important Factor

VOLUME III – PRICE PROPOSAL			
Factor/Subfactor	Location	Description	Relative Importance
N/A	VOL III TAB A	Proposal Cover Sheet	Not Rated
N/A	VOL III TAB B	Signed Letter Responding to RFP, SF 1442 and Acknowledgement of Amendments	Not Rated
FACTOR 4	VOL III TAB C	SECTION 00 11 00, PRICING SCHEDULE	4th Most Important Factor
N/A	VOL III TAB D	Bid Guarantee (Bid Bond)	Not Rated
N/A	VOL III TAB E	Representations & Certifications	Not Rated
N/A	VOL III TAB F	JV Agreement (if applicable)	Not Rated

VOLUME IV – SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN			
Factor/Subfactor	Location	Description	Relative Importance
FACTOR 5	VOL IV TAB A	SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN	This will only be required of the apparent awardee, if other than a Small Business. Will be rated acceptable/unacceptable.

5.1 VOLUME 1 TAB A – FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH – 2ND Most Important Factor

5.1.1 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

The proposing firm must clearly communicate its proposed technical approach for the solicited project which meets the attached technical specifications and construction drawings. The TAB A technical approach, including all narrative and charts and other graphics, is limited to fifteen (15) pages (**not including resumes**). The proposal must include, as a minimum, the following elements:

5.1.2 Construction Approach to include:

- a. Approach to working adjacent to an occupied facility and active airfield.
- b. Approach to protection of existing surfaces and structures
- c. Approach to commissioning of building systems
- d. Description of your QC System and Safety Plan

5.1.3 Staffing and Management Plan to include:

- a. Management organization chart of proposing firm (prime contractor) indicating lines of authority and responsibility.
- b. Key Staff including Construction Project Manager, Quality Control Manager (CQC System Manager), Site Superintendent, and Site Safety & Health Officer. Resume information for key staff must meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation and also must demonstrate relevant experience on relevant projects as defined in Factor 2. Resumes must include verifiable experience information demonstrating the minimum years of experience have been met. **RESUMES ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE 15 PAGE LIMIT.**

5.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA:

5.2.1 The Government will evaluate the technical approach in its entirety and categorize the proposal with one technical evaluation for this factor.

5.2.2 The proposing firm's technical approach narrative must be in an organized manner that acceptably addresses the elements and any sub-elements listed in the submission requirements. The proposed technical approach must meet all the attached draft plans, specifications, and contract requirements, and be commensurate with this project's size, scope, and complexity.

5.2.3 Minimum Acceptability Criteria:

5.2.4 The proposing firm's technical approach must, at a minimum, include and address all the elements and elements listed in the submission requirements.

5.2.5 A proposing firm demonstrates an acceptable technical approach by meeting the minimum submission requirements for this factor and providing the Government with a technical approach that meets all of the attached plans, specifications, and contract requirements, commensurate with this project's size, scope, and complexity.

6.0 VOLUME I TAB B – FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE – Most Important Factor

There are three aspects to the performance confidence evaluation: recency, relevancy, and quality of past performance. In accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2), the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in offeror's performance shall be considered. Relevance and quality of performance will be combined to establish one performance confidence assessment rating for each Offeror.

6.1 RECENCY OF PAST PERFORMANCE

The first aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine if the past performance is recent. Recent is defined as completed, or currently in progress with at least 50% construction completed, within the past (7) years as of the date of this solicitation. Based on this criteria, an Offeror's past performance submissions will be determined either "recent" or "not recent." Submissions deemed not recent will not be evaluated further.

6.2 RELEVANCY OF PAST EXPERIENCE

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how relevant the past performance is to this solicitation. Relevant past performance is past performance that has a significant and demonstratable relationship to this solicitation. Examples of attributes that may demonstrate relevance to this solicitation include but are not limited to:

- a. Construction of new facility of similar size and material type
- b. Commissioning of building systems
- c. Construction of aircraft hangars
- d. Construction of airfield pavements
- e. Construction on a military installation or other similarly limited / restricted access site.
- f. Construction using the 3-phase inspection process.
- g. Management of Construction in close proximity to occupied facilities and active airfields.

Projects that demonstrate a combination of multiple relevant attributes will receive a higher relevancy rating than projects that demonstrate only one relevant attribute. The information presented in the offeror's proposal, together with that from other sources available to the Government, will comprise the input for evaluation of this factor.

Attachment 1, Experience in Relevant Projects, can be used and extended as necessary. Offerors are not required to use the form itself as part of their proposal, but the information requested must be in the offeror's proposal and should be in the same format as the template.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past experience to have confidence in the Offeror's probability to successfully supply products and services that meet all the contract's plans, specifications requirements. At a minimum, this will include:

- a. Each project must include at least three of the similar scope criteria listed above in a through g.
- b. One of the submitted projects must comply with item a above and have a contract value of at least \$20M.
- c. All projects submitted must be greater than or equal to \$10M.
- d. Determined to meet the recency requirements above.
- e. Determined to meet the relevancy requirements above.

The Government will evaluate each submitted project's extent of recent and relevant experience compared to this project's size, scope of work, and performance requirements. The Government will categorize the proposal with one combined confidence evaluation for this factor. The project descriptions and relevancy narratives must clearly articulate the relevancy in sufficient detail to determine technical capability. The more similarities an example project has with the prospective contract, the greater the degree of relevancy.

6.2.1 The Government may consider previous recent teaming experience among the team members, JV partners or key teaming subcontractors, as value added, even if on different type design and/or construction projects than this project. The more relevant the experience, the more credit will be given.

6.3 QUALITY OF PAST PERFORMANCE

The third aspect of past performance evaluation is to establish the overall quality of the offeror's past performance. The Government determines the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate these into the performance confidence assessment. Evaluation will include, but is not limited to, the extent to which the offeror attained applicable percentages for small business participation under contracts that required subcontracting plans, if applicable.

6.4 PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

The past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance. It will be based on the past performance of the firms or that of its predecessor, as defined in FAR 52.204-20, if applicable. An entity may not establish past performance based on the past performance of its key personnel apart from that of the entity.

In the case of firms for which there is no information on past contract performance, or where past contract performance information is not available, or has been determined not to be recent or relevant, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past contract performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv).) In this case, the firm's past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence rating of "neutral." Although the Government may not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the Government may determine, that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" past performance rating in a best value tradeoff as long as the determination is consistent with the stated solicitation criteria.

6.5 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

6.5.1 The offeror shall provide a brief introduction of the proposed team, identifying the roles and general responsibilities of each firm. The narrative shall be no longer than 1 page and will be utilized to improve the Government's understanding of the proposed team and associated responsibilities. This narrative will not be separately evaluated.

6.5.2 The Offeror shall submit information on up to five (5), but no more than five (5) projects demonstrating the Offeror's recent and relevant experience using the Project Information Worksheet (Attachment 1). Failure to provide the required information in the Project Information Worksheet may negatively impact the Government's ability to assess the relevancy of the project to this solicitation, as well as the overall confidence assessment. A "project" is defined as a task order or stand-alone contract. Indefinite delivery indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts do not qualify as a project.

6.5.3 For each of the projects submitted, to ensure the agency has all relevant past performance information, the Offeror shall submit copies of Federal / DoD / Navy / Army performance reviews that are likely already in the agency's databases or likely within the agency's arm's reach (i.e., Contractor's copy of CPARS evaluations). The offeror shall submit complete past performance records to include all interim evaluations as well as the final evaluations.

6.5.4 For each project that does not have a CPARS evaluation, Offerors shall provide a Past Performance Questionnaire form PPQ-0 (Attachment 2) to a representative of the owner that can provide the owner's opinion of the Offeror's past performance for the project. The Past Performance Questionnaire form PPQ-0 is included in the solicitation and is provided for the Offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the Offeror includes in its proposal. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. There is no page limit associated with this factor.

6.5.5 Form PPQ-0 shall be utilized, and Offerors shall submit the completed PPQ with their proposal submission to the Contracting Office designated in the request for proposal submission location. The Contract Specialist or Contracting Officer will not require the PPQ to be sent directly from the client. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contact and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients / references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact shown in Section 00 21 16, INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS.

6.5.6 While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate, and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

6.5.7 The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the completed questionnaires are submitted by the closing date. The Government may contact and interview the owner's representative on Past Performance questionnaires and reserves the right to interview other individuals acting for the owner's representative if the owner's representative is not available.

6.5.8 The Government will evaluate the responses from the customers from which Past Performance Questionnaires have been received. The Government may contact and interview points of contact on the Past Performance Questionnaires. The Government reserves the right to interview other individuals acting for the listed references if the listed reference is not available. In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for the purpose of evaluating past performance.

6.5.9 Past performance information may be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials; and the Defense Contract Management Agency.

6.5.10 To improve the accuracy of database searches, the Offeror must also provide the CAGE Codes for the prime contractor, and all teaming partners (i.e., design firms, key subcontractors, Joint Venture Partners).

6.5.11 The Government may contact references for information regarding the Offeror's past performance on the project and for purposes of assessing and verifying the scope of work performed. Offerors should provide accurate, current, and complete information for references provided in the project descriptions. Owners / references may be asked to comment on items such as quality of design and / or construction, timeliness, management of the work, subcontractor management, including timely payment to subcontractors or suppliers, safety, relations between owner and designer or contractor, level of support for such things as as-built documentation, O&M manuals, training, correcting design or construction errors, and warranty work. The Government will not release the Interview Forms to the Offeror at any time, in order for the Government to solicit candid, unbiased interview comments.

6.5.12 The Government places a higher value on projects which demonstrate successful outcomes and are supported by outside source confirmation.

6.5.13 The Government also places a higher value on projects, which provided particularly difficult or unique challenges and the innovative methods the contractor used to resolve problems successfully.

6.5.14 Joint Ventures. If the Offeror represents the combining of two or more companies for the purpose of this RFP, the proposal shall clearly identify the contractual responsibilities of each firm and the work to be performed by each; describe the nature of the association; indicate whether the firms have experience working together in construction ventures, including how long and how many projects. In addition, each company, including joint ventures, shall list their Government contract experience. Provide a copy of the commitment letter of the firms or the Joint Venture Agreement. Prior to award of any contract, a copy of the Joint Venture Agreement will be required. If approval of the Joint Venture Agreement is required by the Small Business Administration (SBA), failure to timely provide an approved Small Business Administration Joint Venture Agreement may prevent award of a contract.

a. Offerors submitting proposals as a Joint Venture (JV) shall obtain a UEI number and be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) as the offering Joint Venture. The Joint Venture shall comply with the submission requirements outlined in paragraph 5.5.2.

b. If the Offeror cannot provide a sufficient number of projects as the Joint Venture, the Offeror must provide those recent, relevant projects that it has performed as the Joint Venture, and then supplement the record with additional recent, relevant projects performed by each Joint Venture member in their individual capacities. Limitations on total number of projects submitted shall be in compliance with paragraph 5.3.3.

c. The Joint Venture shall provide a brief narrative stating the roles that each partner of the Joint Venture will perform on this project and how the presented projects demonstrate the Joint Venture member's experience and past performance commensurate with their role on this project, or how their experience qualifies them for their role on this project. This narrative will be utilized to improve the Government's understanding of the proposed team and will not be separately evaluated.

6.6 EVALUATION CRITERIA

6.6.1 The Government will perform a performance confidence assessment of the Offeror's probability of successfully meeting the contract requirements. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's responsiveness to the solicitation regarding past performance using the sources identified above. New companies and Joint Ventures shall be evaluated on their own past performance, or that of its predecessor as defined in FAR clause 52.204-20 Predecessor of Offeror, if relevant, to determine the company's ability to perform satisfactorily under the elements of evaluation.

6.6.2 The Government will first assess and rate the relevancy of recent projects accomplished by the Offeror to the scope of this contract for overall application to the performance confidence assessment ratings described hereinafter. The past performance relevancy ratings definitions are contained in Section 00 22 16 Paragraph 2.3.

6.6.3 The Government will next consider how well the Offeror performed on the contracts. The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor performance. With respect to relevancy, past performance on projects with more relevance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment rating than past performance on projects of lesser relevance. The past performance confidence ratings are contained in Section 00 22 16 Paragraph 2.3.

6.6.4 Each entity (firm) will be rated on its own performance or that of its predecessor as defined in FAR clause 52.204-20 Predecessor of Offeror, if relevant. If the Government does not obtain past performance information for the projects identified by the Offeror and cannot establish a past performance record for the Offeror through other sources, past performance will be rated neither favorably nor unfavorably. The performance confidence assessment will be considered "Neutral Confidence". Offerors may be provided an opportunity to address any negative past performance information about which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. The Government will evaluate past performance based on the elements listed below:

- **QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION.** Based on all information available, the Government will assess the quality of the actual construction undertaken and the standards of workmanship exhibited by the Offeror.
- **TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror completing past projects within the scheduled completion times.
- **CUSTOMER SATISFACTION.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's past customer satisfaction, cooperation with customers, and interaction on past projects.
- **SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's management of subcontractors, including mitigation of conflicts and resolution of disputes at the lowest level. For large businesses, the Government will also evaluate compliance with subcontracting plans.
- **DOCUMENTATION.** The Government will evaluate all information available with respect to the Offeror's level of meeting customer satisfaction on timeliness and quality of the documentation, reports, and other written materials completed by the Offeror on past projects.
- **SAFETY RECORD.** All information available with respect to the Offeror's safety record, to include CPARS rating for safety, lost time incident rate, safety incentive program, safety awards, and other indications of improvements in safety will be taken into consideration in evaluating the Offeror's overall safety record.

7.0 VOLUME II, TAB A: FACTOR 3 –SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT – Less Important than Factors 1 and 2.

7.1 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:

All offerors, regardless of size status, are required to complete a SBPCD. In accordance with DFARS 215.304(c)(i) for unrestricted acquisitions that require the use of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The Government will evaluate Small Business Participation in source selections, and this evaluation is required for this procurement.

Offerors shall articulate how they intend to meet the SBPCD criteria outlined in the solicitation.

All offerors shall complete and may use the format template, *Attachment 3* when submitting the SBPCD. This factor does not have a page limitation.

Nothing precludes an offeror from further demonstrating their extent of commitment to using small businesses beyond what has been required by this solicitation.

7.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA:

The Government requirement will evaluate the level of proposed participation of small businesses in the performance to determine which offeror proposes the best value relative to the participation percentages and other criteria outlined in this document. Failure to submit a SBPCD will be evaluated as a deficiency.

All offerors shall articulate the extent to which Small Businesses (SB), Small, Disadvantaged Businesses (SDB), Women-Owned Small Businesses (WOSB), Historical Underutilized Business Zones (HUBZone), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSB) and Service-Disabled, Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB) that are specifically identified in the proposal.

Extent of participation of Small Business firms in terms of percentages based on the total value of the offeror's proposal of the acquisition and the extent to which the proposal meets or exceeds SBPCD percentages detailed in *paragraph 7.2.1*.

Other-than-small business (OTS) may achieve their small business participation commitments through subcontracting to small businesses. Small businesses may achieve their small business participation commitments through their own performance/participation as a prime or through a joint venture, teaming arrangement, and subcontracting to other small businesses.

7.2.1 The minimum SBPCD percentages are:

- SB: 20% based on total value of proposal
- SDB: 5 % based on total value of proposal
- WOSB: 3% based on total value of proposal
- HUBZone: 3 % based on total value of proposal
- VOSB: 5% based on total value of proposal
- SDVOSB: 5 % based on total value of proposal

Offeror shall describe the extent of commitments to identify firms (if any) in place for this solicitation. The offeror is not limited to the examples provided below.

Enforceable commitments are weighed more heavily than non-enforceable commitments. Enforceable commitments must:

- (1) Firm must be a small business
- (2) Include the socioeconomic category of the small business
- (3) Identify the services/supplies to be provided by the small business
- (4) Specificity to the subject requirement by indicating the solicitation number on the document
- (5) Include legible signature blocks and signatures from BOTH parties authorized to sign on behalf of their respective firm to demonstrate acknowledgement of the business relationship
- (6) Small business firm must be identified on the SBPCD as appropriate

The offeror shall describe the use of small business firms providing the following information:

- (1) Name of each small business, include each socio-economic category
- (2) Complexity and variety of work to be performed by small business
- (3) Percentage of work performed by each firm

Offerors failing to identify, or severely limit, the supplies/services to be performed may be evaluated as a weakness or deficiency.

Past performance of the offerors in complying with the requirements of the clause FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns or 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

The Offeror shall provide a narrative describing compliance to small business. The Government will evaluate based on one and/or a combination of the following:

- (1) Reporting of small business performance in CPARS
- (2) History of prompt payments to small business subcontractors
- (3) Reporting of small business performance in eSRS.
- (4) Documentation from customers demonstrating use/support of small businesses
- (5) Documentation of other information to substantiate the use of small business demonstrating the total small business contract completion by the small business prime and/or subcontracting to other small business.
- (6) Documentation from federal agency customers demonstrating the use/support of small business and/or information substantiating the use of small business subcontractors may be evaluated more favorably.
- (7) Small Business compliance reviews
- (8) DCMA Small Business Subcontracting Program reviews

Offerors are encouraged to submit proof of awards, accolades, or similar type documentation received for their current and/or past support of small businesses. The offeror is not limited to the examples provided. The Government reserves the right to review additional information outside of the evaluation criteria below.

Material submitted in support of the SBPCD shall be logically assembled and organized to facilitate evaluation. The use of hyperlinks in lieu of incorporating information into the proposal is prohibited. Do not cross-reference materials as the Government will not look to obtain information in support of an offeror's SBPCD from other volumes or within the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, if applicable.

Offerors shall not submit a hybrid plan that includes a combination of elements from a SBPCD (in accordance with DFARS PGI 215.304) and elements of a Small Business Subcontracting Plan (in accordance with FAR 52.219-9) as the two are distinctly different. Doing so will result in a weakness.

7.3 The submitted SBPCD will utilize the ratings as described in *paragraph 7.2.1*, Ratings for Factor 3 based on the following:

Extent of participation of Small Business firms in terms of percentages and the extent to which the proposal meets or exceeds the SBPCD percentages as detailed in *paragraph 7.2.1* in the solicitation. Offerors providing less than the percentages outlined above may be evaluated as a weakness or deficiency.

The Government will verify the total value of the offeror's proposal to ensure percentages are consistent as identified in the solicitation. If an offeror's value of their total proposal is inconsistent with the percentages outline in the SBPCD, it may result in a weakness or deficiency.

Extent to which Small Business firms, as defined in FAR Part 19, SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZONE, VOSB and SDVOSB, are specifically identified in the proposal. The Government will evaluate the firms specifically identified by the Offeror in the submitted SBPCD.

Extent of commitment to use the identified firms. The Government will evaluate the types of commitments in place (if any) for this specific acquisition (small business prime, written contract, verbal, enforceable, non-enforceable, joint ventures, mentor-protégé, teaming agreements, partnership letters of commitment(s), etc.). Enforceable commitments as defined in *paragraph 7.2.1* may be evaluated more favorably than non-enforceable commitments.

Extent to identify the complexity and variety of work small business firms are to perform. The Government will evaluate the meaningful elements of the type and complexity of work to be performed by small business. Offerors failing to identify, or severely limit, the supplies/services to be performed may be evaluated as a weakness or deficiency.

Extent of past performance of the offerors in complying with the requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8 Utilization of Small Business Concerns or 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

Offerors with no prior contracts containing FAR clause 52.219-8, and whether negative information has been reported concerning the Offeror's past compliance with FAR 52.219-8 alongside any explanation to address the negative information. The government reserves the right to review additional information outside of offer's proposal.

Extent of documentation from federal agency customers demonstrating the use/support of small business and/or information substantiating the use of small business subcontractors may be evaluated more favorably.

The government reserves the right to review additional information outside of offer's proposal.

The SBPCD will be evaluated using Table 6 under 3.1.4.1.2. of the DoD Source Selection Manual.

8.0 **VOLUME III TAB A – FACTOR 4 - PRICE PROPOSAL**

8.1 GENERAL: Submit the Price Proposal (Volume III) in a separate pdf. file labeled "Volume III – Price Proposal."

8.2 SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

8.2.1 **VOLUME III, TAB A: PROPOSAL COVER SHEET.** The proposal cover sheet is required by FAR 52.215-1(c)(2)(i)-(v) and must be submitted by all Offerors. This provision, titled "Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition", and the format for the proposal cover sheet as shown here:

PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

- (i) The solicitation number;
- (ii) The name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the offeror (and electronic address if available);
- (iii) A statement specifying the extent of agreement with all terms, conditions, and provisions included in the solicitation and agreement to furnish any or all items upon which prices are offered at the price set opposite each item;
- (iv) 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; and
- (v) Name, title, and signature of person authorized to sign the proposal. Proposals signed by an agent shall be accompanied by evidence of that agent's authority, unless that evidence has been previously furnished to the issuing office.

8.2.2 **VOLUME III, TAB B: LETTER AND SF1442.** The letter provided to respond to this Request for Proposal is to be completed by all Offerors and duly executed with an original signature by an official authorized to bind the company in accordance with FAR 4.102. Submit the letter and the signed SF1442, with all amendments acknowledged, in accordance with the instructions on the Standard Form 30, Amendment of Solicitation.

8.2.3 **VOLUME III, TAB C: FACTOR 4 – PRICING SCHEDULE.** Section 00 11 00, Pricing Schedule, is to be completed in its entirety by all Offerors. See Section 00 11 00 with attached notes, for further instructions. Include price breakdown information behind the Pricing Schedule.

8.2.4 **VOLUME 3, TAB D: BID GUARANTEE.** Provide a fully executed Bid Bond as required by FAR Clause 52.228-1, Bid Guarantee. The completed bid bond shall be provided electronically. A paper copy may be requested by the contracting officer.

8.2.5 VOLUME 3, TAB E: REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS. All Offerors must have electronically completed the annual representations and certifications in the SAM website (www.sam.gov). Offerors are responsible for ensuring on-line Representations and Certifications are updated as necessary or at least annually to reflect changes and ensure entries are current, accurate and complete. If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, all partners must separately complete the on-line Representations and Certifications.

8.2.6 VOLUME 3, TAB F: JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT (if applicable). If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), include a copy of the JV Agreement. If a JV Agreement has not yet been finalized/approved, indicate its status. JV Agreements must clearly indicate the percentage of the JV participants, in particular the percent of the controlling party, and a clearly delineate responsibilities and authorities between the JV parties.

9.0 VOLUME IV TAB A - FACTOR 5 - SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN (LARGE BUSINESSES ONLY)

Separate from the SBPCD, *If the apparent awardee is an OTS business, the offeror must also submit a small business subcontracting plan* meeting the requirements of FAR 52.219-9 and DFARS 252.219-7003 (or DFARS 252.219-7004 if the offeror has a comprehensive subcontracting plan).

OTS businesses must submit acceptable subcontracting plans to be eligible for award. Subcontracting plans shall reflect and be consistent with the commitments offered in the SBPCD. The socio-economic dollars must be equal to or greater than the commitments proposed in the SBPCD. Small businesses specifically identified in the SBPCD must be listed in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

Failure to submit an acceptable Small Business Subcontracting Plan will result in the offeror's ineligibility for award. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated as "acceptable" or "unacceptable".

9.1 Offerors are reminded: It is the Government's expectation that the SBPCD percentages (equated), based on the offer's proposal, will be met. Failure to meet the dollars without sufficient justification in terms of the good faith efforts applied may result in the offeror paying liquidated damages to the Government in accordance with FAR 52.219-16, Liquidated Damages and a CPARS rating less than satisfactory during execution and administration of the contract.

Awarded contractor(s) requiring a Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall also include the district small business professional within their email distribution when submitting their ISR within SAM.gov. Failure to include the district small business professional may be considered a failure in making a "good faith effort" to the contractor's Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

The firms will be required to notify the Contracting Officer of any substitutions of firms that are not Small Business firms, for the Small Business firms specifically identified in the SBPCD and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Notifications shall be in writing and shall occur within a reasonable period after award of the subcontract to facilitate compliance with DFARS 252.219-7003(e) during execution and administration of the contract.

The Small Business Subcontracting Plans are not evaluated as part of the source selection process and is separate from Factor 4 requirements in this solicitation.

SECTION 00 22 16 - ATTACHMENT 1

VOLUME I – TAB B PROJECT INFORMATION WORKSHEET	
The information provided on this worksheet will be utilized in the evaluation of Factor 2, Past Performance.	
1. Project Title/Description:	
2. Location:	
3. Contract Number:	
4. Procurement Agency & Point of Contact with Telephone Number:	
5. Address & Telephone Number of Owner/Customer:	
6. Type of Project (private sector, Government, planned unit development, hangar, etc.)	
7. Contract Type & Delivery Method: (fixed price, cost plus, etc...) and (design-bid-build / design-build)	
8. General Scope of the Contract and how it is relevant to this solicitation, reference 00 22 16, Paragraph 6.2:	
9. Identification and narrative description of involvement in this Project, (i.e., General Contractor, Subcontractor, Designer, etc.)	
10. Award Date:	
11. Original Contract Amount:	
12. Final Contract Amount:	
13. Original Completion Date:	
14. Final Completion Date:	
15. Explanation for any differences between original and final contract costs and completion dates:	
16. Total number of manhours including all subcontractors:	
17. Total number of lost time accidents including all subcontractors:	
18. Is performance documentation provided: If not, state reason.	

SECTION 00 22 16 - ATTACHMENT 2

USACE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Form PPQ-0)

CONTRACT INFORMATION (Contractor to complete Blocks 1-4)

1. Contractor Information

Firm Name: CAGE Code:
Address: DNS Number:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
Point of Contact: Contact Phone Number:

2. Work Performed as: Prime Contractor Sub Contractor Joint Venture Other (Explain)
Percent of project work performed:
If subcontractor, who was the prime (Name/Phone #):

3. Contract Information

Contract Number:
Delivery/Task Order Number (if applicable):
Contract Type: Firm Fixed Price Cost Reimbursement Other (Please specify):
Contract Title:
Contract Location:

Award Date (mm/dd/yy):
Contract Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):
Actual Completion Date (mm/dd/yy):
Explain Differences:

Original Contract Price (Award Amount):
Final Contract Price (to include all modifications, if applicable):
Explain Differences:

4. Project Description:

Complexity of Work High Med Routine
How is this project relevant to project of submission? (Please provide details such as similar equipment, requirements, conditions, etc.)

CLIENT INFORMATION (Client to complete Blocks 5-8)

5. Client Information

Name:
Title:
Phone Number:
Email Address:

6. Describe the client's role in the project:

7. Date Questionnaire was completed (mm/dd/yy):

8. Client's Signature:

NOTE: USACE REQUESTS THAT THE CLIENT COMPLETES THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUBMITS DIRECTLY BACK TO THE CONTRACT SPECIALIST. THE OFFEROR WILL SUBMIT THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO USACE WITH THEIR PROPOSAL, AND MAY DUPLICATE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

FUTURE SUBMISSION ON USACE SOLICITATIONS. CLIENTS ARE HIGHLY ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONNAIRES DIRECTLY TO THE OFFEROR. HOWEVER, QUESTIONNAIRES MAY BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO USACE. PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFEROR FOR USACE POC INFORMATION. THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO VERIFY ANY AND ALL INFORMATION ON THIS FORM.

TO BE COMPLETED BY CLIENT

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.

1. QUALITY:	
a) Quality of technical data/report preparation efforts	E VG S M U N
b) Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance	E VG S M U N
c) Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance	E VG S M U N
d) Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements (without adverse effect on performance)	E VG S M U N
2. SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:	
a) Compliance with contract delivery/completion schedules including any significant intermediate milestones. <i>(If liquidated damages were assessed or the schedule was not met, please address below)</i>	E VG S M U N
b) Rate the contractor's use of available resources to accomplish tasks identified in the contract	E VG S M U N
3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:	
a) To what extent were the end users satisfied with the project?	E VG S M U N
b) Contractor was reasonable and cooperative in dealing with your staff (including the ability to successfully resolve disagreements/disputes; responsiveness to administrative reports, businesslike and communication)	E VG S M U N
c) To what extent was the contractor cooperative, businesslike, and concerned with the interests of the customer?	E VG S M U N
d) Overall customer satisfaction	E VG S M U N
4. MANAGEMENT/ PERSONNEL/LABOR	
a) Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors, suppliers, materials, and/or labor force?	E VG S M U N
b) Ability to hire, apply, and retain a qualified workforce to this effort	E VG S M U N
c) Government Property Control	E VG S M U N
d) Knowledge/expertise demonstrated by contractor personnel	E VG S M U N
e) Utilization of Small Business concerns	E VG S M U N
f) Ability to simultaneously manage multiple projects with multiple disciplines	E VG S M U N
g) Ability to assimilate and incorporate changes in requirements and/or priority, including planning, execution and response to Government changes	E VG S M U N
h) Effectiveness of overall management (including ability to effectively lead, manage and control the program)	E VG S M U N
5. COST/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	
a) Ability to meet the terms and conditions within the contractually agreed price(s)?	E VG S M U N
b) Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client	E VG S M U N
c) If this is/was a Government cost type contract, please rate the Contractor's timeliness and accuracy in submitting monthly invoices with appropriate back-up documentation, monthly status reports/budget variance reports, compliance with established budgets and avoidance of significant and/or unexplained variances (under runs or overruns)	E VG S M U N
d) Is the Contractor's accounting system adequate for management and tracking of costs? <i>If no, please explain in Remarks section.</i>	Yes No
e) If this is/was a Government contract, has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending	Yes No

terminations? <i>Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.</i>	
f) Have there been any indications that the contractor has had any financial problems? <i>If yes, please explain below.</i>	Yes No
6. SAFETY/SECURITY	
a) To what extent was the contractor able to maintain an environment of safety, adhere to its approved safety plan, and respond to safety issues? (Includes: following the users rules, regulations, and requirements regarding housekeeping, safety, correction of noted deficiencies, etc.)	E VG S M U N
b) Contractor complied with all security requirements for the project and personnel security requirements.	E VG S M U N
7. GENERAL	
a) Ability to successfully respond to emergency and/or surge situations (including notifying COR, PM or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent contractual issues).	E VG S M U N
b) Compliance with contractual terms/provisions (<i>explain if specific issues</i>)	E VG S M U N
c) Would you hire or work with this firm again? (<i>If no, please explain below</i>)	Yes No
d) In summary, provide an overall rating for the work performed by this contractor.	E VG S M U N

Please provide responses to the questions above (*if applicable*) and/or additional remarks. Furthermore, please provide a brief narrative addressing specific strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, or other comments which may assist our office in evaluating performance risk (*please attach additional pages if necessary*):

SECTION 00 22 16 - ATTACHMENT 3

SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT

ALL OFFERORS ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD). Offerors are to propose the level of participation of small businesses (as a small business prime, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or other teaming agreements) in the performance of the acquisition relative to the small business and percentages set forth in the solicitation. The SBPCD shall be based on the offeror's best effort as outlined under 9.3.1 and is required to address each of the following areas individually:

- (1) The extent of participation of small business firms in terms of percentages based on the total value of the offeror's proposal.
- (2) The extent to which the small business firms as defined in FAR 19 are specifically identified in the proposal.
- (3) The extent of commitments to use the identified firms (including letters of intent, documented agreements, or other evidence of mutual understanding) in place for this specific proposal.
- (4) The extent to identify the complexity and variety of work small business firms are to perform.
- (5) The extent of the offeror's past performance in accordance with FAR 52.219-8 and 52.219-9.
- (6) The extent of documentation from federal agency customers demonstrating the use/support of small business.
- (7) The SBPCD shall be organized as follows:

(a) Check the applicable size and socioeconomic small business categories for the PRIME Offeror only:

- Large Prime
- Or**
- SB Prime also categorized as a:
- SDB
 - WOSB
 - HZ
 - VOSB
 - SDVOSB

(b) Submit the total combined percentage of work to be performed by both large and small businesses (include the percentage of work to be performed both by Prime, joint venture, teaming arrangement, and subcontractors):

Total Percentage planned for Large Business(es): _____%

Total Percentage planned for Small Business(es): _____%

100%

Example: If the Prime proposes a price of \$1,000,000 (including all options), and small business(es) will provide \$250,000 in services/supplies as a prime, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor, the % planned for small businesses is 25% (\$250,000) and 75% (\$750,000) for large business, equaling 100% (\$1,000,000).

(c) Submit the total percentage of participation to be performed by each type of socioeconomic subcategory below. The percentage of work performed by Small Businesses that qualify in multiple small business categories may be counted in each category.

SDB _____ %
WOSB _____ %
HZ _____ %
VOSB _____ %
SDVOSB _____ %

Example: Firm 1 (WOSB and SDVOSB) performing 2%; and Firm 2 (SDB, HZ and WOSB) performing 3%. Results equate to: SMALL BUSINESS 5%; SDB 3%; HZ 3%; WOSB 5%; SDVOSB 2%; VOSB 2%.) SDVOSBs are also VOSBs automatically; however, VOSBs are not automatically SDVOSBs.

(d) Identify the PRIME Offeror and its intended large or small business subcontractors for Table 1 as follows:

- (1) Size of Prime Offeror and intended subcontractor
- (2) Socio-economic categories for intended subcontractor
- (2) Name of Company to include UEI or CAGE (if available)
- (3) NAICS Code that describes the products or services being acquired by each intended subcontractor
- (4) Type of products or services provided by the subcontractor

Table 1

Total Participation	Size/SB Category	Name of Company Include UEI or CAGE (if available)	NAICS Code	Type of Products/Services
Prime Offeror				
Subcontractors				
Large				
SB				
SDB				
WOSB				
HZ				
VOSB				
SDVOSB				