

Section M: Evaluation Factors for Award

GENERAL:

A SSEB will be established to conduct the evaluation of proposals received in response to this solicitation. The evaluation will be based on the content of the proposal, proposal updates and any information obtained from other sources, e.g., past performance information.

The Source Selection Evaluation Board will evaluate the proposals and assign a consensus rating for each evaluation factor and subfactor, utilizing the evaluation and rating system described in the Phase 1 evaluations.

The Government reserves the right to allow proposal updates if deemed necessary to determine the most highly qualified Offerors to shortlist for Phase 2.

The Contracting Officer will consider the SSEB's individual consensus and overall ratings, but will also independently exercise prudent business judgment to select up to three (3) of the most highly qualified Offerors to short-list for Phase 2.

Evaluation of Non Price Factors. Evaluation of all non-price related criterion will be accomplished using the following tables/narratives.

TECHNICAL STRENGTH/WEAKNESS DEFINITIONS	
Rating	Definition
Significant Strength	A significant strength is defined as an aspect of the proposal that appreciably increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.
Strength	A strength is defined as an aspect of the proposal that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.
Weakness	A weakness is defined as a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A significant weakness is a flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
Deficiency	A deficiency is defined as an aspect of the proposal that fails to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
Clarification	A clarification is defined as limited exchanges between the Government and offerors, for the purpose of enhancing the Government's understanding of proposals, without entering into discussions, or requesting a revision to the proposal.

Table 1 TECHNICAL STRENGTH/WEAKNESS DEFINITIONS

TECHNICAL ADJECTIVAL RATING DEFINITION

Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional understanding of the requirements; significantly exceeds all the minimum requirements of the criteria; contains significant strengths, exceptional feature, or innovation that should substantially benefit the Government; contains no weaknesses or deficiencies; has a very high probability of success and the risk of unsuccessful performance is extremely low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough understanding of the requirements; exceeds all the minimum requirements of the criteria; contains significant strengths and/or minor strengths, features, or innovation that should benefit the Government; weaknesses, if any, are minor and are more than offset by strengths; no deficiencies are noted; has a better than average probability of success and the risk of unsuccessful performance is very low
Satisfactory	Proposal meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria; there are few, if any, strengths or features to benefit the Government; has an average probability of success; weaknesses are offset by strengths and/or can be readily corrected; the risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Marginal	Proposal has demonstrated a superficial or vague understanding of the requirements; fails to meet one or more of the minimum requirements of the criteria; there are weaknesses that cannot be offset by strengths and cannot be readily corrected; the risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate.
Unacceptable	Proposal lacks understanding of the requirements; fails to meet any of the minimum requirements of the criteria; numerous weaknesses and deficiencies exist; proposal needs major revisions; the risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

Table 2 TECHNICAL ADJECTIVAL RATING DEFINITION

Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Table 3: Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

Table 4: Past Performance Confidence Ratings

CONFIDENCE	DEFINITION
High Confidence	The Government has <i>high confidence</i> that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with <i>little or no</i> Government intervention
Some Confidence	The Government has <i>some confidence</i> that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with <i>some</i> Government intervention.
Low Confidence	The Government has low confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, or will be successful in performing the contract <i>even with</i> Government intervention.

Table 5 Presentation Confidence Rating

DISCUSSION (If Necessary)-

During Phase 2, the Government intends to award without discussions based on information in the proposal. A "Competitive Range" is a subjective determination of the most highly rated Phase 2 proposals if the Contracting Officer determines that discussions with Offerors are required in Phase 2. In such an event, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range of all the most highly rated Phase 2 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.

Price: The price proposals will not be rated but will be evaluated against the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) and the other price proposals received to determine price reasonableness. The Independent Government Estimate will be used as a benchmark for which the price reasonableness will be conducted. The analysis of the variance between the Government's estimate and each offer and variance among the Offerors will indicate whether further review is necessary in order to determine if the price is reasonable. The Government may perform additional review of price proposals.

Pre-Screening Criteria

- A. Bonding Capacity
 - 1. Standard: Individual project capacity of \$8 million
 - 2. Substantiation:
 - a. Provide a statement in the Phase I cover letter of the amount of individual project and firm aggregate bonding capacity and the name of the surety.
 - b. Provide a letter from the Offeror's surety stating the surety's commitment to bond the Offeror for at least the amount listed in the standard for performance and payment bonds. The Offeror shall submit one copy with each proposal package.
Actual bonds are not required until the Award phase.
- B. Constructor Safety Record
 - 1. Standard: Average Experience Modification Ratio (EMR) of 1.2 or less for the last three years with the rating in any one year not greater than 1.2
 - 2. Substantiation:
 - a. Provide a statement in the Phase I cover letter that the firm's average EMR is 1.2 or less for the last three years, and that the EMR in any one year has not exceeded 1.2.
 - b. Provide copies from the insurer of the firm's EMR for the last three years as attachments to the Prescreening/Safety cover letter

PRESCREEN PAGE LIMITATION: 2. The pre-screening narrative / Cover Letter shall be Times New Roman 11 font (minimum) and limited to two (2) single-sided 8.5" x 11" pages.

Phase I Evaluation Criteria

Criteria 1 and 2 together are more important than Criterion 3.

C. Criterion 1: Preliminary Management and Technical Approach

1. Standard: The composition and management of the proposed Design-Build team for this contract will be evaluated in this Criterion. Page count to be in compliance with Section M.
 - a. Project Management: This factor addresses the offeror's approach to managing the project specifically in the areas of Key Personnel qualifications, quality control, safety, project management software and staffing. The offeror shall submit resumes for Key Personnel, a Quality Control Plan of Approach, a Safety Plan of Approach, identify the Project Management Information System and implementation plan, and a Staffing Plan to demonstrate project management capabilities and plans.
 - b. Technical Approach: This factor addresses how the offeror will provide a suitable design and technical solution and integrate the Government's project team into the project delivery.
2. Substantiation
 - a. Provide a complete SF-330 for the Team.
 - b. In Section H, provide a narrative describing the proposed primary construction firms and primary design firms for this contract and the rationale for proposing this arrangement. Provide the role, responsibilities, and contractual relationships between the various firms. The organizational chart shall clearly identify the lines of authority between the team members. If the experience of a significant subcontractor is being claimed, the firm must be named in the above narrative and organizational chart.
 - c. In addition to the narrative, the Offeror shall submit a signed copy of a joint venture (JV) agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment for each member of the Offeror's team identified above in Volume IB of the proposal.
 - d. Describe the management of design and construction to promote quality through integrated design principles. Describe how the Government's reviews will be incorporated and how the overall schedule may be shortened tighter integration with the Government's project team.
 - e. Safety Plan of Approach: Clear and concise description of the DBC's approach to safety in all phases of the work that will form the basis for the awarded DBC's project safety plan.
 - f. Communications plan for all project phases incorporating the use of an infrastructure project management information system (IPMIS) provided by the contractors. State which IPMIS will be used by the DBC and the Government.

D. Criterion 2: Specialized Experience

1. Standard: Page count to be in compliance with Section M.
 - a. Prior sustainable design and construction, including Net Zero energy and onsite renewable energy generation
 - b. Work with wood, including mass timber and alternative framing systems
 - c. Prior design-build experience by both constructor and designer. Preference will be given to teams with prior documented experience as an integrated design-build team.
 - d. Offerors that demonstrate more recent and relevant experience will be rated more favorably.
2. Substantiation
 - a. Submit at least three but no more than six projects completed within the last seven years of the date of issuance. Preference may be given to more recent projects within the last three years.
 - b. A project is defined as a design, construction, or design-build project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole should not be submitted as a project; rather Offerors should submit the work performed under a task order as a project.
 - c. For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP (i.e.: unique features, area, construction methods). In addition, the description should also address any sustainable features for the project, including specific descriptions of those features. This requirement also applies to self-certified or that have not received a third party green building certification. For projects that have achieved certification, provide the certification number in the project narrative. Project narratives may use a maximum of two pages.
 - d. In Section H, provide a supplemental narrative response illustrating the Offeror's experience is relevant to this project and will benefit the Government. Lists of projects or clients are not desired.
 - e. If the Offeror is a JV, relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the JV entity. If the JV does not have shared experience, projects shall be submitted for each JV partner. Offerors who fail to submit experience for all JV partners may be rated lower. Offerors are still limited to a total of six (6) projects combined.
 - f. If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates / subsidiaries / parent / Limited Liability Company (LLC) / Private Limited Company (LTD) member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF 1442), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate / subsidiary / parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract.
 - g. The Offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate design or construction experience under this evaluation factor. The Offer must provide a letter of commitment and an explanation in Section H of the meaningful involvement that the subcontractor will have in performance of this contract.

-
- h. Offerors that demonstrate more recent and relevant experience will be rated more favorably.

E. Criterion 3: Past Performance

1. Standard: Page count to be in compliance with Section M.
 - a. If a completed Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Evaluation Report or a Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS) Evaluation Report is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 2 for construction experience. If a completed A-E Contractor Appraisal Support System (ACASS) Evaluation Report is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal for each project included in Factor 3 for design experience. If there is not a completed CPARS, CCASS or ACASS evaluation then submit a Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) (RFP Attachment B) for each project included in Factor 3 for both Construction Experience and Design Experience. The Offeror should provide completed PPQs in the proposal.
 - b. 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. 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). The Government may make reasonable attempts to contact the client noted for that project(s) to obtain the PPQ information. However, Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to help ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact,
*email subject line: 12445122R0041 Performance Questionnaire_Company Name
Charles Cotton /Steven Alves at charles.cotton@usda.gov / steven.alves@usda.gov*
2. Substantiation
 - a. For at least two of the projects submitted in Criterion 2: Specialized experience, submit either a Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Evaluation Report or Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ).
 - b. 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 information in the past performance evaluation. If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed evaluation 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). The Government may make reasonable attempts to contact the client noted for that project(s) to obtain the PPQ information. However, Offerors should follow-up with project owners to help ensure timely submittal of questionnaires.
 - c. Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under their Specialized Experience response. Offerors may also address any adverse past performance issues.
 - d. The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the references unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor.

-
- e. For DB projects where the offeror did not receive a past performance evaluation report that did not specifically address design performance, the offeror shall submit a PPQ specifically for the design work associated with the DB project.
 - f. Submitting only performance award or additional information is not acceptable.

Phase II Evaluation Criteria

Phase II Volumes and Criterion Weight

Volume IIA (36 page limitation)

Criterion 4, Confirmation of Design Development., yes or no qualifier

Criterion 5, Design Solution, is the most important.

Criterion 6 and 7, Mgt Approach/Betterments, when combined, are less important than criterion 5.

Volume IIB (20 page limitation)

Large drawing design submittal

Volume IIC (20 page limitation)

Criterion 8, Price, is the least important within specified budget restriction.

Phase I factors will not be incorporated into the Phase II evaluation. The Government will assess, and rate proposals based on how well the offerors meet the factors and requirements outlined in the RFP using the evaluation criteria as follows:

Criterion 4: Confirmation of Design Development In Accordance With The RFP. Page count to be in compliance with Section L.

1. GENERAL: The Government will not be performing a detailed engineering analysis or design review at the proposal stage. The intent during the proposal submission is to focus on the proposed materials and systems. After award, in the event of a conflict between the contractor's accepted proposal and the requirements in the final, amended RFP, the order of precedence is indicated in Special Contract Requirement 1.2, DESIGN/BUILD CONTRACT - ORDER OF PRECEDENCE. The Offeror shall identify what it considers to be Betterments. Betterments will be given additional consideration during the evaluation process, provided they are included within the contract cost limitation (CCL) identified in the Solicitation. Note that the Government will not evaluate any material that exceeds the page limits, where indicated below.

2. Submission Requirements:

Confirmation of Design Consistent With RFP. The Offeror shall provide a *signed statement confirming that the Offeror will develop the design in accordance with the RFP criteria. The Offeror shall provide a detailed listing of proposed betterments, if any.* The final design must comply with the RFP requirements except that accepted betterments become the new contract minimum requirements. Completion of the design shall conform to the design standards in accordance with the RFP. Proposals that do not commit to developing the design in compliance with the RFP will be rejected.

Criterion 5: Design Solution: Page count to be in compliance with Section L.

1. Standard

- a. Design provides an efficient, effective, safe, secure, and healthy workplace for the London Ranger District integrating the offeror's understanding of the project requirements, objectives, and challenges and the offeror's proposed solutions.
- b. Design minimizes long term operations and maintenance costs.
- c. Provides architectural character appropriate for the Forest Service in the local community. Preference may be given for the use of mass timber.
- d. Innovative solutions or alternatives to the Program and Facility Design Standards that benefit the Government (at no or minimal additional first cost) but adds substantial value to the Offeror's proposal may be considered more favorably.

2. Substantiation

- a. Provide a Design Solution that includes:
 - i. Concept drawing(s) including:
 - (1) Site plan
 - (2) For the Office, Warehouse, and Pole Shed:
 - (a) Floor Plans
 - (b) Exterior Elevations,
 - (c) Typical Building Sections
 - (3) 3D renderings
 - (4) Material, finish, and color board
 - ii. Design Narrative describing:
 - (1) Planning and design rationale.
 - (2) Major assemblies and materials.
 - (3) Expected Site Energy Use Intensity (EUI) in thousand British Thermal Units per square foot per year $\left(\frac{kBTU}{ft^2 \cdot Year}\right)$. Provide for entire site and for each building individually and describe method of determination.
 - iii. Checklist for proposed third party green building certification system documenting expected credits certification level to be attained.
 - iv. List of additional site investigations needed for a successful design and included in the price proposal.
- b. Design Presentation: Requirements for the Design Presentation are documented in Section L.

Criterion 6: Construction Management Approach. Page count to be in compliance with Section L.

1. Standard

- a. Offeror's demonstrates effective use of Integrated Design and Construction principles to deliver maximum function for the lowest life cycle cost to the Government.
- b. Schedule minimizes the time the Government is working away from the London Administrative Site without substantially increasing contract price
- c. Method for managing supply chain disruptions
- d. Methodology for providing a collaborative project delivery with the Government.
- e. Innovative solutions or alternatives to Construction Management and Technical Approach that benefits the Government or reduces the overall schedule without compromising quality (at no or minimal additional first cost) but adds substantial value to the Offeror's proposal may be considered more favorably

2. Substantiation

- a. Updated Management and Technical Approach from Phase I based on the proposed design and technical solution.
- b. Project Schedule: Submit a project schedule in Gantt Chart format which identifies all milestones **listed in Section 013000** – Administrative Procedures of the Project Manual, along with appropriate intermediate milestones and the critical path. This schedule shall establish the Period of Performance and completion date based on the date of anticipated award listed in the Phase II RFP.

Criterion 7 Betterments. Page count to be in compliance with Section L.

1. Standard

- a. Provide a compiled listing of all proposed quality improvements, or construction/design alternatives or innovations in methodology contained in the Offeror's proposal that exceed the minimum quality, performance, or durability stated in the RFP performance specs, or provide for efficiencies in construction via savings in cost or efficiency. Suggested attached reference document includes: London Admin Office - Project Program_08Dec21
- b. See - London Admin Office - Project Program_08Dec21
- c. All betterments must comply with all RFP requirements. Identify all quality betterments by developing and providing the following table or similar, using the provided column headings text, exactly as written, to organize provided information.
- d. Betterments: Offeror-proposed betterments (if any) that exceed the minimum quality, performance, or durability stated in the RFP performance specifications, comply with all RFP requirements, and are properly identified in a table as required, will receive additional consideration. The value of all betterments will be determined by the Government. No betterments will be evaluated if the betterment table column heading text provided is altered. You may add additional rows as necessary. (see attached form for actual size). The USDA-FS reserves the right to accept none/some/all/ betterments outside of the cost limitation at its discretion and subject to availability of funds at award.

2. **Substantiation.** Contractor is to submit a completed Betterments Proposal Submittal Worksheet at the time of proposal submittal.

Feature Category	Proposed Reference	Improved Quality	Concise Description of Improved Quality, Enhanced Performance, or Increased Durability or Sustainability	Feature is Included within Contract Cost Limitation – YES/NO	Betterment Outside of Cost Limitation Price
				YES	NA
				YES	NA
				YES	NA
				YES	NA
				YES	NA
				YES	NA
				NO	\$
				NO	\$
				NO	\$
				NO	\$
				NO	\$
				NO	\$
				NO	\$

Table 3 Betterments Proposal Submittal Worksheet

Criterion 8: Price. Page count to be in compliance with Section L.

Standard. The project is subject to a cost ceiling of \$5.4M for design and construction.

- a. Offerors are under no obligation to approach this ceiling. However, the Government may not be able to make an award if this dollar amount is exceeded
- b. Offeror's overall pricing is within the Government's available funding and competitive with the other Phase II offers
- c. Offeror's Schedule of Values is clearly organized with a sufficient level of detail to allow for the Government to effectively administer the contract.

Substantiation

- i. Completed Price Proposal Form
- ii. *Provide a detailed breakdown of the line item pricing following the requirements listed in Section 012000 - Price and Payment Procedures, Schedule of Values. Provide an equivalent breakdown for design and commissioning services within the form by primary labor category*

Phase II PROPOSAL PRESENTATION BRIEFING EVALUTION.

The contractor's proposal presentation will be evaluated against criteria contained within the request for proposal. Format and minimum topics are covered in Section L and throughout the RFP and attachments.