

515-23-600

Create Market Capitol Assets Master Plan – Michigan

Primary Evaluation Factors:

1.0 EVALUATION FACTORS

2.1 The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

- 1) Experience and Technical Competence (40% weighting)
- 2) Professional Qualifications (30% weighting)
- 3) Capacity (10% weighting)
- 4) Past Performance (20% weighting)

1) **Experience and Technical Competence** to deliver a comprehensive Master Plan to include, infrastructure, market analysis, planning guidelines, strategic planning goals, service lines, departmental planning, emerging trends and growth opportunities. Work shall include data collection, site investigation, existing facility assessment, and cost estimating. Include Government and private sector experience on projects similar in size, scope and complexity. The evaluation will consider the management approach, coordination of disciplines and subcontractors, quality control procedures, prior experience of the prime firm and any key subcontractors working together on relevant projects and familiarity with VA Design Guides/ Manuals, and other applicable standards.

Offeror shall provide a Summary Page of its recent and relevant specialized experience and technical competence which is similar in size, scope and magnitude to this requirement. "Relevant" is defined as those task requirements identified in the RFP's Scope of Work. "Recent" is defined as services provided within the past ten (10) years.

Offeror shall provide a minimum of 3 projects but no more than six (6). Each project shall include the following:

- Project title, location and detailed narrative describing the scope of services provided including the type of work performed by the offeror and its role in the project i.e., Prime Contractor, Teaming Partner or Subcontractor
- Project Owner, owner's point of contact including telephone number and email addresses
- Services & Deliverables provided under the contract/ task order
- Period of Performance, including start and completion dates

2) **Professional Qualifications** necessary for satisfactory performance of required service. The Architects and Engineers on the firm's staff representing the project for each discipline must possess a minimum of five (5) years of experience and are required to be licensed, registered or certified by a US state, the District of Columbia or a US territory. Provide professional license jurisdiction of issue and license numbers and/ or proof of licensure.

At a minimum, the offeror shall describe the professional qualifications of project team and have not less than five (5) years of experience in the required disciplines. Disciplines required for this project include, but are not limited to: Architectural, Structural, Civil, Landscape, Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing, Fire Protection, Life-Safety, Industrial Hygienist, Technology, Cost Estimating, Project Management. The evaluation will consider education, certifications, training, registration, overall and relevant experience, longevity with the firm and history of working with other members of the team.

- 3) **Capacity (10% Weighting)** to accomplish work in the required time. The evaluation will consider the firms number of current contracts, the firms plan and ability to meet the schedule of the overall project, as well as the available capacity of personnel in key disciplines in order to determine their capacity to complete the project work. Describe the firm’s ability to accomplish the work in the required time, including existing workload from all private and public clients and awards of similar type to this project that may limit the AE’s capacity to perform the project work expeditiously.

- 4) **Past Performance (20% Weighting)** on contracts with Government agencies and private industry in terms of, quality of work, and compliance with performance schedules. CPARS data or PPQs (if no CPARS data is available) must be provided for projects submitted under Factor 1 (Specialized Experience). Government Past Performance Information Systems may be accessed. Evaluating past performance and experience may include information provided by the firm, recommendation letters, customer inquiries, Government databases, and publicly available sources. Failure to provide requested data, accessible points of contact or valid phone numbers could result in a firm being considered less qualified.

The following information is required for all projects: contract/ task order number, project title, prime firm, start date, and completion date. Evaluations may also include additional performance related from the firm, customer inquiries, Government databases, publicly available sources, and additional projects in CPARS.

The Government reserves the right to also evaluate past performance on previously awarded federal task orders and any other information available.

Note: We recommend you contact every reference listed and let them know we may contact them for information. Their timely replies would be appreciated.

2.0 SCORE KEY

3.1 Assessment Rating Definitions

Table 1: Assessment Rating Definitions

Pts	Assessment	Definition
1	Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough presentation of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths.

		Offeror's response is clearly superior. The response is innovative and exceeds requirements. No deficiency or significant weaknesses exists.
2	Very Good	Exceeds all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an above average probability of success; contains no significant weaknesses and only minor, correctable weaknesses exist.
3	Acceptable	Meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an average probability of success with no significant weaknesses and any deficiencies can be readily corrected.
4	Marginal	Fails to meet one or more of the minimum requirements of the criteria; low probability of success; major weaknesses and/ or significant number of deficiencies exist.
5	Poor	Fails to meet any of the minimum requirements of the criteria; very low probability of success.

3.2 Adjectival Descriptions Definitions

- **Strength:** An area in the SF 330 which there is a high level of confidence or meeting the requirements and to some extent clearly exceeds what is necessary to meet the requirement.
- **Weakness:** Is a flaw in the SF 330 that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- **Deficiency:** Is a failure of a SF 330 to meet a government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a SF330 that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to a marginal or poor level.

3.0 CONSENSUS EVALUATION

4.1 The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will provide a Consensus Evaluation to the Contracting Officer that that will state the reasons why the best rated proposal was found to be superior to the others. The Consensus Evaluation paragraph should be two or three sentences, using information provided above that should clearly explain the selection. The Contracting Officer will receive only one Consensus Evaluation from the SSEB Team and the raw worksheets from SSEB members. The SSEB Chair has the responsibility for combining all of the comments into a coherent explanation of the SSEB's selection.

The Consensus Evaluation will include the following:

- a) Evaluation factors that were significant to the decision
- b) Limitations of non-selected firms that were significant