

# AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE 1	OF PAGES 48
--------------------------	-----------	----------------

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER 0003	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 16 JAN 2026	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER (If applicable) 513102
6. ISSUED BY CODE W9127S  W076 ENDIST LITTLE ROCK KO CONTRACTING DIVISION, 700 W CAPITOL AVE ROOM 7315 LITTLE ROCK, AR 72201-3225 UNITED STATES MARKEITH BERRY, EMAIL: MARKEITH.J.BERRY@USACE.ARMY.MIL TELEPHONE: 817-886-1031		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE  SCD: PAS:	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)	(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER W9127S25RA001
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 10 DEC 2025
	<input type="checkbox"/>	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE	

### 11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers  is extended.  is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:  
 (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted;  
 or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.  
 If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)  
 SEE SECTION G - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA

### 13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor  is not  is required to sign this document and return \_\_\_\_\_ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

This amendment is issued to extend the proposal due date, remove FAR Clause 52.209-1 and include the following attachments:

1. SOLICITATION\_AMENDMENT\_0003\_-\_27\_51\_19
2. SOLICITATION\_AMENDMENT\_0003\_-\_ALL\_DRAWINGS
3. SOLICITATION\_AMENDMENT\_0003\_-\_Cover\_Letter
4. SOLICITATION\_AMENDMENT\_0003\_-\_PROJECT\_TOC

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) NICHOLAS JOHNSTON
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
  <hr/> (Signature of person authorized to sign)	   <hr/> (Signature of Contracting Officer)
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED 16 JAN 2026

Previous edition unusable

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE SUMMARY OF CHANGES

### Section A - Solicitation/Contract Form

The following changes have been made:

INFORMATION	FROM	TO
Response Due Date	30 Jan 2026	13 Feb 2026

### Section I - Contract Clauses

#### Additional Information/Notes

The following clauses were deleted:

FAR Clauses Incorporated by Full Text  
52.209-1 Qualification Requirements.

(Feb 1995)

The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 52.209-1, Qualification Requirements, in solicitations and contracts when the acquisition is subject to a qualification requirement.

Qualification Requirements (Feb 1995)

(a) *Definition.* "Qualification requirement," as used in this clause, means a Government requirement for testing or other quality assurance demonstration that must be completed before award.

(b) One or more qualification requirements apply to the supplies or services covered by this contract. For those supplies or services requiring qualification, whether the covered product or service is an end item under this contract or simply a component of an end item, the product, manufacturer, or source must have demonstrated that it meets the standards prescribed for qualification before award of this contract. The product, manufacturer, or source must be qualified at the time of award whether or not the name of the product, manufacturer, or source is actually included on a qualified products list, qualified manufacturers list, or qualified bidders

list. Offerors should contact the agency activity designated below to obtain all requirements that they or their products or services, or their subcontractors or their products or services, must satisfy to become qualified and to arrange for an opportunity to demonstrate their abilities to meet the standards specified for qualification.

(Name) \_\_\_\_\_

(Address) \_\_\_\_\_

(c) If an offeror, manufacturer, source, product or service covered by a qualification requirement has already met the standards specified, the relevant information noted below should be provided.

Offeror's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Manufacturer's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Source's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Item Name \_\_\_\_\_

Service Identification \_\_\_\_\_

Test Number \_\_\_\_\_ (to the extent known)

(d) Even though a product or service subject to a qualification requirement is not itself an end item under this contract, the product, manufacturer, or source must nevertheless be qualified at the time of award of this contract. This is necessary whether the Contractor or a subcontractor will ultimately provide the product or service in question. If, after award, the Contracting Officer discovers that an applicable qualification requirement was not in fact met at the time of award, the Contracting Officer may either terminate this contract for default or allow performance to continue if adequate consideration is offered and the action is determined to be otherwise in the Government's best interests.

(e) If an offeror, manufacturer, source, product or service has met the qualification requirement but is not yet on a qualified products list, qualified manufacturers list, or qualified bidders list, the offeror must submit evidence of qualification prior to award of this contract. Unless determined to be in the Government's interest, award of this contract shall not be delayed to permit an offeror to submit evidence of qualification.

(f) Any change in location or ownership of the plant where a previously qualified product or service was manufactured or performed requires reevaluation of the qualification. Similarly, any change in location or ownership of a previously qualified manufacturer or source requires reevaluation of the qualification. The reevaluation must be accomplished before the date of award.

(End of provision)

## **Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award**

### **Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:**

Construct an F-35 Special Access Program Facility providing controlled workspace for ICD 705 compliant secure flight planning and training, unclassified aircrew training and administrative space, aircrew flight equipment storage and maintenance, and step desk to support combat crew functions. The facility is segregated to support up to three foreign countries using separate secure systems. The facility includes concrete floor slabs and footings on pile foundation, structural steel frame, brick masonry finish walls, concrete decking, and a combination pitched standing seam metal and flat roof. The facility has lightning protection, fire detection and suppression, intrusion detection, and all required supporting facilities to provide a complete and usable facility including utilities, pavements, site improvements, and communication support. Privatized utility connection fees are included in their respective supporting facilities line item.

This solicitation is for a Design-Bid-Build, Firm Fixed Price contract at Ebbing Air National Guard Base, Fort Smith Arkansas.

Award will be made to the best overall proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, through the tradeoff process. The Tradeoff Process permits the tradeoffs among cost, price and/or non-cost factors and allows the Government to accept other than the lowest priced proposal. The perceived benefits of the higher priced proposal must merit the additional cost, and the rationale for tradeoffs must be documented. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will give due consideration to all the factors and their relative order of importance but reserves the right to make an award to other than the lowest priced offeror, or to other than the offeror with the highest technical rating or to reject all offers if the SSA determines that to do so would result in the best value to the Government.

Relative weights among technical factors are provided in this Section. The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) reviews, evaluates, and rates the proposals against the source selection criteria in the RFP. A competitive range consisting of the most highly qualified technical offerors will be established prior to discussions (if held). Concurrently, the Government analyzes price proposals of Offerors utilizing the project cost proposal. Price will not be rated but will be a factor in making the final best value determination for award. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) compares proposals and determines the best value for the government. The perceived benefits of the higher priced proposal must merit the additional cost, and the rationale for tradeoffs must be documented.

### **BASIS OF AWARD**

The Contracting Officer will award a firm fixed-price contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal the SSA determines conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable with regard to pricing, and whose proposal offers the best overall value to the Government, considering the price and non-price factors described herein. All evaluation factors, other than price, when combined, are approximately equal to the price. As part of the evaluation, the Government will

evaluate proposals relative to the minimum standards in the RFP to determine if they offer additional value to the Government. In addition, innovations in proposals will be evaluated to determine if creative ideas of the Offeror are a better value to the Government compared to the minimum criteria. After the Government evaluates and rates each proposal, the SSA will compare proposals to determine which proposal represents the best value for award.

The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers. The Government will not award a contract to an Offeror whose proposal contains a deficiency, as defined in FAR 15.001. If there is a lower priced, conforming offer(s), the SSA must determine that the added value of a more expensive proposal would justify award to that Offeror.

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Relative Importance</b>
<b>FACTOR 1</b>	Vol. 1 TAB A	PAST PERFORMANCE	MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR
<b>FACTOR 2</b>	Vol. 1 TAB B	TECHNICAL APPROACH	LESS IMPORTANT THAN FACTOR 1, MORE IMPORTANT THAN FACTOR 3
<b>FACTOR 3</b>	Vol. 1 TAB C	SUMMARY SCHEDULE	LESS IMPORTANT THAN FACTORS 2 AND MORE IMPORTANT THAN FACTOR 4
<b>FACTOR 4</b>	Vol. 3 TAB A	SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION	LEAST IMPORTANT FACTOR

**NOTE: All evaluation factors, other than price, when combined, are considered approximately equal to price.**

**VOLUME I: PAST PERFORMANCE/TECHNICAL**

## TAB A - FACTOR 1 - PAST PERFORMANCE

Past Performance refers to the quality of relevant and recent project experience. This tab shall contain past performance information regarding same/similar projects that demonstrate the experience of the offeror and/or proposed team. The past performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, based on a demonstrated record of performance. In this factor, the Government will consider recent and relevant project performance, team organization, and team experience to determine the confidence rating.

### a. Submission Requirements for Factor 1:

Offerors shall submit no more than five (5) Government and/or commercial projects for Construction which are recent and relevant to the efforts required by this solicitation as defined below. Use the attached Construction Past Performance Worksheet (Attachment 1) to submit construction experience. Limit each worksheet to no more than three pages.

**Relevant:** Demonstrate the experience of the offeror and/or proposed team on projects same /similar in SIZE, SCOPE, and COMPLEXITY to that described in the solicitation. Offerors shall identify and describe the relevancies for each of the projects submitted compared to the scope of this project. The Government will evaluate the information provided in making the relevancy determination.

Project to construct an F-35 Special Access Program Facility providing controlled workspace for ICD 705 compliant secure flight planning and training, unclassified aircrew training and administrative space, aircrew flight equipment storage and maintenance, and step desk to support combat crew functions. The facility is segregated to support up to three foreign countries using separate secure systems. The facility includes concrete floor slabs and footings on pile foundation, structural steel frame, brick masonry finish walls, concrete decking, and a combination pitched standing seam metal and flat roof. The facility has lightning protection, fire detection and suppression, intrusion detection, and all required supporting facilities to provide a complete and usable facility including utilities, pavements, site improvements, and communication support. Privatized utility connection fees are included in their respective supporting facilities line item. Facility will be designed as permanent construction in accordance with Department of Defense Unified Facilities Criteria 1-200-01. This project will comply with Department of Defense antiterrorism/force protection requirements per Unified Facilities Criteria 4-010-01. Air Conditioning: 195 Tons.

**Recent:** All projects submitted for construction experience must have been completed, or currently in progress with at least 50% construction completed, within the past (7) years as of the date of this solicitation. Projects completed more than (7) seven years from the date of the solicitation will not be deemed recent and will not be evaluated.

If any firm has multiple functions or divisions, limit the project examples to those performed by the division or unit submitting the offer. If projects were design-bid-build, identify them as such. If the Offeror is proposing as a Joint Venture (JV) and past performance cannot be provided as a JV, each partner shall submit past performance information. Combined number of projects submitted shall be no more than the number allowed.

Past Performance Assessment Questionnaire (PPQ) (Attachment 2) included in the solicitation is provided for the offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 1: Past Performance that does not have a final Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation or is a non-Federal Government project. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed Past Performance Questionnaires should be submitted with your proposal for projects submitted for past performance experience. 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 contract 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, Nicholas I. Johnston via email at [nicholas.i.johnston@usace.army.mil](mailto:nicholas.i.johnston@usace.army.mil) prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

Do not request PPQs on projects that have a final CPARS evaluation. If a final CPARS evaluation exists and a PPQ is provided for the same project, the CPARS evaluation will be reviewed as the official past performance record for the project, and the PPQ will not be considered by the Source Selection Board or the Source Selection Authority.

For USACE or other DoD projects which are completed but do not yet have a final CPARS evaluation, one PPQ per contract may be submitted; to be considered, the PPQ shall be signed by the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) for the contract.

Offerors are not required to submit any additional past performance information. The Government will utilize CPARS, and any other information deemed relevant to assess confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform.

Offerors are encouraged to submit completed CPARS for projects submitted for past performance experience.

Offerors may submit performance recognition documents received within the last six years, such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition. There is no page limit for the performance recognition documents.

Offerors may submit information on past performance issues and corrective actions taken to prevent these issues from reoccurring. Discuss whether these corrective actions have been implemented on projects awarded after the performance issues, the effectiveness of the corrective actions, and POC information for the subsequent projects. Limit to no more than three pages, if submitted.

In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through CPARS, using all CAGE/UEI numbers of team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary /affiliate) identified in the offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

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.

## **B. Evaluation Criteria for Factor 1:**

### **1. Relevancy Determination**

a. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance to determine how relevant each of the past performance projects is to the project under consideration. The Government may place greater value on projects performed as a prime contractor than as a subcontractor, depending upon overall role and relevancy considerations. Federal Government project past performance will not be rated inherently more important than non-Federal Government project past performance.

- b. Projects completed outside the defined time period for recency will not be considered relevant to this solicitation.
  
- c. More relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.
  
- d. Projects with lower degrees of relevance will not be as strong of predictors of likely future contract performance success and will typically have less influence on the final past performance confidence rating.
  
- e. Projects that have little or no relevance typically do not influence the performance confidence rating; however, any projects with adverse past performance could reflect larger company-wide concerns and may have impact upon the past performance confidence rating.

## **2. Confidence Determination**

- a. The SSEB will review the past performance information available to determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment. If the Government cannot establish the Offeror's relevant past performance, it reserves the right to utilize the Past Performance Questionnaire to conduct telephone interviews on any source it deems relevant to the evaluation. Owners/references may be asked to comment on items such as quality of construction, timeliness, management of the work, subcontractor management, including timely payment to subs 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 construction errors, warranty work, etc.
  
- b. The Government's evaluation is not limited to past performance information on the cited example projects.
  
- c. In determining the performance confidence rating for Past Performance, the degree of relevancy/recency of each of the considered efforts; the overall performance record of the offeror on each contract assessed; the number and severity of problems and the demonstrated effectiveness of corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised); recognition documents; and trend data will be considered. Projects with higher degrees of relevance will typically have a greater influence on the final performance confidence rating. Projects with lower degrees of

relevance will typically have less influence on the final performance confidence rating however, any projects with adverse past performance could reflect larger company- wide concerns and may impact upon the past performance confidence rating. Projects which are comparatively more recent may be better predictors of likely future success than older projects. The resulting relevant/recent assessment conclusions will then be combined, along with the assessed quality of performance on prior projects, to arrive at a single performance confidence rating for the Past Performance Factor.

d. The confidence rating will be established based on the past performance of the firms or that of its predecessor, if applicable. An entity may not establish past performance based on the past performance of its key personnel apart from that of the entity. If the Government does not obtain past performance information and cannot establish a past performance record for the Offeror through other sources, a rating of "Neutral Confidence" will be assigned.

e. If adverse past performance information is received and the Government initiates discussions, the offeror will be given the chance to respond to this information. CPARS included in the official record will be treated as if the offeror has already had an opportunity to address any adverse past performance identified during the evaluation process.

f. Although the SSEB may not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the SSA 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 stated solicitation criteria.

### **C. Evaluation and Rating System**

1. A single, overall confidence rating shall be assigned to Past Performance.
2. The relevancy determination will assess the Offeror's past performance on a project-by-project basis to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort to be acquired under this solicitation.
3. The confidence rating assesses the risks associated with each Offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the RFP based on the Offeror's demonstrated performance on recent projects. SSEB members and the SSA may use personal knowledge or

information from other sources in its evaluation of an Offeror's past performance, provided such information is consistent with the established evaluation criteria of the RFP. Offerors that have no relevant performance record will be given a neutral confidence rating.

## **TAB B - FACTOR 2 - TECHNICAL APPROACH**

### **A. Submission Requirements for Factor 2:**

Offerors shall provide a comprehensive, well-organized description of their team's approach to successfully executing the requirements outlined in the RFP. The narrative should demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of work, illustrate the offeror's capability to meet or exceed performance expectations, and describe how the work will be delivered on time and within budget.

FACTOR 2 shall be limited to 30 pages. Tables, illustrations, and drawings are excluded from this limitation.

The Technical Approach shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

#### **1. Disruption Mitigation**

This project, located at Ebbing ANGB in Fort Smith, AR, presents unique challenges which include it is a semi remote location from large population areas, hence, limited workforce resources, and logistical constraints (e.g. lack of specialized subcontractors, third party inspectors, testing, labor, materials and equipment delivery, etc.). These challenges can impact project timelines, costs, safety, and requires careful planning and innovative solutions.

- Explain your strategy for minimizing schedule delays and cost growth, and for maintaining project safety based on the above stated challenges as well as disruption to any ongoing operations and adjacent activities during the construction effort.

- Include any innovative methods, staging techniques, or sequencing approaches intended to reduce impacts.

## 2. **Project Execution Plan**

Provide a comprehensive work plan describing how the project will be managed and executed from start to finish. At a minimum, address the following areas:

- Site mobilization and demobilization
- Subcontractor management
- Safety management and compliance
- Environmental compliance and sustainability measures
- Physical and information security requirements

## 3. **Methodology and Innovation**

- Describe the specific techniques, tools, frameworks, or best practices your team will use to accomplish the work.
- Highlight any innovative solutions or value-added approaches that will improve efficiency, safety, quality, or cost-effectiveness.

## 4. **Key Personnel**

- Identify all key personnel assigned to the project.
  
- Include their roles, responsibilities, qualifications, and relevant experience managing similar efforts.
  
- Explain the structure of the project team and reporting relationships.

## 5. **Risk Management**

- Provide a risk mitigation plan that identifies potential construction-related risks and outlines proactive strategies to address them.
  
- Include both internal and external risk factors (e.g., weather delays, supply chain issues, subcontractor performance).

## 6. **Quality Control**

- Describe how you will comply with Section 01 45 00.
  
- Provide your internal quality control measures that exceed the requirements of the solicitation that will be implemented to ensure that all deliverables meet contractual, regulatory, and technical requirements.
  
- Discuss inspection protocols, testing methods, and corrective action processes.

## 7. **Utility Coordination**

- Identify any known privatized utility providers at the project location (e.g., water, electric, gas, telecommunications).
- Provide a detailed utility coordination plan that outlines early engagement efforts, tie-in procedures, and service activations.

## 8. **Communication Plan**

- Describe how your team will communicate with the Government throughout the project lifecycle.
- Include the frequency and format of progress updates, stakeholder coordination, points of contact, and issue escalation protocols.

### **B. Evaluation Criteria for Factor 2:**

The Government will evaluate the offeror's Technical Approach to determine the degree to which it reflects a comprehensive understanding of the requirements and the feasibility of the proposed plan to successfully execute the work. This evaluation will consider the clarity, completeness, and logic of the overall approach, as well as the offeror's ability to deliver quality results within the required timeframe and with minimal disruption to ongoing operations.

The evaluation will assess how well the offeror demonstrates an understanding of the scope of work and project objectives. This includes the offeror's ability to articulate the tasks, constraints, and operational environment in a manner that reflects a strong grasp of the technical and logistical challenges inherent in the project. Particular emphasis will be placed on the realism and feasibility of the proposed schedule. The Government will evaluate whether the submitted narrative and graphic (e.g., Gantt chart) schedules clearly identify all major features of work, milestones, and activity sequencing. The schedule will be assessed for logic, completeness, and consistency with the assumed Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of 2 June 2026.

The offeror's strategy for mitigating challenges such as schedule delays, cost growth, and project safety as well as minimizing disruption to ongoing operations will also be evaluated. The Government will consider the practicality and effectiveness of proposed sequencing, staging,

and work-around measures intended to reduce impacts on the installation or adjacent activities. Proposals that demonstrate innovative but realistic approaches to disruption mitigation may be evaluated more favorably.

The work plan will be reviewed for its level of detail and the adequacy of its approach to managing and executing the construction effort. This includes evaluation of the offeror's plans for site mobilization, subcontractor management, quality control, safety management, environmental compliance, and adherence to security requirements. The Government will assess how clearly the offeror presents these elements and the degree to which they contribute to overall project success.

Additionally, the methodology and techniques proposed to execute the work will be evaluated for appropriateness and effectiveness. This includes the use of industry best practices, management frameworks, construction methods, and any value-added or innovative approaches that enhance project performance, efficiency, or cost-effectiveness.

The qualifications and experience of proposed key personnel will be assessed to determine their ability to successfully manage and execute the project. The evaluation will consider the clarity of team structure, the relevance of personnel experience to the scope of work, and the definition of roles and responsibilities.

The Government will review the offeror's risk mitigation plan to assess how well potential risks are identified, analyzed, and addressed. Evaluation will consider the realism of the proposed mitigation strategies and the offeror's ability to proactively manage risk throughout the project lifecycle.

The quality control approach will be evaluated based on the offeror's proposed procedures for ensuring compliance with contract requirements, including the use of inspections, testing protocols, and corrective action measures to ensure deliverable accuracy and completeness.

The plan for utility coordination will be reviewed to assess the offeror's preparedness to engage with privatized utility providers. The Government will evaluate the completeness of the coordination strategy, including activities related to disconnection, relocation, tie-ins, and service activation.

Finally, the Government will assess the offeror's communication approach, including how the team will maintain effective interaction with Government stakeholders throughout the project. This includes evaluation of reporting mechanisms, issue escalation procedures, and coordination practices.

## **TAB C - FACTOR 3 - SUMMARY SCHEDULE**

### **A. Submission Requirements for Factor 3:**

a) Proposed Contract Duration: The Offeror shall propose the overall contract duration in the appropriate Contract Line-Item Number in the CLIN Schedule, not to exceed the maximum contract duration.

b) Summary Schedule: Submit a summary level schedule for construction. This summary schedule will, after contract award, be replaced with a project schedule. The summary schedule shall be task oriented, indicating the number of calendar days, after notice to proceed, by which milestones are to be achieved. Offeror may use a critical path or other method of his choice; however, schedules shall be graphically represented and shall include, as a minimum, Activity ID, Activity Description, Original Duration, early start and early finish dates, and total float for each activity. The proposed schedule shall include an activity that shows the proposed overall contract duration in calendar days. Give attention to the following features:

i) Show activities for the building, site work and each feature of work in sufficient detail to demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work and to substantiate the reasonableness and realism of the proposed duration.

ii) Show submittal preparation and review/approval activities for long lead items to demonstrate an understanding of the submittal process and minimum review times for Government approved submittals. (See Section 01 33 00 Submittal Procedures).

iii) Show all critical activities (inspection, testing, certification.) in achieving the required quality and final accreditation to achieve ICD 705 standards.

iv) Show turnover of the building. The time to complete the building and turnover to the Government must consider the requirement for the Contractor's CQC completion inspection and the subsequent joint Contractor-Government turnover inspection.

v) Show closeout activities, to include the Red Zone meeting, record drawings, O&M manuals, to demonstrate your understanding of the closeout requirements for the contract. (See section 01 78 00 Closeout Submittals).

vi) Indicate the anticipated overall critical path on the schedule.

vii) Show activities and/or milestones for coordination with other entities during construction, to demonstrate your understanding of the coordination requirements for the contract.

viii) Constraints: Offeror must demonstrate the capability and flexibility to plan and schedule the complete project to meet the proposed contract completion period. Clearly identify any constraints on the schedules presented (e.g., labor or material availability, permits, weather, etc.).

ix) Show activities and/or milestones for the construction of privatized utilities in sufficient detail to demonstrate your understanding of the scope of work and coordination requirements with the Contracting Officer Representative (COR).

c) Schedule Narrative: Provide a maximum 2-page narrative that describes the approach to schedule management to ensure the project is delivered, successfully accredited, on time. Discuss how the proposed schedule accounts for labor and material challenges. Describe your plan to manage material and labor challenges to reduce schedule risk and complete construction within the proposed duration.

## **B. Evaluation Criteria for Factor 3:**

**a) Proposed Contract Duration:** The proposed duration will become the contractually binding schedule. The Government will evaluate the contract duration, as proposed by the Offeror herein, not to exceed the maximum allowed duration. This duration shall also include all bid options. In assessing the reasonableness of the proposed contract duration, the Government

may take into account how well the proposed summary schedule supports the proposed duration, as well as use other information, such as but not limited to independent judgment concerning logic, constraints and typical construction durations. A proposed contract order duration shorter than the duration will receive additional rating consideration, provided the schedule is realistic and deemed to be achievable. The Government will consider an unreasonably condensed contract duration, which places additional cost or schedule risk on the Government, or which may create a risk of contract or performance failure, as a significant weakness or a deficiency, depending upon the evaluators' judgment.

**b) Summary Schedule:** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's capability to schedule the complete project within the proposed contract duration and the realism of the schedule. A schedule that offers advantage(s) to the Government over one that merely indicates an adequate understanding of the scope, restrictions, major milestones, and general understanding of the contract requirements will receive additional consideration.

**c) Schedule Narrative:** The Government will evaluate the schedule narrative to assess the strength of understanding of the project scope, objectives, coordination and restrictions which must be considered in the schedule, long lead items, closeout process. This includes the offeror's ability to articulate the tasks, constraints, and operational environment in a manner that reflects a strong grasp of the technical and logistical challenges inherent in the project. Particular emphasis will be placed on the realism and feasibility of the proposed schedule. The Government will evaluate whether the submitted narrative and graphic (e.g., Gantt chart) schedules clearly identify all major features of work, milestones, and activity sequencing. The schedule will be assessed for logic, completeness, and consistency with the assumed Notice to Proceed (NTP) date. A narrative that indicates, major milestones, and critical actions for successful final accreditation, will receive additional consideration.

**VOLUME II: PRICE PROPOSAL**

TAB	CONTENTS OF THE PRICE PROPOSAL
A	Signed Standard Form 1442 & Acknowledgement of Amendments
B	<b>Price (FACTOR 5)</b>

C	Representations and Certifications
D	Joint Venture and LLC (If Applicable)
E	Bid Guarantee (Bid Bond)
F	Responsibility Determination Data Form

**General Instructions:**

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.402 and 15.403-1, certified cost or pricing data are not required based on the fact that adequate competition is expected for this procurement. In the event that adequate competition is not obtained, the Contracting Officer may incorporate FAR 52.215-20 entitled, "Requirements for Cost or Pricing Data or Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data," into the solicitation and request a Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data. **There are no page limitations for this volume.** Proposal information included in this volume which is not directly related to Price will be disregarded.

**TAB A** - Standard Form 1442 and acknowledgement of all amendments (Block 19), completed and signed by authorized individual of the offeror. Offers submitted in the name of a Joint Venture must be signed in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the joint venture agreement as evidenced in the proposal.

**TAB B - FACTOR 5 - PRICE.** Proposed price schedule is to be completed in its entirety by all offerors to include the Subtotals and Totals section as found in Section 00 10 00 - Solicitation, Contract Line-Item Number (CLIN) Schedule.

**TAB C - Representations and Certifications.** Confirm that the Offeror's representations and certifications have been completed in the System for Award Management (SAM) in accordance with FAR 52.204-8. Submit the representations and certifications not entered in SAM that are included in Section 00 45 00 and elsewhere in the solicitation, under this tab.

**TAB D - Joint Venture and LLC, if applicable.** See Section 00 21 16 paragraph 5.a(4).

**TAB E - Bonds format.** Offerors shall submit bid bonds (Standard Form 24) in electronic format. Copies of the form can be found at <https://www.gsa.gov/reference/forms/bidbond>. Hard copies of bid bonds with the raised seal are no longer required and are not to be sent to the contracting office. Verification of Bid Bonds with sureties will be completed during the evaluation process and before award. Bid bond submissions shall be due by the proposal due date and time. Offerors are responsible for the accurate submission of the Bid Bonds with all signatures and seals applied.

**For the purposes of this Request for Proposal, please note that IAW FAR 28.001:**

"Bond means a written instrument executed by a bidder or contractor (the "principal"), and a second party (the "surety" or "sureties") (except as provided in FAR 28.204), to assure fulfillment of the principal's obligations to a third party (the "obligee" or "Government"), identified in the bond. If the principal's obligations are not met, the bond assures payment, to the extent stipulated, of any loss sustained by the obligee."

Bonds shall therefore be executed in the name of the legal entity, whether a joint venture, partnership, or the Prime Contractor of an informal teaming arrangement, with whom the Government would enter into a contract for a successful offeror. The entity named on the bond must be able to acquire bonding capacity on its own merits, and not as the result of indemnification from a subcontractor or third party.

**TAB F - Responsibility Determination Data Form (Attachment 3)**

Compliance. Failure to comply with the RFP requirements for Price information may reduce or eliminate the offeror's chance of being selected for award. Offerors shall ensure that the information presented in this volume is consistent and correlates with the information contained in the other proposal volumes.

## Price Evaluation:

Adjectival ratings shall not be used for offerors' Price proposals. The Government will fully evaluate and negotiate, if applicable, all priced Contract Line-Item Numbers (CLINs) for award. For award purposes, the total proposed price for all CLINs will be added together into a total sum (contract value). The Offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated as follows:

1. Firm Fixed Price Evaluation: For a price to be fair and reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. The Offeror's proposed fixed-price CLINs may be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques described in FAR 15.404-1 in order to determine if they are fair and reasonable.
  
2. Overall, Price Proposal Evaluation: The overall Price proposal will be evaluated for the following:
  - a. Compliance: The Price proposal submitted by the Offeror will be evaluated for compliance based upon the submission requirements contained in this Section.
  
  - b. Unbalanced Pricing: The Offeror's overall Price proposal will be evaluated for unbalanced pricing as defined in FAR 15.404-1(g). An offer may be rejected if the contracting officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (see FAR 15.404-1(g)(1) through FAR15.404-1(g)(3)).
  
  - c. Errors: The Offeror's Price proposal will be reviewed for errors. The Offeror may be given an opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposal at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer.
  
  - d. Business Systems: The Government may verify the adequacy of the Offeror's business systems, if applicable.
  
  - e. Total Evaluated Price: The total evaluated price consists of summing the Offeror's proposed fixed-price CLIN prices together with all options, if applicable.

**Discussions:** The Government intends to award without discussions. A "Competitive Range" is a subjective determination of the most highly rated proposals in the event that discussions with Offerors are required. In such an event, the SSA will approve a competitive range of all the most highly rated proposals. If discussions are held, the Government may engage in a broad give and take with each Offeror in the competitive range, in accordance with FAR 15.306(d). The Government will provide the Offeror an advance agenda for the discussions. During discussions, the Government may ask the Offeror to further explain its proposal and to answer questions about it. Upon conclusion of discussions, those Offerors still considered the most highly rated, will be afforded an opportunity to submit their final proposal revisions for final evaluation and selection.

**VOLUME III: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION AND SUBCONTRACTING PLANS**

<b>TAB</b>	<b>CONTENTS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION AND SUBCONTRACTING PLANS</b>
A	<b>Small Business Participation (Factor 4)</b>
B	Subcontracting Plan (other than small business only)

**TAB A - FACTOR 4 - SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

All offerors, regardless of size status, are required to submit a Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD). In accordance with DFARS 215.304(c)(i), Army FAR Supplement (AFARS), the Government will evaluate Small Business Participation in source selections for unrestricted acquisitions that require use of FAR 52.219- 9, Small Business Subcontracting. Offerors shall articulate within their SBPCD how they intend to meet the small business objectives.

**A. Submission Requirements for Factor 4:**

All Offerors shall submit a Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD) (Attachment 4) which specifies the offeror's level and degree of commitment to small business utilization/participation in performance of this requirement, per Army source selection procedures. This factor does not have a page limitation. Nothing precludes an offeror from further demonstrating their extent of commitment to use small businesses beyond what has been required by this solicitation.

The Government will evaluate the level of proposed participation of small businesses in the performance of this contract to determine which offeror proposes the best value in terms of the contract relative to the objectives, percentages and criteria established herein. Failure to submit a SBPCD will be evaluated as a deficiency.

All offerors shall articulate the extent to which Small Businesses (SBs), Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDBs), Women-Owned Small Businesses (WOSBs), HUBZone Small Businesses (HZs), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSBs), and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSBs) 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 and the extent to which the proposal meets or exceeds small business participation percentages detailed below.

Large businesses 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.

The target small business participation percentages are:

SBs: 30.66% based on total contract value

SDBs: 5 % based on total contract value

WOSBs: 5 % based on the total contract value

HZs: 3 % based on the total contract value

VOSBs: 4 % based on the total contract value

SDVOSBs: 5 % based on the total contract value

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 to be performed by each firm

The Offeror shall provide a narrative describing their past performance complying with the requirements of the clause FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns and 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. 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) SBA 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.

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 remains 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 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 Subcontracting Plan (in accordance with FAR 52.219-9) as the two are distinctly different. Doing so will result in a weakness.

**B. Evaluation Criteria for Factor 4:**

The Government will evaluate the extent of participation of Small Business firms in terms of percentages and amounts of the value of the total acquisition and the extent to which the

proposal meets or exceeds small business participation percentages as detailed in the submission requirements above. Offerors providing less than the percentages outlined above, without adequate justification of all the resources conducted to arrive at proposed percentages, may be evaluated less favorably and/or as a weakness.

The Government will verify the total proposed contract amount to ensure dollar amounts are consistent with what is being proposed in the SBPCD. If an offeror's value of their total acquisition is inconsistent with the values in the SBPCD, it may be evaluated less favorably.

Offerors that name specific Small Business firms that it intends to use in order to meet the stated participation percentages may be rated more favorably.

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 may be evaluated more favorably than non-enforceable commitments.

Enforceable commitments must include the following:

- (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 Government will evaluate the meaningful elements of the type and complexity of work to be performed by small business. Offerors failing to adequately identify the supplies/services to be performed or identifying less complex or a smaller variety of work may be evaluated less favorably.

The Government will evaluate the 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. 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) SBA compliance reviews, and (8) DCMA Small Business Subcontracting Program reviews. Offerors with positive past performance information with respect to these requirements may be rated more favorably, while negative information may be rated unfavorably.

Offerors with no prior contracts containing FAR clause 52.219-8 will not be rated favorably or unfavorably.

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.

For purposes of this requirement, total contract value is defined as the cumulative value of the base plus all options, if applicable. Small business prime offerors may achieve small business participation through their own performance/participation as a prime, and through subcontracting to other small businesses. All offerors are required to submit Small Business Participation Commitment Document in accordance with the instructions in this section.

**TAB B** - Small Business Subcontracting Plan Alternate II, will be included in the solicitation. If the offeror is a large business, the offeror shall submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan meeting the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, DFARS 252.219-7003, DFARS 252.219-7004 (if the offeror has a comprehensive subcontracting plan).

The socio-economic dollars must be equal to or greater than the commitments proposed in the Small Business Participation Commitment Document.

Small businesses specifically identified in the small business participation commitment document must be listed in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan submitted pursuant to DFARS 215.304(c)(i)(C).

Failure to submit an acceptable Small Business Subcontracting Plan will result in the offeror's ineligibility for award. Per FAR clause 52.219-9 and DFARS 252.219-7003, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan must be determined as "acceptable" by the Contracting Officer for consideration of an award under this solicitation.

The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated as "acceptable" or "unacceptable".

Offerors are reminded:

It is the Government's expectation that the small business participation commitment document 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 contractors requiring a Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall include the district small business professional within eSRS to receive the required Individual Subcontracting Reports. 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 Small Business participation proposal and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Notifications shall be in writing and shall occur within a reasonable period of time after award of the subcontract to facilitate compliance with DFARS 252.219-7003(e) during execution and administration of the contract.

<b>ATTACHMENT 1</b>	
<b>CONSTRUCTION PAST PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET</b>	
<i>(Limit each worksheet to no more than 3 pages)</i>	
<b>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT # _____</b>	
Offeror:	
Project and Location and Contract Number:	
Was this project performed by the division or unit of the company submitting the offer for this solicitation?	
Owner:	

Owner's Point of Contact for Reference:	Telephone:		
Awarded Construction Cost:	Final Construction Cost:		
Explain Cost Growth, if any:			
Date of Award:	Original Completion Date:	Revised Completion Date:	Percent Complete:
Explain Time Growth, if any:			
General Scope of Construction and Offeror's Role:			
Work Your Company Self-Performed:		Extent and Type of Work You Subcontracted Out:	
Identify and describe the relevancies for this project compared to the scope of the solicitation. The Government will evaluate the information provided in making the relevancy determination.			

Did any members of the proposed team (firms, not individuals) have a role in this project? Identify the team members (by firm), their role in this project, and their proposed role in this solicitation.

--	--	--	--	--	--

**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:

UEI Number:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

Point of Contact:

Contact Phone Number:



**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Continued**

**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 OFFEROR. 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.**

**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Continued**

***ADJECTIVE RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS TO BE USED TO BEST REFLECT YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE***

**RATING  
NOTE**

**DEFINITION**

<b>RATING NOTE</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>

<p><b>(E) Exceptional</b></p>	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government /Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.</p>	<p>An Exceptional rating is appropriate</p> <p>When the Contractor successfully performed multiple significant events that were of benefit to the Government/Owner. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
<p><b>(VG) Very Good</b></p>	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's/Owner's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub- element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.</p>	<p>A Very Good rating is appropriate when the Contractor successfully performed a significant event that was a benefit to the Government /Owner. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.</p>
<p><b>(S) Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>Performance meets minimum contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.</p>	<p>A Satisfactory rating is appropriate when there were only minor problems, or major problems that the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. Per DOD policy, a fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.</p>
<p><b>(M) Marginal</b></p>	<p>Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.</p>	<p>A Marginal is appropriate when a significant event occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming which impacted the Government /Owner.</p>

<p><b>(U) Unsatisfactory</b></p>	<p>Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.</p>	<p>An Unsatisfactory rating is appropriate when multiple significant events occurred that the contractor had trouble overcoming and which impacted the Government/Owner. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating.</p>
<p><b>(N) Not Applicable</b></p>	<p>No information or did not apply to your contract</p>	<p>Rating will be neither positive nor negative.</p>

<p><b>Please circle the adjective rating which best reflects your evaluation of the contractor's performance.</b></p>						
<p><b>1. QUALITY:</b></p>						
<p>a) Quality of technical data/report preparation efforts</p>	E	VG	S	M	U	N
<p>b) Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance</p>	E	VG	S	M	U	N
<p>c) Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance</p>	E	VG	S	M	U	N
<p>d) Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements (without adverse effect on performance)</p>	E	VG	S	M	U	N

<b>2. SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE:</b>						
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
<b>3. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:</b>						
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
<b>4. MANAGEMENT/ PERSONNEL/LABOR</b>						
a) Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors, suppliers, materials, and/or labor force?	E	V G	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	V G	S	M	U	N
e) Utilization of Small Business concerns	E	V G	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
<b>5. COST/FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT</b>						
a) Ability to meet the terms and conditions within the contractually agreed price(s)?	E	VG	S	M	U	N

<p>b) Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client</p>	E	VG	S	M	U	N
<p>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)</p>	E	VG	S	M	U	N
<p>d) Is the Contractor's accounting system adequate for management and tracking of costs? <i>If no, please explain in Remarks section.</i></p>		Ye s			No	
<p>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 terminations? <i>Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.</i></p>		Ye s			No	
<p>f) Have there been any indications that the contractor has had any financial problems? <i>If yes, please explain below.</i></p>		Ye s			No	
<p><b>6. SAFETY/SECURITY</b></p>						
<p>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.)</p>	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
<b>7. GENERAL</b>						
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 (explain if specific issues)	E	VG	S	M	U	N
c) 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*):**

## **Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD) (Format)**

The SBPCD format is designed to streamline and bring uniformity to responses and evaluations for small business participation when required under FAR 15.304. The format is distinctly different than the small business subcontracting plan required for other than small businesses (FAR 52.219-9). Proposals addressing the extent of small business participation (SBPCDs) shall be submitted separately from small business subcontracting plans (DFARS 215.305(c)(i)(B)). A copy of the SBPCD is recommended to be provided in your instructions to offerors or as an attachment to the RFP.

**Other than small businesses** are required to complete a SBPCD which will be incorporated into the resulting award by reference or attachment as an enforceable contractual requirement. Offerors should propose the level of participation of small businesses (as a small business prime, joint venture, teaming arrangement, and/or small

business subcontractors) in the performance of the acquisition relative to the

objectives/goals set forth in the evaluation of this area.

**NOTE:** Proposals including WOSB, HUBZone, VOSB, and SDVOSB percentages must ensure those socio-economic category submissions are SBA Certified.

(a) Check the applicable size and categories for the **PRIME** Offeror only - Check all applicable boxes:

Other-than Small Business (OTSB) Prime

**OR**

Small Business (SB) Prime; also categorized as a

Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)

Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB)

Historically Underutilized Zone (HUBZone) Small Business

Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB)

Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)

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

**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%; and 75% for OTSBs, equaling 100%.

Total Percentage planned for OTSBs	75% = \$ 750,000
Total Percentage planned for SBs	25% = \$ 250,000
	100% = \$1,000,000

(c) Please indicate the total percentage and dollar value of participation to be performed by each type of subcategory small business. The percentage of work performed by Small Businesses that qualify in multiple small business categories may be counted in each category:

**Example:** Victory Prop Mgt (WOSB and SDVOSB) performing 2%; and Williams Group (SDB, HUBZone and WOSB) performing 3%. Results equate to: SB 5%; SDB 3%; HUBZone 3%; WOSB 5%; SDVOSB 2%; VOSB 2%;). SDVOSBs are also VOSBs automatically; however, VOSBs are not automatically SDVOSBs.

Socio-Economic Status	Percentage	Dollars
SDB	%	\$
WOSB	%	\$

<b>HUBZone</b>	%	\$
<b>VOSB</b>	%	\$
<b>SDVOSB</b>	%	\$

(d) Identify the Prime Offeror and type of service/supply that the Prime Offeror will provide. Then list each of the intended subcontractors and principal supplies/services to be provided by that subcontractor. Provide the Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) or Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code (if available) for the Prime and each intended subcontractor. Also, provide the anticipated NAICS code(s) that the Prime Offeror believes best describes the product or services being acquired by its subcontracts with each intended subcontractor. Small business Primes and small business subcontractors that qualify as small businesses in multiple small business categories should be listed in each applicable small business category.

**Example:** If a Small Business qualifies as a WOSB and a SDVOSB, you can add them to each category below in which they qualify. Sample Chart below.

<b>*Size/Socio-Economic Status</b>	<b>Name of Company Include UEI or CAGE</b>	<b>Anticipated NAICS Code</b>	<b>Type of Service/Supply</b>
<b>Prime Offeror</b>			
<b>OTSB</b>			

<b>SB</b>			
<b>SDB</b>			
<b>WOSB</b>			
<b>HUBZone</b>			

<b>VOSB</b>			
<b>SDVOSB</b>			

NOTE: Pursuant to Sections 8(d) of the Small Business Act, a business is considered small for Government procurements if it does not exceed the size standard for the NAICS code that the prime contractor believes best describes the product or services being acquired. In other words, the size of the prime's suppliers is determined by the applicable NAICS code of their joint venture, teaming partner, or subcontract, which may or may not be the same NAICS code as the one for your prime contract with the Government.

(e) Describe the extent of commitment to use small businesses (e.g., what types of commitments, if any, are in place for this specific acquisition either - small business prime, written contract, verbal, enforceable, non-enforceable, joint venturing, mentor-protége, etc.). Provide documentation regarding

commitments to small business for this effort. Copies of such agreements should be provided as part of your SBPCD and will not count against the page limitation for this volume.

## SECTION III

### DISCUSSIONS

GENERAL INFORMATION. In accordance with FAR 15.306(d), discussion sessions with each offeror may be held. Should discussions take place, all offerors in the competitive range will be allowed a minimum of three calendar days to submit Final Proposal Revisions.

1. 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. Prior to the establishment of the competitive range, the PCO may enter into limited "communications" with offerors only as described in FAR 15.306(b). Communications shall be documented on and conducted via transmittal of Evaluation Notices (ENs) to the applicable offeror. Each EN shall clearly indicate that the type of exchange being conducted is "Communications."
3. If discussions are to be conducted, the PCO shall, in consultation with the SSEB and with the approval of the SSA, establish the competitive range based on the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria, as identified in the RFP, unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency (see FAR 15.306[c]). The criteria used for establishing the competitive range and a written analysis explaining what will be discussed with each offeror shall be documented in a competitive range decision document (see paragraph 3.4). If, during discussions, the PCO decides an offeror's proposal should no longer be included in the competitive range, the PCO shall obtain SSA approval to eliminate the proposal from consideration for award and update the competitive range decision document. Written notice of this decision shall be provided to unsuccessful offerors in accordance with FAR 15.503
4. Discussions are tailored to each offeror's proposal and must be conducted by the PCO with every offeror within the competitive range. The scope and extent of discussions are a matter of PCO judgment. While the Government is not required to expound on every item that must be addressed by the offeror to improve its submission, the PCO must conduct and document meaningful discussions. At a minimum, during discussions, the SSEB through the

PCO shall indicate to, or discuss with, each offeror in the competitive range the following: (a) any adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not yet had an opportunity to respond and (b) any deficiencies or significant weaknesses that have been identified during the evaluation. Discussions shall be documented on, and conducted via transmittal of, ENs to the applicable offeror. Each EN shall clearly indicate that the type of exchange being conducted is "Discussions." ENs are prepared by the SSEB and reviewed minimally by the PCO and Legal Counsel. Any EN addressing a proposal deficiency or significant weakness shall clearly indicate that a deficiency or significant weakness exists. The PCO is encouraged to discuss other aspects of the offeror's proposal that could, in the opinion of the PCO, be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award, such as weaknesses, excesses, and price. However, the PCO is not required to discuss every area where the proposal could be improved as outlined at FAR 15.306(d) and (e). The PCO is responsible for documenting the disposition and evaluation of each EN.

5. Although not mandatory, it is a best practice to discuss proposal weaknesses with prospective offerors. It is also a best practice for the PCO to require offerors to submit written proposal changes resulting from discussions before requesting Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) to ensure the offeror understands the EN, the SST understands the offeror's response, and the FPR is a request for pricing updates only.

6. An additional best practice following release of Discussions ENs is to set aside a time to review the ENs with the offeror by teleconference (a day or two after the offerors receive their ENs) to make sure the offeror understands what the Government is attempting to convey in the ENs. This helps ensure offerors answer the questions the SST intended to ask and reduces the need for follow-on ENs.

7. Discussions are concluded once the SSEB has documented the disposition of all ENs that were issued during the course of discussions/negotiations. Discussions shall only be concluded once the SSEB and PCO have an understanding of the offeror's proposal, and no further discussions are necessary.