

EVALUATION CRITERIA
For Architect-Engineering Services
191BWC23R0002

1. QUALIFICATIONS/EVALUATION CRITERIA

Per FAR 26.602-1, the following selection criteria is used for this RFP and all Task Orders issued from the resulting Contracts.

- 1.A. Professional qualifications necessary for satisfactory performance of required services
- 1.B. Specialized experience and technical competence in the type of work required
- 1.C. Capacity to accomplish the work in the required time
- 1.D. Past performance on Contracts with Government agencies and private industry in terms of cost control, quality of work, and compliance with performance schedules
- 1.E. Location in the general geographical area of the project and knowledge of the locality of the project
- 1.F. Acceptability under other appropriate evaluation criteria (as defined per each Task Order)

2. IDIQ CONTRACT EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.A. Merit Factor 1

Specialized Experience (1.B.): Specialized experience and technical competence for satisfactory performance of Architect-Engineering Services. If no experience is provided on a particular item, it will be considered as the Offeror having no experience. Demonstrate experience in each of the following:

2.A.1. Studies, Analysis, and Design of Hydraulic Structures

- (a) Dams
- (b) Levees
- (c) Floodwalls
- (d) River Channel
- (e) Canals
- (f) Culverts

2.A.2. Analysis of Hydraulic and Hydrologic Systems

- (a) Surface Water and Groundwater Studies
- (b) Dam Break
- (c) Reservoir Capacity
- (d) Flood Routing
- (e) Sediment Transport Studies and Modeling

2.A.3. Studies, Analysis, and Design of Wastewater Treatment Plants

- (a) Upgrades to existing wastewater treatment plants required for permit compliance and/or capacity increases
- (b) Advanced Primary Treatment
- (c) Secondary Treatment

2.A.4. Studies and Analysis of Geotechnical Support Requirements

- (a) Seepage Analysis

- (b) Slope Stability
- (c) Design of dewatering systems

2.A.5. Studies, Analysis, and Design of Civil Works

- (a) Buildings, e.g. administrative, storage, and maintenance buildings. Discuss components and requirements involved (Mechanical, Fire Protection - facility and equipment, Electrical, Plumbing, Structural, Communications, Physical and Environmental controls for information systems, Security, Safety Systems, LEED Certification, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)).
- (b) Bridges
- (c) Ancillary Civil Structures, e.g. water towers, sewage lift stations, parking structures, wash racks, exterior lighting, retaining walls, fencing, and utilities infrastructure.
- (d) Energy conservation, pollution prevention, waste reduction and use of recovered materials in design of any civil works projects.
- (e) Feasibility studies and cost benefit analysis for civil works.

2.A.6. Studies, Analysis, and Design of Hydroelectric Plant Systems, specifically for rehabilitation and upgrades of existing plants

- (a) Instrumentation and Controls
- (b) Automation
- (c) Structural

2.A.7. Geographic Information System (GIS) - Integrate hardware, software, and data for capturing, managing, analyzing, and displaying all forms of geographically referenced information.

2.A.8. Preparation of Base Maps, using and preparing the following

- (a) Aerial Photography/Traditional Land Surveying
- (b) Scanning vectorization and geo-referencing of historical maps
- (c) Inundation and Floodplain Maps
- (d) Light Detecting and Ranging (LIDAR) surveys
- (e) Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) applications

2.A.9. Studies, Analysis, and Design of Site Remediation

- (a) Underground Storage Tanks
- (b) Contaminated soil and ground water remediation
- (c) Lead and Asbestos remediation
- (d) Mold remediation (small buildings)

2.B. Merit Factor 2

Past Performance (1.D.): Past performance on contracts with Federal, State, and/or local government agencies and private industry in terms of quality of work, cost control, compliance with schedules, and managerial ability.

2.B.1. Provide a list of projects performed during the last 10 years similar in nature to the work described for each Category under Merit Factor 1 (2.A.). For Categories 2.A.1 through 2.A.5, a maximum of 5 projects per Category shall be listed. For Categories 2.A.6 through 2.A.82.A.9, a maximum of 2 projects per Category shall be listed. Each project shall contain the following information (Note the one page maximum requirement does

not apply to this Category, however additional information submitted other than what is requested will not be read and evaluated):

- (a) Name of Contracting Agency/Owner
- (b) Contract Number, if available
- (c) Contract Type
- (d) Total Contract Value of Contractor's Work (Original and Final Value)
- (e) Agency/Owner Contact Name and Telephone Number
- (f) Indicate if Contractor was Prime Contractor or Sub-Contractor.
- (g) Brief description of the work and how this work relates to the work outlined under this Solicitation. This list, in conjunction with the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), will be used for evaluation. **The description shall not exceed 10 lines.**
- (h) Provide 1 example, for each Category 2.A.1 through **2.A.82.A.9** above, of past performance in quality of work, cost controls, compliance with performance schedules, and managerial abilities, demonstrating timely completion, reasons for any modifications to contract, and difficulties or issues with contract and resolution to each. Each example shall not exceed ½ of 1 page.
- (i) Describe regional or national quality awards received during the past 5 years that indicate the technical and engineering performance of the firm.

2.C. Merit Factor 3

Professional Qualifications (1.A.): Professional qualifications necessary for satisfactory performance of Architect-Engineering Services.

2.C.1. Provide information discussing qualified professional who are certified and highly trained to include the following key disciplines listed in 2.C.1.(a). The description shall include the number of personnel in each discipline.

- (a) Project Manager, Civil Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Hydrologic Engineer, Hydraulic Engineer, Structural Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, Electrical Engineer, Central Office (network and communication) Engineer, U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) certified Leadership in Energy and Environmental (LEED) Accredited Professional, multi-disciplined Security Specialist, Historical Preservation Specialist, Geophysicist, Cost Engineer, Hydrogeologist, Geologist, Surveyor, GIS Specialist, CADD Designer, and CADD Operator, which shows consistency with this Solicitation.
- (b) It is highly preferred that professionals have certifications such as Project Management Professional (PMP), Program Management Professional (PgMP), Planning and Scheduling Professional (PSP), Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM), Risk Management Professional (PMI-RMP), Value Specialist (CVS) as certified by Society of American Value Engineers (SAVE) International, and Certified Facility Manager (CFM).

2.C.2. Provide information discussing qualified professional who are certified and highly trained to include the following key disciplines: Construction Inspectors that are Civil Engineers, Geological Engineers, Geotechnical Engineers, and Mechanical Engineers, and experienced Construction Inspectors (no degree required). Provide information on the experience the professionals have in each type of construction project that would reasonably be designed under the various Category Items listed under Merit Factor 1 (2.A.). The description shall include the number of personnel in each discipline.

2.C.3. Identify state registration and licensing for architects, engineers, geologists, and surveyors in CA, AZ, NM, and TX.

- 2.C.4. Provide information on Contractor's corporate structure, including regional and field office structure.
- 2.C.5. Note that the one page maximum requirement does not apply to 2.C.1. and 2.C.2., however additional information submitted other than what is requested will not be read and evaluated: The Offeror shall not exceed 2 pages in length. For 2.C.4., the Offeror shall use 11X17 size paper.

2.D. Merit Factor 4

Capacity (1.C.): The firm's capacity to accomplish the contract performance in the required time frame.

- 2.D.1. Provide information on the firm's capacity to accomplish work within a required period of time. In addition, from the projects listed in Past Performance (2.B.1.), expound on 1 project, where you were the Prime Contractor, detailing information on which there were significant delays and obstacles to complete the project yet the deliverable was submitted on time.
- 2.D.2. Provide the firm's Proposed Professional Team for this contract to accomplish the contract performance in the required time frame. Include qualified and experienced professional assigned to this contract including the design team as well as the quality control review team. Include professional employee name, education, title, certification, years of experience, years with the firm for each of the applicable disciplines: Program Manager, Project Manager, Civil Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, Electrical Engineer, Hydraulic Engineer, Structural Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Surveyor, Environmental Engineer, Hydrologist, Geo-hydrologist, Geologist, Cost Engineer, GIS Professional and AutoCAD Technician.
- 2.D.3. Provide all the locations and number of professionals (Construction Inspectors with and without degrees listed in 2.C.2.) that would be available at each to serve as inspectors during construction projects along the entire US-Mexico border.
- 2.D.4. Provide information on availability of equipment, facilities, and other resources needed to perform all required data analysis, design work, and preparation of drawings, specifications, studies, and assessments including, but not limited to, office and field equipment, computer hardware and software, specialized tools and equipment, and vehicles.
- 2.D.5. Note that the one page maximum requirement does not apply to 2.D.2, however additional information submitted other than what is requested will not be read and evaluated: The Offeror shall not exceed 2 pages in length.

2.E. Merit Factor 5

Location (1.E.): Firm's location in the general geographical area of the project (CA, AZ, NM, and TX) and knowledge of the locality of the project. Note experience in dealing with local and regional issues to include economic, environmental, and binational along the US/Mexico border.

3. IDIQ TASK ORDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Task Order Evaluation Criteria - Each Task Order will detail required information and how it applies to items listed in 1.A. through 1.F.

4. WEIGHT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

4.A. IDIQ Contract - The evaluation criteria shall be weighted as listed below:

4.A.1. The Merit Factors are provided in descending order of importance—Specialized Experience (2.A.), Past Performance (2.B.), Professional Qualifications (2.C.), Capacity (2.D.), and Location (2.E.). Merit Factor 1 (2.A.) is of highest importance, followed by Merit Factor 2 (2.B.), and so forth. Each Merit Factor is then divided into Categories that are also listed in descending order of importance. Hence, Category 1 under each Merit Factor is of highest importance, as is Item (a) under each Category.

4.A.2. Other criteria (1.F.) is not evaluated for the IDIQ Contract.

4.B. Task Orders - Weight of evaluation factors shall be detailed in each Task Order.

5. OFFER EVALUATION

The Government intends to evaluate proposals submitted under this Solicitation and select a source for Contract award without discussions (unless the Contracting Officer later determines discussions to be necessary) in accordance with FAR 52.215-1 Instructions to Offerors -- Competitive Acquisition. Source selection shall be in accordance with procedures contained in FAR Part 15. These procedures are summarized as follows:

5.A. General Instructions for Evaluation

Proposals received in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP) and in response to any Task Order RFPs provided will be evaluated in accordance with the process as established in this solicitation and applicable Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR).

5.B. Review of Proposals

An adjectival rating system has been established prior to the issuance of this solicitation. Before this system will be applied, however, all proposals received will undergo an initial review to determine if any proposals are nonresponsive. A nonresponsive proposal is defined as a proposal that neglects to contain mandatory information or documents requested in the solicitation. A nonresponsive proposal is also one that does not follow the requested format as stated in the Evaluation Approach section below. Firms submitting nonresponsive proposals will be notified upon the determination of such non-responsiveness.

5.C. Past Performance Evaluation

In addition to the past performance information required under the Merit Factor 2 (2.B.) and information gathered from any other sources per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii), the Contracting Officer shall use past performance information available from the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (www.cpars.gov) in the source selection process on Offerors competing for awards in excess of \$250,000, unless the Contracting Officer has documented an exception from past performance consideration in accordance with FAR 15.304(c)(3)(iii).

5.D. Each Merit Factor and Category will receive an adjective rating. The Category ratings will be used to establish the Merit Factor Rating. The Merit Factor ratings will be used to rate the whole proposal.

5.E. Any proposal having an overall rating or any factor rating of "Unsatisfactory" will not be considered for award.

6. GENERAL GUIDANCE

6.A. For Merit Factor 1 (2.A.), each Offeror shall submit a maximum of 1 page response per Item under each Category. For Example, Category 2.A.1, (Studies, Analysis, and Design of Hydraulic Structures) – A maximum of 1 page for each Item (Dams, Levees, Floodwalls, etc.)

shall be submitted. Each Item shall not exceed the 1 page and will not be read and evaluated past the 1 page requirement.

- 6.B. For the remaining Merit Factors, each Offeror shall submit a maximum of 1 page response per Category under each criteria, unless otherwise noted. Each Category response shall not exceed the 1 page requirement and will not be read and evaluated past the 1 page requirement.
- 6.C. In each response page, the Evaluation Criteria (Merit Factor), Category, and Item shall be included followed by the response.
- 6.D. The responses to the Evaluation Criteria shall be submitted in both hardcopy and electronically (pdf) and shall be in the same sequential order as provided.
 - 6.D.1. A total of 5 hardcopies shall be provided, each in their own three-ring binder. All hardcopies shall have the Evaluation Criteria separated with a tab.
 - 6.D.2. Pdf shall be provided on CD.
- 6.E. All pages within the Evaluation Criteria shall be numbered in the following manner: x of xx.
- 6.F. All responses shall be in 12 point, Times New Roman font.
- 6.G. Margins shall have the following minimum dimensions: Left 1 inch, Right 0.75 inch, Top 0.4 inch, and Bottom 0.5 inch.
- 6.H. Responses that are not in the format specified shall be set aside and shall not be evaluated.
- 6.I. Task Orders may detail additional or different General Guidance to follow.

7. SCORING ADJECTIVES AND DEFINITIONS

- 7.A. *Technical Scoring Adjectives.* The following adjectives will be used in evaluating all the Merit Factors and Categories, except for past performance (Merit Factor 2), and for the proposal as a whole:

Exceptional: Exceeds the Scope of Work (SOW) requirements and exemplifies a thorough understanding of all aspects of the Solicitation requirements to the extent that timeliness and the highest quality performance is anticipated. Contains strengths, exceptional features, or innovations that should substantially benefit agency projects. There are no deficiencies and one or more significant strengths. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is extremely low.

Very Good: Meets the minimum SOW requirements and demonstrates good understanding of Solicitation requirements that is anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency, productivity, or quality. There is at least one significant strength. Strengths outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

Satisfactory: Meets the minimum SOW requirements and demonstrates adequate understanding of Solicitation requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on the performance of projects. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.

Marginal: Does not meet some of the minimum SOW requirements and/or demonstrates superficial or vague understanding of the Solicitation requirements. Has weaknesses that are not offset by strengths. Only marginally meets performance or capability standards necessary for minimal, but acceptable performance on projects. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is moderate to high.

Unsatisfactory: Does not meet the SOW requirements. There is at least one significant weakness and/or deficiency which indicates a failure to understand the SOW and/or Solicitation requirements. The risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable.

- 7.B. *Past Performance Scoring Adjectives.* The following adjectives will be used in evaluating past performance (Merit Factor 2):

Exceptional: Performance met contractual requirements and exceeded many requirements. The contractual performance was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective. The Government has an extremely high degree of confidence and no doubt that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements of the Solicitation. Past performance exceeds "Very Good."

Very Good: Performance met contractual requirements and exceeded some requirements. The contractual performance was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective. The Government has a high degree of confidence that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements of the Solicitation. Past performance exceeds "Satisfactory."

Satisfactory: Performance met contractual requirements. The contractual performance contained some problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were, or appear to be, satisfactory. The Government has reasonable confidence that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements of the Solicitation.

Marginal: Performance did not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance reflected a serious problem for which the contractor did not identify corrective actions or the contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. The Government is somewhat confident that the Offeror can meet the requirements of the Solicitation. Past performance is less than "Satisfactory."

Unsatisfactory: Performance did not meet most contractual requirements. The contractual performance contained serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions were, or appear to be, ineffective. The Government has no confidence that the Offeror can meet the requirements of the Solicitation. Past performance is less than "Marginal."

Neutral: Pursuant to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), in the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

- 7.C. *Definitions.*

"Significant Strength" is an aspect of the proposal that appreciably increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.

"Strength" is an aspect of the proposal that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance. *(Simple adherence to the requirements of the solicitation is compliance and shall not be listed as a strength.)*

"Deficiency" is 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.

"Weakness" means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. *(Failure to provide items listed in respective proposal instructions will be considered a weakness.)*

"Significant Weakness" is a flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. *(Failure to provide items listed in respective proposal*

instructions that results in an inability to evaluate factors will be considered a significant weakness.)

"Magnitude" is the dollar amount of work performed. Similar in magnitude refers to projects priced at 85% of your bid and above.

"Scope" is the technical requirements of work performed. Similar in scope refers to the same type of work with comparable or greater quantities.

"Complexity" is the difficulty of performing work due to many varied interrelated parts.