

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. CONTRACT ID CODE U	PAGE OF PAGES 1   23
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0004	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 17-Dec-2015	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NAVFAC EXWC CODE ACQ / NAVAL BASE VENTURA COUNTY 1100 23RD AVE BLDG 1100 PORT HUENEME CA 93043-4301	CODE N39430	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) <b>See Item 6</b>		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N39430-16-R-1802	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 12-Nov-2015	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer 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 <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram 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 telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter 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)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> 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.)  The purpose of the amendment is to:  1) Provide Government responses to Offerors questions; and 2) Revise sections of the solicitation as necessary.				
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)		
		TEL:	EMAIL:	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED  17-Dec-2015

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

## SUMMARY OF CHANGES

## SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0004

<b>ESTS Q&amp;A 4</b>			
<b>General Solicitation Revisions</b>			
Section L.4(2) has been revised to reflect the deletion of Attachment J-3, Key Personnel Experience/Qualifications. Offerors are now required to provide a resume vice Attachment J-3.			
<b>Questions &amp; Answers</b>			
	<b>Page #</b>	<b>Section Number and Title</b>	<b>Question &amp; Answer</b>
<b>Q51</b>	87	M.2 Factor 1 Corporate Experience	<b>Question:</b> The RFP states, "A subcontractor's experience may not be given the same level of consideration as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner." Traditional teaming arrangements with a single prime and multiple subcontractors can provide the breadth of required services at a superior level of expertise and be cost effective. Will the Navy consider such an agreement and score it equally with a Joint Venture or single prime that executes almost all the work?
			<b>Answer:</b> No. We consider that the prime contractor is ultimately responsible for the performance of the contract, and there is no contractual relationship between the Government and the subcontractors. If the actual experience does not exist at the prime contractor level, then it is unrealistic to believe that the prime can effectively plan and oversee the work of its subcontractors because it hasn't had the relevant experience itself. Likewise, when problems arise, the prime cannot immediately respond without checking with (potentially) multiple subcontractors, because the prime has not had experience in working through similar challenges. We recognize that subcontractors can bring expertise that may not exist, or exist to the same extent, at the prime contractor level, but we expect the prime to have the majority of the relevant experience and to be the true leader/decision maker of the team, not just a fictitious leader of multiple subcontractors cobbled together to meet the experience requirements. Even with highly capable subcontractors, we expect the prime to have the ultimate decision authority. Lastly, a teaming arrangement is less binding than a Joint Venture agreement.
<b>Q52</b>	74	L.4 Factor 1 Corporate Experience	<b>Question:</b> The RFP states: "the Government will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal." Can the government clarify what is meant by "generally focus?"
			<b>Answer:</b> As stated in Q51, the prime contractor is the firm that is ultimately responsible for the performance of the contract, and as such we will focus on the relevant experience that firm has, and to a lesser extent the experience that the subcontractors bring to the entire team.
<b>Q53</b>	87	L.4 Factor 1 Corporate Experience	<b>Question:</b> The RFP states: "the Government will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal." Can you provide clarification on the relative evaluation weight for "Project Data" and "IDIQ Contract Data Sheets" for a prime versus a subcontractor?

			<b>Answer:</b> There is no mechanical weighting scheme. Keeping in mind the response to Q51, prime contractors should demonstrate their own experience in as many of the tasks listed in Section C, Part 3 as possible.
<b>Q54</b>	87	M.2 Factor 1 Corporate Experience	<b>Question:</b> Per RFP, "A subcontractor's experience may not be given the same level of consideration as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner." Does the Navy have a preference for Joint Ventures over a traditional prime/subcontractor teaming arrangement? If so, can you please explain why this method is preferred?
			<b>Answer:</b> The weight given to the experience (and past performance) of entities other than the offeror includes, but are not limited to considerations such as: the nature of the relationship and strength of the commitment between the parties, the extent of their proposed involvement, and the past working relationship between the entities.
<b>Q55</b>	87	M.2 Factor 1 Corporate Experience	<b>Question:</b> In M.2 Bullet D, the RFP states "The Government may consider the experience of a subcontractor where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement which creates legal responsibility on the part of the subcontractor." The term "may" is ambiguous. Will the government please clarify if they "will" or "will not" consider subcontractor corporate experience? Can the government explain the decision criteria on whether or not they will evaluate the experience of a subcontractor?
			<b>Answer:</b> See Q54.
<b>Q56</b>	87	M.2 Factor 1 Corporate Experience	<b>Question:</b> In M.2 Bullet D, the RFP states "A subcontractor's experience may not be given the same level of consideration as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner." Can the government explain the relative weighting associated with a subcontractors experience relative to a prime contractor or a joint venture partner?
			<b>Answer:</b> See Q54.
<b>Q57</b>	76	L.4 Factor 2. Key Personnel	<b>Question:</b> Can the government confirm that key personnel coming from an unpopulated JV will be considered employees of the prime, and can be used as Key Personnel in the proposal?
			<b>Answer:</b> Yes, but see the answer to Q58.
<b>Q58</b>	76	L.4 Factor 2. Key Personnel	<b>Question:</b> The RFP allows for the Prime to use both past experience and corporate experience from subcontractors, but not Key Personnel. This seems to be an inconsistent approach in the RFP. Would the Government consider allowing a limited number of Key Personnel from subcontractors?
			<b>Answer:</b> No. We consider that the prime contractor is ultimately responsible for the performance of the contract; as such the employees in the key personnel positions must have influence with the prime contractor. Further, when dealing with these individuals on site, for privity of contract reasons, these key personnel must be employees of the prime contractor. If the employees are members of a lower-tier subcontractor, then they don't have the decision making authority that we would expect from some of these key positions.
<b>Q59</b>	79	L.4 Factor 5 Past Performance	<b>Question:</b> The RFP states: "the Government will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal." Can you provide clarification on the relative weight for "past performance evaluation forms" for a prime versus a sub-contractor?
			<b>Answer:</b> The prime contractor is the firm that is ultimately responsible for the performance of the contract, and as such we will focus on the past performance of that firm, and to a lesser extent the past performance that the subcontractors bring to the entire team.

<b>Q60</b>	87, 90	M.2(1); Factor 1 Corporate Experience; item d.	<p><b>Question:</b> The RFP allows the "...experience of a sub-contractor where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement which creates legal responsibility on the part of the subcontractor". What kind of evidence is needed and does this evidence count towards the page count? Should the entire TA be submitted as evidence, and if so where does it belong?</p>
			<p><b>Answer:</b> Evidence of a binding agreement can be in the form of a teaming agreement, signed copy of the joint venture agreement, or a signed binding letter of commitment from each team member. For 8(a) Mentor-Protégé JV agreement, submit the SBA approved Mentor-Protégé agreement. All JVs, teaming agreements, and letters of commitment shall: (1) clearly identify the expected relationship, role and responsibility between the firms or of the subcontractor or other entity (type and proportion of work to be performed) (including an explanation of the meaningful involvement that the entity will have in performance of this contract) and (2) shall be signed by the appropriate individual(s) of each firm.</p> <p>Copies of JV agreements, teaming agreements, and letters of commitment shall be included in Factor 1 and Factor 4 in the technical proposal. Copies of the aforementioned agreements shall not be applied against the overall page limit under the technical proposal.</p>
<b>Q61</b>	N/A	Attachment J-5	<p><b>Question:</b> Our experience with unpopulated JVs is that the money that goes to the JV members is not considered subcontracted dollars for calculating small business targets. Does the Navy use this same approach?</p>
			<p><b>Answer:</b> Yes.</p>

## SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

### SECTION L

#### **L.1 INQUIRIES BY PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS**

Questions concerning any aspect of this solicitation shall be submitted via electronic mail to Elizabeth.Corder@navy.mil and Geralyn.Castro@navy.mil using the following in the email subject line: **N39430-16-R-1802 ESTS Questions**. Please submit questions by December 09, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. Pacific and allow 4-5 business days for responses. The questions should include the page number and paragraph number or identifier, which pertains to the Offeror's question. All questions will be answered via written amendment to the solicitation.

#### **L.2 ORGANIZATION OF OFFER**

(1) Organization. The offer shall contain all pertinent information in sufficient detail to conduct an effective evaluation. The information shall be organized as follows:

- a. Cover Letter. A letter containing the following:
  - i. Name and address of offeror;

- ii. The name of the person or persons authorized to represent the offeror in contractual matters, including final negotiations; and
- iii. The address and telephone number for the authorized representative of the offeror.
- b. Standard Form 33, Solicitation, Offer, and Award and all its Amendments in Standard Form 30
- c. Confirmation of VETS-4212 report(s) filing
- d. Requirements of Section K
- e. Volume I – Technical Proposal
- f. Volume II – Price Proposal

## (2) Content.

- a. Each volume of the proposal shall be separately bound in a three-ring loose-leaf binder that shall permit the volume to lie flat when open. Staples shall not be used. A cover sheet should be bound in each book, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, solicitation identification and the Offeror's name.
- b. The technical proposal should address the evaluation factors in Section M and include all of the required documentation outlined in Section L. The documentation should be provided in volumes that are formatted as described below:

VOLUME/TAB	FACTOR	MAX NO. OF PAGES	TITLE
I	1	40	Corporate Experience
I	2	27	Key Personnel
I	3	3	Safety
I	4	-	Small Business Utilization
I	5	-	Past Performance
II	6	-	Cost

Each section shall start on a new page and pages shall be sequentially numbered and identified with the name of the Proposer and the RFP number. The Cover Letter, blank pages, tables of contents, and indexes are not considered a "page" for purposes of the above page limits. **No cost information shall be contained in your technical proposal.**

- c. Each volume shall contain a detailed table of contents to outline the subparagraphs within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections.
- d. Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against page limitations.
- e. The proposal shall be typewritten, and shall be presented on Standard 8.5 x 11 inch paper, one-inch margins, single-spacing using 10-point Times New Roman font print. Each section shall start on a new page; pages shall be sequentially numbered and identified with the name of the offeror and the RFP number. Pages submitted which exceed the limits in the chart above will not be considered in the evaluation. The Cover Letter, blank pages, table of contents, glossaries, and indexes are not considered a "page" for page limit purposes. The font requirement for tables and graphics may be either Times New Roman or Calibri, but must be no less than font size 10. Offerors may only submit 11x17 page foldouts in lieu of 8.5 x 11 pages to accommodate graphics and tables.
- f. A copy of the Standard Form 33, "Solicitation, Offer, and Award," with blocks 12 through 18 completed, signed by an authorized representative of your company by the closing date and time indicated on the face page of the RFP, shall be included with the proposal.
- g. A copy of the email confirmation of VETS-4212 report(s) filing at [www.dol.gov/vets/vets4212.htm](http://www.dol.gov/vets/vets4212.htm), as

required by regulation (41 CFR Part 61-300). Upon the successful submission of a VETS-4212 report(s), federal contractors will receive an email confirmation of receipt notification for their records. These confirmation notifications will be used as verification of submission by the Contracting Officer. A copy of a submitted report is NOT required to suffice for a confirmation / validation of submission.

- h. Offerors shall include an additional section that addresses the requirements in Section K; statement that representation and certifications are current in SAM. Finally, offerors shall provide identification of any Organizational Conflict of Interest.
- i. Volume I – Technical Proposal; and one cover letter (Original proposal and 3 hard copies separately bound and organized by evaluation factor). A cover letter shall accompany the technical proposal to include the solicitation number, name, address, DUNS and Cage Code, telephone number and facsimile number of the offeror. This page will not be included in the page count. The Technical Volume shall consist of the following sections:
  - Factor 1 – Corporate Experience
  - Factor 2 – Key Personnel
  - Factor 3 – Safety
  - Factor 4 – Small Business Utilization
    - Sub-factor 4.A. – Past Performance in Utilization of Small Business Concerns
    - Sub-factor 4.B. – Small Business Participation
  - Factor 5 – Past Performance
- j. Volume II – Cost Proposal; and one cover letter (one copy of the signed Original proposal and 1 copy separately bound and organized). A cover letter shall accompany the cost proposal to include the requirements indicated in Factor 6 of Section L. The cost proposal includes completed cost schedules, as well as, the other attachments and requirements indicated in Section L of the solicitation.
- k. Modifications, amendments, or withdrawal of proposals and other written non-electronic communications should also be made to the address indicated below.

### **L.3 SUBMISSION OF OFFERS**

Offeror(s) shall submit proposal packages in paper (hard copy) and CD (electronic) format as follows:

- (1) Page limits, if stipulated, must be adhered to. Electronic page size shall be 8.5" x 11". Font size shall be 10 or larger.
- (2) **HARD COPY AND ELECTRONIC INSTRUCTIONS:** The proposals shall be submitted to the address cited below. The package(s) shall be marked with the name of the offeror, the solicitation number, and the date and time specified for receipt of proposals. No other markings shall be used on the package(s). Proposals not received at the address below on or before the hour and date set forth for receipt of proposals shall be subject to the provisions of FAR 52.215-1 INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS- COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION.

Submit your technical and cost proposal in the following format:

- Volume I – Technical Proposal: Submit one (1) original technical proposal and three (3) copies separately bound and organized by evaluation factor in paper (hard copy) format, as well as, on four (4) CD electronic copies in PDF format.
  - Volume II – Cost Proposal: Submit one (1) original signed cost proposal and one (1) copy separately bound and organized in paper (hard copy) format, as well as, on two (2) CD electronic copies in PDF format.
- (3) Submit all of the requested paper (hard copies) and CDs (electronic) to the following address, no later than the date and time specified on the first page of the SF33, Block 9:

NAVFAC EXWC Acquisitions Department

Code ACQ72  
Naval Base Ventura County  
Attn: Elizabeth Corder, ESTS N39430-16-R-1802  
1100 23rd Avenue Bldg. 1100 Room B105  
Port Hueneme, CA 93043-4301

- (4) Offerors are advised to be aware of FAR 15.208 and take proper steps to ensure timely receipt of their proposals at NAVFAC EXWC Acquisitions Department (Code ACQ72), Naval Base Ventura County, Port Hueneme.

#### **L.4 SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR EACH FACTOR**

For purposes of this solicitation, scope, magnitude and complexity are defined as follows:

- Scope – Tasks that are described in Section C, Part 3.
- Magnitude – The dollar value of the project
- Complexity – (1) Depth and diversity of technical experience performing the tasks described in Section C, Part 3, and (2) Management of multiple task orders under IDIQ contracts for Navy/DOD/federal agencies.

##### **(1) Factor 1, Corporate Experience:**

This factor evaluates the volume of work completed by the Offeror that are comparable to the types of work described under the definition of recent, relevant projects, in terms of scope, magnitude, and complexity; and the Offeror's ability and approach for controlling and managing the entire project.

In the evaluation of this factor, the Government will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal (single corporation, individual joint venture partners, or the LP or LLC identified on the SF33). If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity, if available. If the Joint Venture does not have shared experience, projects may be submitted for any of the Joint Venture members. Offerors are still limited to the number of projects specified below. The Offeror shall submit a signed copy of the Joint Venture agreement.

If an Offeror is relying on the experience performed under a previous JV, the Offeror shall demonstrate what portion of the work was performed by the entity offering on this contract under the prior JV and shall not include work performed by the JV as a whole unless all members of the prior JV are being proposed under this solicitation.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates / subsidiaries / parent / LLC / LP member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract.

##### **i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:**

- a. Provide an Organizational Chart showing lines of authority and functional areas of responsibility for key personnel and management personnel defined in the solicitation.
- b. Provide all current office locations along with the number of professional staff at each location that the Offeror plans to utilize in the execution of work under this contract. Include the plan for handling multiply taskings in various different locations simultaneously.
- c. Using Attachment **J-1** "Project Data Sheet," Offerors shall provide detailed information on at least five (5), but not more than ten (10) recent, relevant projects that demonstrate work similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to those anticipated under this contract. For this element of the factor, projects are defined as **standalone contracts** and **task orders** under an IDIQ contract. Recent projects are considered to be work completed or substantially (80%) completed within the past three (3) years of the solicitation closing date.

- d. Using Attachment **J-2** “IDIQ Contract Data Sheet”, Offerors (Prime/Joint Venture) shall provide up to a maximum of three (3) IDIQ contracts that demonstrate the ability of the Offeror to manage a contract of the type and magnitude contemplated under this solicitation. Submitted IDIQ contracts must have been awarded within the last five (5) years, and there must have been work performed under the contract within the last three (3) years.
- e. Provide all information as specifically instructed on the appropriate forms, using Attachment **J-1** for projects offered under element (c) above and Attachment **J-2** for contracts offered under element (d) above. Additional spaces may be added to the forms as needed, but must not exceed the following page limits: three (3) pages maximum per project for Attachment J-1 and two (2) pages maximum per project for Attachment J-2. Offeror(s) shall not deviate from the basic format of the form. **PROJECTS/CONTRACTS NOT SUBMITTED ON THE APPROPRIATE FORM WILL NOT BE EVALUATED.**

(2) **Factor 2, Key Personnel:**

This factor evaluates the Offeror’s proposed key personnel qualifications and experience in undertaking projects of similar scope and complexity. The Offeror shall submit a resume for all key personnel specified in Section H of the solicitation. Proposed key personnel shall be available to start work upon contract award. The Offeror is required to submit a current, signed “Letter of Intent” for all key personnel that are contingent hires. The letter must be signed by the employee and the Offeror. The meaning of “current” as used in this factor is defined as “within 30 days prior to submission of proposal”. A “Letter of Intent” shall state that personnel working other contracts in various global locations are willing and ready to support the contract (signed by the company employee).

**i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:**

- a. For each Key Personnel who will be assigned to work on this contract, submit a resume to detail his/her education and experience. Key Personnel must be employees of the Prime and must meet the minimum qualifications indicated in Section H of the solicitation to be considered for this contract. The Offeror shall not submit more than three (3) pages single-sided for each individual submitted as Key Personnel. Offeror shall adhere to the submission limit specified below for each Key Personnel position. Offerors shall not submit a resume for personnel who will not be assigned as Key Personnel under this contract. Key Personnel experience may include experience gained while not employed by the Offeror.

The following table indicates the maximum limit of individuals submitted by Key Personnel position:

<b>Key Personnel Position:</b>	<b>Maximum amount of individuals per position:</b>
Program Manager (or equivalent)	1 individual
Senior Project Engineer/Manager (or equivalent)	3 individuals
Senior Technical Advisor (or equivalent)	5 individuals

(3) **Factor 3, Safety:**

**i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:**

The Offeror shall submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture; however, only one safety narrative is required. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR): For the *three* previous complete calendar years [2012, 2013, 2014], submit your EMR (which compares your company’s annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a three year period). If you have no EMR, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the EMR and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: For the *three* previous complete calendar years [2012, 2013, 2014], submit your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA DART Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach for Safety: Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety Narrative shall be limited to three pages.

(4) **Factor 4, Small Business Utilization:**

**Factor 4 consists of two Subfactors, 4A, Past Performance in Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and 4B, Small Business Participation.** The evaluation of Subfactors 4A and 4B are of equal importance to the determination of Factor 4 Rating.

**Definitions:** “SB” as used herein, is intended to include Small Business concerns, Small Disadvantaged Business concerns (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business concerns (WOSB), Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business concerns (HUBZone), Veteran-Owned Small Business concerns (VOSB), and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business concerns (SDVOSB). All small business programs are self-certifying programs with the exception of HUBZone certifications, see HUBZone SB Certifications below. Small Business Program requirements and definitions may be found in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), Part 19.

**HUBZone SB Certifications:** Offerors are reminded that HUBZone SB concerns must obtain formal certification from the Small Business Administration (SBA) if they expect to receive the evaluation benefits associated with the HUBZone SB programs either as a prime or subcontractor(s). For more information on the HUBZone SB certification requirements and available benefits, contact your local SBA representative. Certified HUBZone SB firms are listed on the U.S. Small Business Administration’s Dynamic Small Business Search (DSBS) website at [http://web.sba.gov/pro-net/search/dsp\\_dsbs.cfm](http://web.sba.gov/pro-net/search/dsp_dsbs.cfm). It is the responsibility of the prime contractor to periodically check the DSBS as certifications are subject to change.

**SUBFACTOR 4.A – PAST PERFORMANCE IN UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS**

- i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:** Proposals that do not include responses addressing ALL elements of the requirements stated below (a. through d.) must include an explanation why that element is not addressed.
- a. Provide performance evaluation ratings (i.e., SF1420, DD2626, or equivalent) obtained on the implementation of small business subcontracting plans for all of the Offeror’s projects referenced under Factor 5, Past Performance. Recently completed project evaluations are desired, however, in the absence of recently completed project evaluations, interim ratings for projects that are 80% complete may be considered. In addition, the Government may consider past performance information on other projects as made available to the Government from other sources (such as the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support Systems (CCASS)), Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support System (ACASS) and Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)).
  - b. Provide small business subcontracting history. Large businesses with Federal prime contracting experience shall provide final or current Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts (SF294) or Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISR’s) on prime (only) contracts submitted under Factor 5, Past Performance. If Factor 5 submitted contracts are not prime contracts, submit SF294s or ISRs for contracts of similar scope performed as the prime contractor. If goals were not met on any submitted contracts, an explanation for each unmet goal is required. Large Businesses with no documented

- SF294/ISR history shall submit a subcontracting history on Attachment **J-4**, Small Business Past Performance.
- c. Small Business proposers shall provide a subcontracting history on Attachment **J-4**, Small Business Past Performance.
  - d. If an Offeror is utilizing past performance information of affiliates / subsidiaries / parent / LLC / LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the solicitation), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliates / subsidiaries / parent / LLC / LTD member companies will have meaningful participation of all members in the management of the subcontracting program/plan by identifying the personnel or resources from the member companies that will be dedicated to managing the plan, and an organization chart which demonstrates the reporting chain within the membership.

**If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, Partnership LLC or other entity consisting of more than one entity, provide past performance information, elements a. through d., for each individual business entity(ies) that will be responsible for managing the subcontracting program/plan.**

Proposals including information on any of the following additional elements may be rated higher, based on the evaluated extent to which the information addresses the basis of evaluation in Section M of the solicitation:

- a. Provide information on national-level, and industry-issued awards that Offerors received for outstanding support to SB concerns within the past five (5) years. Include purpose, issuer, and date of award(s). National and industry-issued awards received beyond five (5) years will not be considered.
- b. Provide information on previous, existing, planned or pending mentor-protégé agreements (MPA) under any Federal Government, or other, program held within the last five years. Information should include, at a minimum, the members, objectives, period of performance, and major accomplishments during the MPA.
- c. Provide information on past use of Community Rehabilitation Program (CRP) organizations certified under the AbilityOne Program by SourceAmerica, or the National Industry for the Blind (NIB). Information should include the contract type, type of work performed, period of performance, and number of employed severely handicapped persons.

#### **SUBFACTOR 4.B – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

##### **i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:**

Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total acquisition, the extent of work you will perform as the prime contractor. If submitting an offer as a Joint-Venture, identify the percentage of work each member will be responsible for and indicate the size status of each member, e.g., LB, SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, etc.

If you are a Large Business, submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan for this project in the format provided in Attachment **J-5** for this factor, to include all information required in the attachment. If you are a Small Business, submit a subcontracting participation breakdown in the format provided in Attachment **J-6** for this factor. All proposers: To demonstrate commitment in using small business concerns, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan or subcontracting participation breakdown may list all subcontractors by name. If the proposed Small Business Subcontracting goals do not meet the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, include a detailed explanation describing the actions taken to arrive at that determination, along with an explanation for the goals that actually were proposed. For proposals submitted on design-build solicitations, the proposer must identify its designer/design team in its Subcontracting Plan or Small Business Participation Breakdown.

Firm commitments to subcontract to multiple companies: The Offeror may provide a demonstration of commitments in planned subcontracts by listing multiple names of companies that will be used to support specific small business category (i.e., SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB and SDVOSB).

##### **(5) Factor 5, Past Performance:**

This factor pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well the Offeror has performed on projects that are similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to those anticipated under this contract. For this element of the factor, projects are defined as **standalone contracts** and **task orders** under an IDIQ contract. In accordance with FAR 42.1503(g), recent past performance is considered to be work completed or substantially (80%) completed within the past three (3) years of the solicitation closing date.

In the evaluation of Past Performance, the Government will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal (single corporation, individual joint venture partners, or the LP or LLC identified on the SF33). If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant past performance should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity, if available. If the Joint Venture does not have shared past performance, projects may be submitted for any of the Joint Venture members. Offerors are still limited to the number of projects specified below. The Offeror shall submit a signed copy of the Joint Venture agreement.

If an Offeror is relying on the past performance under a previous JV, the Offeror shall demonstrate what portion of the work was performed by the entity offering on this contract under the prior JV and shall not include work performed by the JV as a whole unless all members of the prior JV are being proposed under this solicitation.

If an Offeror is utilizing past performance of affiliates / subsidiaries / parent / LLC / LP member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract.

**i. Solicitation Submittal Requirements:**

Offerors shall provide **PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORMS** for EACH of the recent, relevant projects submitted in Attachments **J-1** and Attachment **J-2** under Factor 1, Corporate Experience.

Past Performance Evaluation Forms

For each project reference, the Offeror must submit a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation or a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ). If a completed CPARS evaluation is available for the contract, the Offeror must submit the CPARS evaluation. If a CPARS evaluation has NOT been completed for the contract, a PPQ must be submitted. A PPQ form is included as Attachment **J-7** of this solicitation. **AN OFFEROR SHALL NOT SUBMIT A PPQ WHEN A COMPLETED CPARS IS AVAILABLE.**

If a CPARS evaluation is not available, Offerors must submit the PPQ form to the client for completion. Offerors should ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client on the PPQs. If submitting a PPQ for a Subcontractor, the PPQ must be completed by the client, not by the Prime Contractor. Completed Past Performance Questionnaires should be submitted with your proposal. 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 to ensure timely submittal of the questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be emailed directly to the Government's point of contacts: [Elizabeth.Corder@navy.mil](mailto:Elizabeth.Corder@navy.mil) and [Geraldyn.Castro@navy.mil](mailto:Geraldyn.Castro@navy.mil), prior to the RFP closing date/time. In order for the reference to be considered and evaluated, the PPQs completed by the Offeror's client must be received by the Contracting Officer by the above deadline; and if received after the date/time specified, will be handled as a late proposal modification in accordance with FAR 15.208.

The Offeror should also include performance recognition documents received within the last three years, such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

The requirement to submit these forms cannot be satisfied by directing the Government to consider forms or information submitted on other procurements. However, the Government may utilize previously submitted PPQ information or any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System

(PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS 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), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), 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.

(6) **Factor 6, Cost:**

- (a) The Contracting Officer has determined that certified cost or pricing data is not required to be submitted by the Offeror for the solicitation for the indefinite delivery indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract due to the exception at FAR 15.403-1 for adequate price competition. However, other than certified cost or pricing data is required to be submitted for the solicitation for the contemplated IDIQ contract.
- (b) The cost proposal shall be submitted in a separate volume from the technical proposal. No technical information shall be submitted as part of the cost proposal.
- (c) The Offeror's cost proposal volume should be organized as follows:
  - (i) Cover letter
  - (ii) Completed Schedules of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Attachment **J-8** of the solicitation.
  - (iii) A narrative describing the Offeror's basis of estimate for the following cost elements proposed for the contemplated IDIQ contract as follows:
    - Labor Hourly Rates
    - Annual labor Escalation
    - Indirect Expense Rates
    - Facilities Capital Cost of Money (FCCOM), if any
  - (iv) The Company Compensation Plan for only those professional employees identified by the Government on the IDIQ pricing schedules as potentially working on task orders issued against the IDIQ contract.
  - (v) The company operating financial budget for the current fiscal year and the company forecasted operating budget for next fiscal year.
  - (vi) A completed Schedule of the Current Year-to-Date (YTD) Accounting Recorded and 3-Year Historical Indirect Expense Pools, Allocation Bases, and Rates. Reference Attachment **J-9** of the solicitation.
  - (vii) The company financial statement for the most recent completed 12-month financial accounting year.
  - (viii) Financial Institution/Bank Information for the Prospective Contractor. Reference Attachment **J-10** of the solicitation.
  - (ix) A completed Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist. Reference Attachment **J-11** of the solicitation.
  - (x) If Offeror is a joint venture, a complete copy of the Joint Venture Agreement.

- (xi) If offeror has a Government approved purchasing system, a copy of the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) letter granting approval.
- (d) The Government may require an equitable ceiling covering the final indirect cost rates be negotiated and specified in the contract. If implemented, the Government will not be obligated to pay any additional amount should the final indirect cost rates exceed the negotiated ceiling rates; and in the event the final indirect cost rates are less than the negotiated ceiling rates, the negotiated rates will be reduced to conform with the lower rates.
- (e) Content of the Cost Proposal (Volume II)

**IDIQ Proposal Submission Requirements:**

- (i) **Cover Letter:** The first page or two of the proposal (e.g., cover letter) shall include:
- Date
  - The solicitation number
  - Company Name
  - Cage Code, Duns #, TIN #
  - Physical address
  - Mailing address if different than the physical address
  - Company Point of Contact (PoC)
  - PoC Telephone number, fax number, and email address
  - Name of the contract administration office (if available)
  - Type of contract action (that is new contract, change order, price revision/redetermination, letter contract, unpriced order, or other)
  - Proposed IDIQ Cost, Fee, and Total
  - Whether you will require the use of Government property in the performance of the IDIQ contract, and, if so, what property
  - Whether your organization is subject to cost accounting standards; whether your organization has submitted a CASB Disclosure Statement, and if it has been determined adequate; whether you have been notified that you are or may be in noncompliance with your Disclosure Statement or CAS (other than a noncompliance that the cognizant Federal agency official has determined to have an immaterial cost impact), and, if yes, an explanation; whether any aspect of this proposal is inconsistent with your disclosed practices or applicable CAS, and, if so, an explanation; and whether the proposal is consistent with your established estimating and accounting principles and procedures and FAR Part 31, Cost Principles, and, if not, an explanation,
  - Whether your organization has a Government approved purchasing system. “Approved Purchasing System” means a contractor’s purchasing system that has been reviewed and approved in accordance with FAR Part 44 Subcontracting Policies and Procedures.
  - A statement specifying the extent of agreement with all terms, conditions, and provisions included in the solicitation and agreement to furnish any or all services and items upon which prices are offered.
  - Date of the submission, and,
  - Name, title, and signature of the person authorized to negotiate on the Company’s behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation.
- (ii) **Schedules of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost Plus Fixed Fee** – Offeror shall submit with their cost proposal a completed Schedule of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Attachment **J-8**. The Offeror shall supply the most currently available forecasted annual rates for direct labor, overhead expense, general and administrative expense, and any other factors used in developing the cost proposal. The Offeror shall use the Government estimated annual amounts delineated

below for labor category hours, direct material, equipment, supplies, other direct cost (ODC), and subcontracts in developing the cost proposal.

The IDIQ Base Period and Option Periods each have a 12-month period of performance. For proposal purposes, assume an IDIQ contract date of April 1, 2016. The actual effective date shall be established at contract award.

The Schedule of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost consists of six separate schedules to be completed and submitted by the Offeror – one schedule for the base period, one schedule for each of the four options, and a summary schedule which combines pricing included in the base and option schedules. All elements of price shown on the Schedule of Total Estimated Cost must be consistent with the separate IDIQ schedules.

Offeror may tailor the IDIQ schedule to be consistent with the company’s established cost rate structure or use their own format for the Schedule of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost, if (i) use of the Government’s preferred format will cause an unreasonable burden on resources and (ii) the Offeror’s format provides in substance the same level of detail and information reflected on the Government’s pricing format.

(iii) **Basis of Estimate Narrative for Rates and Factors Proposed for the IDIQ Contract:**

The Offeror shall submit a narrative describing its basis of estimate for each of the direct and indirect rates and factors proposed for the contemplated IDIQ contract. The requirements are:

a. **Direct Labor Costs**

Hourly Rates - Provide written narrative describing the basis of estimate for all proposed direct labor rates (unburdened). Offeror may propose individual wages or category average rates for key and non-key labor category. Despite the estimating method employed, Offeror’s supporting narrative and justification shall provide the current actual hourly wage rate for each key and non-key labor category proposed. Identify the date as of which the actual wage rate is current. If proposed direct labor rates vary from actual wages of key and non-key personnel, explain the basis for those rates. If the Offeror proposes/invoices category average rates, the Offeror must provide the detail of employees and wage rates within each labor category and the average rate computational methodology. Any proposed “new hires” should be identified and provide justification for the wage rate (e.g., letter of intent to hire, company compensation policy). The proposed direct labor rates should trace to supporting justification. Some labor categories may be subject to the Service Contract Act. Utilize WD 05-2071 for determining minimum wage and health and welfare requirements for the applicable labor categories. The Offeror should submit any information reasonably required to explain the estimating process, including the judgmental factors applied and the mathematical or other methods used in the hourly rate estimate.

Annual Labor Hours by Labor Category - The Offeror shall use the Government estimated annual labor hours delineated, below, to develop its proposal and prepare the Schedule of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost.

Labor Category	Base Year Hours	Option 1 Hours	Option 2 Hours	Option 3 Hours	Option 4 Hours
Program Manager	1500	1500	1500	1500	1500
Senior Project Engineer/Manager	20000	20000	20000	20000	20000
Health & Safety Specialist	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000
Engineer/Scientist	40000	40000	40000	40000	40000
Senior Technical Advisor	4000	4000	4000	4000	4000
Technician	2500	2500	2500	2500	2500
Administrative Support	20000	20000	20000	20000	20000

Graphics	20000	20000	20000	20000	20000
Editor	10000	10000	10000	10000	10000
Total Level of Effort	119000	119000	119000	119000	119000

b. Annual Escalation

Offeror must support any proposed escalation factor with convincing rationale, factual data (including actual direct labor rates for at least three years) and complete supporting data and rationale for out-year escalation projections. Supporting documentation may include management approved or human resources approved policy or memo relative to employee raise information.

Offeror not proposing labor increase/escalation must clearly state so. Offeror must provide rationale and or justification sufficient to convince the Government that the company will not provide employee raises/merit increases for all or a particular out-year.

c. Indirect Expense Rates

Provide written narrative describing the basis of estimate for all proposed indirect expense rates. The Offeror should submit any information reasonably required to explain the estimating process, including the judgmental factors applied and the mathematical or other methods used in the estimate.

Provide an overview of the company’s indirect cost rate structure used for estimating purposes. We suggest that the Offeror’s proposal include a summary schedule similar to that below, which identifies the name of each cost burden center and related allocation base. Offer must describe each indirect cost pool. Describe or list the major cost components that make up the indirect cost pool. Offer must describe the allocation bases used in the computation of indirect cost rates. Describe or list the cost elements that comprise each allocation base.

Summary of the Cost Burden Centers Name of the Burden Center	Allocation Base (i.e., the cost base to which the rate is applied)

If formal Forward Pricing Rate Agreement as defined in FAR 15.407-3 has been negotiated, provide a complete copy. Identify the company’s cognizant DCMA and DCAA office and provide current contact information for each.

Provide copies of recent DCAA correspondence, if any, that approves proposed indirect rates.

d. For Facilities Capital Cost Of Money factor(s) proposed, provide the supporting CASB-CMF form, Facilities Capital Cost of Money Factors and Computation. The Offeror should submit any information reasonably required to explain the average net book values and judgmental factors applied and the mathematical or other methods used in the estimate.

If formal Forward Pricing Rate Agreement as defined in FAR 15.407-3 has been negotiated, provide a complete copy. Identify the company’s cognizant DCMA and DCAA office and provide current contact information for each.

Provide copies of recent DCAA correspondence, if any, that approves proposed FCCOM factors.

- e. Other Direct Costs (ODCs) and Subcontract Costs – The Offeror shall use the Government estimated annual ODC and subcontract amount delineated below, to develop its proposal and prepare the Schedule of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost:

	Base Year	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Direct Materials, Equipment, Supplies, and Other Direct Costs	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000	\$1,760,000
Subcontract	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000

- f. Fixed Fee

The Offeror shall propose a fixed fee amount to develop and prepare the Schedule of IDIQ Total Estimated Cost. Profit/Fixed fee will be negotiated on individual task orders based on project risk and complexity. The fee shall be dispensed in accordance with Section B of the solicitation.

(iv) **Company Compensation Plan**

Offeror shall submit for evaluation a total compensation plan setting forth proposed salaries and fringe benefits for only those professional employees identified by the Government on the IDIQ pricing schedules as potentially working on task orders issued against the IDIQ contract. Supporting information will include data, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys and studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total compensation structure.

(v) **Current and Forecasted Company Operating Financial Budget**

The cost proposal should include a copy of the company (i) operating financial budget for the current fiscal year and (ii) the forecasted operating budget for next fiscal year. Each budgetary report should include the company's name and the applicable accounting/operating year.

- The budgetary report should present annual amounts projected by general ledger account and/or account short description. The budgetary report should include the company's projections for sales/revenue, cost of sales (direct costs inputs), operating expenses (overhead), general and administrative expenses and marketing and sales expenses.
- If the budgetary report does not identify general ledger accounts, then Offeror must also provide a copy of its financial chart of accounts
- If a forecasted operating budget for next fiscal year is not prepared, then state so.

(vi) **Current Year-to-Date and 3-Year Historical Rate Data**

Offeror shall submit with their cost proposal a completed Schedule of the Current Year-to-Date (YTD) Accounting Recorded and 3-Year Historical Indirect Expense Pools, Allocation Bases, and Rates, included in the solicitation. Offeror must provide current YTD and a three-year history for each proposed indirect cost center. The Offeror should tailor the schedule (Template) as necessary to reflect the company's actual cost rate structure. Offerors may use their own format for the Schedule of the Current Year-to-Date (YTD) Accounting Recorded and 3-Year Historical Indirect Expense Pools, Allocation Bases, and Rates, if the Offeror's format provides in substance the same level of detail and information reflected on the Government's schedule format.

- a. Historical Data - The historical data must be based on the Offeror's Final Annual Indirect Cost Rates proposal submitted to the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA). If the Offeror submission is not yet due, is past due, or the Offeror was not required to submit an

annual final indirect cost rates proposal, then the historical data must be based on company's actual amounts and rates as accounted for on the official accounting books and records, adjusted for amounts considered unreasonable or unallowable per FAR Part 31 Cost Principles. Offeror's should provide an explanation for any significant high or low rate within the three-year history. If three years of historical data is not available, the Offeror must provide the reason or explain why.

- b. Current YTD – The current YTD data must be based on the Offeror's actual amounts and rates as accounted for on the company's official accounting books and records, adjusted for amounts considered unreasonable or unallowable per FAR Part 31 Cost Principles.

(vii) **Company Financial Statement Report**

The cost proposal should include a company financial statement (F/S) for the most recent completed 12-month financial accounting year. If the Offeror prefers, the requested company financials may also be submitted via separate email from the company's Chief Financial Officer or via separate sealed envelope. Include the balance sheet, income statement, and related notes or management discussion and analysis, if any. Include the cash flow statement if prepared. The submission requirement in descending order of preference is:

- F/S compiled, reviewed, or audited by an independent external auditor.
- Company prepared F/S.
- Accounting system generated F/S.

(viii) **Financial Institution/Bank Information of Prospective Contractor**

Offeror shall submit with their cost proposal the completed form included in the solicitation. This information will be utilized to verify Financial Responsibility as required by FAR Part 9.

(ix) **Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist**

Offeror shall submit with their cost proposal a completed Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist.

- a. If the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) performed an audit or review of the adequacy of the Offeror's accounting system design and for performing on cost reimbursable contracts within the past 36-months, then Offeror need only complete checklist Part 1-DCAA Audit Report Information.
- b. If a DCAA accounting system audit or review is currently "in-process", then Offeror need only complete checklist Part 1, item c.
- c. If the subparagraph (f)(i) and (f)(ii) above do not apply, the Offeror must complete Part 2-Preaward Survey of the Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist. The checklist contains instructions and information.

## SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

SECTION M

## M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD

The Government intends to award one contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government, after evaluation, in accordance with the evaluation factors and subfactors specified in this solicitation.

The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contract; to negotiate with Offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contract to the Offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value and be the most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically rated Offeror. The awarded contract will be accompanied by award of a task order to satisfy the minimum contract guarantee.

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions. Proposals may be found to have either a significant weakness or multiple weaknesses that impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal.

## M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS

The relative weighting of the following factors is as follows:

Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 when combined are approximately equal to Factor 5, Past Performance. The aggregate of Factors 1 – 5 are approximately equal to Factor 6, Cost.

### (1) **Factor 1, Corporate Experience:**

The Government will assess the Offeror's relevant experience as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to meet the requirements, in terms of the volume of work comparable to the scope, magnitude, and complexity, of the anticipated contract. Additionally, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness and viability of the Offeror's approach to managing the contract. The Government seeks management approaches that result in optimal use of resources, are cost effective and are highly responsive to the interests of the Government. Under this factor, the Government will be evaluating the following:

- a. The proposed program management organizational structure, lines of authority for key personnel, and organizational relationships with any proposed Subcontractors. Organizational charts shall be presented. Firms shall indicate the extent of their previous working relationship with any proposed Subcontractors. In the event that the use of Subcontractor(s) in a "team" approach is proposed, wherein the sub(s) will accomplish significant portions of a clearly identifiable scope of work on a consistent basis, a "team" relationship will be considered. In such instances, the prime shall clearly identify the limits of responsibility for each team Subcontractor.
- b. The proposed plan for staffing/resourcing this contract to include handling multiple taskings in various different locations simultaneously.
- c. The Offeror's demonstrated experience in performing recent, relevant projects that are similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity; and managing contracts of the type and magnitude as that anticipated under this solicitation, as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror's

relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the solicitation. The Government will only review a maximum of 10 projects for element (c) above and a maximum of 3 contracts for element (d) above as indicated in the solicitation submittal requirements of this section. Any projects submitted in excess of the maximum amount and page limits specified will not be considered.

- d. The Government may consider the experience of a subcontractor where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement with the subcontractor.

A subcontractor's experience may not be given the same level of consideration as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner.

- e. Prime contractor-subcontractor teams/Joint Ventures/LLCs/LPs with a demonstrated history of working successfully together on prior projects may be considered more favorably than those without such history.

- f. To be minimally qualified, Offerors must demonstrate experience with the following:

- Experience with technical tasks described in Section C, Part 3.
- Experience with Navy and DoD Environmental Restoration, Environmental Compliance, Natural Resource, Munitions Response/Range Sustainability and Health & Safety Programs.
- Experience with state and federal environmental regulatory agencies/departments.

- g. Offerors may be evaluated more favorably by demonstrating the following:

- Projects that demonstrate successful optimization efforts that reduced project cost or time and added unique technical value
- Successful execution of projects where standards and methods for execution were not commonly accepted, or that had uniquely complicated site conditions
- Projects performed for the DoD as opposed to other federal agencies or other clients.
- Projects where proposed teaming partners for this contract have teamed with the Offeror in the past on similar work.

- h. The Government will only evaluate corporate experience under this factor and will not evaluate experience of individual employees.

**(2) Factor 2, Key Personnel:**

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates recent, relevant Key Personnel qualifications including education, training, and experience in performing the depth, breadth, and volume of work anticipated under this contract. The assessment of the Offeror's relevant Key Personnel qualifications will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Key Personnel to successfully meet the requirements of the solicitation using the proposed Key Personnel. Experience will be evaluated on the scope, magnitude, and complexity of the work performed as compared to the requirements contemplated under this solicitation and described in Section C. Scope, magnitude, and complexity are defined under Evaluation Factor 1, Corporate Experience.

- a. Firms will be evaluated based on the qualifications of their proposed key personnel. At a minimum, Key Personnel must meet the education, training, and experience qualifications described in Section H of the solicitation to be considered for this contract.

- b. Offerors may be evaluated more favorably by demonstrating the following Key personnel experience:

- Experience with technical tasks described in Section C, Part 3.
- Projects that demonstrate successful optimization efforts that reduced project cost or time and added unique technical value

- Successful execution of projects where standards and methods for execution were not commonly accepted, or that had uniquely complicated site conditions
  - Projects performed for DoD as opposed to other federal agencies or other clients.
- c. Offerors may be evaluated less favorably if Key Personnel do not demonstrate experience with the scope, magnitude, and complexity of the work performed as compared to the requirements contemplated under this solicitation and described in Section C, Part 3.

(3) **Factor 3, Safety:**

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures for itself and its subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall safety record, the Offeror's plan to select and monitor subcontractors, any and innovative safety methods that the Offeror plans to implement for this procurement. The Government's sources of information for evaluating safety may include, but are not limited to, OSHA, NAVFAC's Facility Accident and Incident Reporting (FAIR) database, and other related databases. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete safety information regarding these submittal requirements rests with the Offeror. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR): The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate: The Government will evaluate the OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety: The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(4) **Factor 4, Small Business Utilization:**

**SUBFACTOR 4.A – PAST PERFORMANCE IN UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS**

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates the proposer's level of past performance in utilizing Small Business (SB) concerns, AbilityOne, Mentor-Protégé Agreements, and other socio-economic programs, as defined in FAR Parts 26.1 and 26.2, in subcontracting, and in meeting established Small Business subcontracting goals.

**SUBFACTOR 4.B – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

**The following will be evaluated on all proposals:**

- a. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates maximum practicable participation of SBs in terms of the total value of the acquisition, including options.
- b. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a commitment to use SB concerns that are specifically identified in the proposal, including but not limited to use of mentor protégé programs.
- c. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates SB participation in a variety of industries expected during the performance of work.
- d. The realism of the proposal to meet the proposed goals.

**The following will be evaluated on proposals submitted by Large Business firms:**

- a. The extent to which the proposal provides Small Business Subcontracting goals that meet or exceed the minimum NAVFAC Small Business Subcontracting Targets, and utilization of AbilityOne CRP organizations. Proposals that provide goals exceeding the NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets may be rated higher. The proposed goals and NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are expressed as a percentage of total subcontracted values. The minimum NAVFAC Subcontracting Targets are as follows:

	<b>FY2016</b>	<b>FY2017</b>	<b>FY2018</b>	<b>FY2019</b>	<b>FY2020</b>	<b>FY2021</b>
<b>SB</b>	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
<b>SDB</b>	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
<b>WOSB</b>	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
<b>HUBZone</b>	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
<b>VOSB</b>	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
<b>SDVOSB</b>	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%

- b. The extent to which the proposer's Small Business Subcontracting Plan establishes reasonable efforts demonstrating the subcontracting targets can be met during the performance of the contract.

**(5) Factor 5, Past Performance:**

This factor evaluates the degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g., PPIRS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source) reflect a trend of satisfactory performance considering:

- (a) A pattern of successful completion of tasks;
- (b) A pattern of deliverables that are timely and of good quality;
- (c) A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels (task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc);
- (d) Recency of tasks performed that are identical to, similar to, or related to the task at hand; and
- (e) A respect for stewardship of Government funds.

The Government may consider the past performance of a subcontractor where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement with the subcontractor.

A subcontractor's past performance may not be given the same level of consideration as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner.

Prime contractor-subcontractor teams/Joint Ventures/LLCs/LPs with a demonstrated history of working successfully together on prior projects may be considered more favorably than those without such history.

The Government will evaluate each Offeror's past performance using a two-step process. First, the Government will evaluate the relevancy of all projects submitted by the Offeror and other information available (Relevancy Assessment). Second, the Government will, considering relevancy and the Offeror's performance on those projects, assign a Performance Confidence Assessment Rating.

(a) Relevancy Assessment. The Government will conduct a relevancy assessment of each project submitted by the Offeror to determine how similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity the work performed under the submitted projects relates to the work anticipated under this contract. The Government is not obliged to seek out and consider information other than the information the Offeror submits, but may at its discretion consider recent and relevant information involving other projects. This may include information submitted on other procurements, information in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), information in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), information in the Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), interviews with Government customers and commercial clients, and any other information available. The Government will evaluate the relevancy of projects based on the evaluation scale in the table below. The terms “scope”, “magnitude” and “complexity” in the following table have broad meaning such that evaluators will consider any feature of a past project which has a predicative effect on performance on the current contract.

The purpose of assessing relevancy is to take into account the predictive value of past effort toward success on this contract. Therefore, work performed under a Government contract may be considered more relevant than work performed under a commercial contract. In addition, past performance as a prime contractor may be more relevant than the past effort performed as a sub-contractor.

<b>Past Performance Relevancy Ratings</b>	
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.

(b) Overall Performance Confidence Assessment Rating. Taking into account the Relevancy Assessment (Step 1), and the quality of performance on the past projects, the Government will assign an overall performance confidence assessment rating for this factor (past performance rating) based on the scale in the table below. Offerors for whom past performance information is not available or is so sparse that no rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably and, as a result, will receive an “Unknown Confidence” rating for this factor. A favorable record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than an “Unknown Confidence” rating.

<b>Performance Confidence Assessments</b>	
Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
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.

(6) **Factor 6, Cost:**

- (i) **Cost Realism Analysis:** The Government will conduct a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d) to determine the probable cost of performance for each Offeror. The analysis will address the amounts proposed for the IDIQ. The probable cost is determined by adjusting each Offeror's proposed cost (and fixed-fee, if necessary) to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis. The probable cost may differ from the proposed cost and will reflect the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract which is likely to result from the contractor's proposal. The sum of the total probable cost determined for the IDIQ shall be the amount used to determine the best value (trade-off).

In addition, the Government will assess the adequacy and completeness of the offeror provided information required for this factor. Offerors that submit inadequate or incomplete information may be considered non-responsive.

The Government intends to evaluate all options and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990) in Section M of the solicitation. In accordance with this clause, the Government is not obligated to exercise the option(s).

- (ii) **Company Compensation Plan:** the Government will evaluate the compensation plan to assess whether those professional employees identified by the Government on the IDIQ pricing schedules are compensated fairly and properly. Plans indicating unrealistically low professional employee compensation may be assessed adversely as one of the factors considered in making an award.

(End of Summary of Changes)