Amendment 0005

SECTION M: EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (REVISED)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PARA NO.	TITLE
M1	GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN OBSERVERS
M2	PREFERENCE FOR MAKING MULTIPLE AWARDS
M3	MAGNITUDE OF THE ACQUISITION
M4	BASIS OF AWARD
M5	INTENT TO AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS
M6	COMPETITIVE RANGE
M7	ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL
M8	EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
M9	PRE-AWARD SURVEY/RESPONSIBILITY

SECTION M - Evaluation Factors for Award

M1 GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN OBSERVERS: Offerors are advised that officials of the Government of Japan (GOJ) will be observing the source selection process, the evaluation of proposals and the review of other documentation. Accordingly, submission of a proposal in response to this synopsis and referenced solicitation will be considered evidence of your consent and permission for the Contracting Officer to reveal your proposal and related submissions to participating GOJ officials (who will, in turn, sign Non-Disclosure Statements that will be retained in the contract files).

M2 PREFERENCE FOR MAKING MULTIPLE AWARDS

This procurement consists of a single solicitation with the intent to award a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of six (6) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) type service contracts to the offerors whose proposals, conforming to the solicitation, will be the most advantageous to the Government resulting in the best value, price and technical factors considered. The Government prefers to award a minimum of three (3) contracts in each of the two Divisions, unless all successful offerors are small business concerns—which would eliminate the need for two Divisions (see M4 below). The Government reserves the right to award more than six (6) contracts if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. Successful awardees (also called MAC Holders) will compete for future work during the term of the multiple award contracts.

M3 MAGNITUDE OF THE ACQUISITION

The estimated workload for the Unrestricted Division is approximately $29 million and the amount for the SBSA Division is approximately $20 million, for a combined Not-to-Exceed (NTE) aggregate amount of $49 million. These amounts are subject to change based on the needed Natural Resources Management Services specific tasks ordered by the Government.

M4 BASIS FOR AWARD

1. The contracts resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to those responsible Offerors whose offers, conforming to the solicitation, are determined to be the most advantageous to the Government considering “Price” and “Technical” evaluation factors. Award may be made to other than the lowest priced Offerors or other than the highest technically rated Offerors. The “technical” evaluation factors, when combined, are considered significantly more important than “price.” Business judgments and tradeoffs will be used to determine the proposals offering the “Best Value” to the Government. In determining the best value to the Government, the Government need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the best value decisions.

2. 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.

3. Rating Scheme. The following information is pertinent to the rating of the technical proposals:

a. Strength: A proposed method or technique in the proposal that is of value to the Government and increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.

b. Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

c. Significant Weakness: A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

d. Deficiency: A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

4. As set forth in Section H, paragraph H1, this Natural Resources Management Services MAC will be competed as an unrestricted procurement with a partial small business set-aside. The resulting multiple award contracts will be comprised of two major divisions: An Unrestricted Division established for competing and awarding task orders to perform Government of Japan (GOJ) funded projects that support the Defense Policy Review Initiative (DPRI)/Guam Realignment, and a partial Small Business Set Aside (SBSA) Division established for competing projects funded by United States appropriations (in support of either DPRI or non-DPRI requirements). The selection of the MAC Holders will be made in the manner described below as required by FAR 19.502-3(c)(1) & (2).

a. The contracting officer shall award the non-set-aside portion (Unrestricted Division) using normal contracting procedures.

b. After all awards have been made on the non-set-aside portion, the contracting officer shall negotiate with eligible concerns on the set-aside portion (SBSA Division), as provided in the solicitation, and make award. Negotiations shall be conducted only with those offerors who have submitted responsive offers on the non-set-aside portion (Unrestricted Division).

c. Pursuant to the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, Section 1331, and the Small Business Administration Final Rule (effective 31 DEC 2013), the set-aside portion will be competed amongst all Small Business Concerns that submitted responsive offers for the non-set-aside portion of the solicitation.

d. While the non-set-aside portion (Unrestricted Division) will utilize normal contracting procedures (as set forth in FAR Part 15), it is possible that one or more of the offerors determined to be the most advantageous to the Government could be small business concerns. If all successful offerors in the Unrestricted Division are small business concerns, the Government may elect not to award additional contracts under the SBSA Division.

M5 INTENT TO AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The Government intends to evaluate all proposals received and award a contract or contracts without conducting discussions; therefore, your initial proposal shall conform to the solicitation requirements and should contain your best offer from a technical and price standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions.

M6 COMPETITIVE RANGE

If discussions are deemed necessary to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value, discussions will be held with those Offerors determined to be within the competitive range. The Government 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, considering technical merit and price.

M7 ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL

The proposals must set forth full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract or contracts. By submission of the offer, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., key personnel, subcontractors, management plan, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract and any substitutions will be equal or better than as proposed and accepted for contract award and shall require prior Contracting Officer's approval.

M8 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. The evaluation factors are as follows:

FACTOR 1, EXPERIENCE
FACTOR 2, SAMPLE PROJECT
FACTOR 3, SAFETY
FACTOR 4, SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION

SUBFACTOR 4A, PAST PERFORMANCE IN UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS
SUBFACTOR 4B, SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION
FACTOR 5, PAST PERFORMANCE
FACTOR 6, PRICE

2. The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors and their respective subfactors are as follows: Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 are of equal importance to each other, and, when combined are equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment Factor 5. Subfactors within Factor 4 are in ascending order of importance (i.e., Subfactor 4B is weighted more heavily than Subfactor 4A). When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factors and past performance/performance confidence assessment factor combined are significantly more important than price. The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-cost/price proposals are considered essentially equal in terms of overall quality, or if price is so high as to significantly diminish the value of a non-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award may be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered.

3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS (FACTORS 1 – 5).

a. NOTES applicable to Factor 1, Experience of The Firm and Factor 5, Past Performance on Recent, Relevant Projects:

(1) Definition of "recent relevant project" is as follows:

A. In general, relevant project means projects whose scopes of work were similar to the types of projects that may be ordered against this MAC that require the performance of one or more of the Specific Tasks described in Section C, paragraphs 3.1 through 3.27. A relevant project must be either a standalone contract or task order under an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract. The submission of information or the description of the scope of a Basic IDIQ contract will not be considered a relevant project.

B. A relevant project shall also be for an amount of at least $24,000 in dollar value and shall be 100% completed as of the issuance date of this solicitation. A relevant project shall involve performance of natural resources management services. A relevant project must be either a standalone contract or task order under an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract. The submission of information or the description of the scope of a Basic IDIQ contract will not be considered a relevant project.

C. Recent is defined as five (5) years from the issuance date of this solicitation.

(2) There is a clear distinction between "experience" and "past performance." Experience pertains to previously executed relevant projects. Past performance pertains to how well a contractor performed those same relevant projects.

(3) Definition: "Offeror" typically refers to a single corporation or business entity submitting the proposal as a prime contractor. "Offeror" is also defined as other legal entities such as joint ventures, Limited Partnerships (LTD), or a Limited Liability Company (LLC). In its evaluation of past performance and experience, the Government's evaluation will generally focus on the entity submitting the proposal (single corporation, individual joint venture partners, or the LTD or LLC identified on the SF33). Corporations, joint ventures, partnerships, and other similar entities may not be a part to more than one offeror. Failure to comply with this may result in disqualification of the offeror for contract award.

(4) If proposing as a joint venture, LTD, or LLC, the Offeror shall submit a legally binding joint venture agreement, LTD or LLC Operating Agreement, and/or Teaming Agreement with their proposal that clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of each of the member firms. In addition, the Offer shall include a detailed statement outlining the following terms or percentages where appropriate:

A. The relationship of the team/partners/parties in terms of business ownership, capital contribution, profit distribution or loss sharing.

B. The management approach in terms of who will conduct, direct, supervise, control and the controlling partner's authority to obligate the entity.

C. The structure and decision-making responsibilities of the team/partners/parties in terms of who will control the manner and method of performance of work.

D. Identify the personnel having the authority to legally bind the offeror including the person authorized to sign the SF33 and bonds.

E. Set forth procedures to be followed in the event that the entity is dissolved due to unforeseen circumstances, such as the bankruptcy of a member.

F. A list of partners/parties, to include company names, DUNS and CAGE numbers, addresses, points of contact, email addresses, phone numbers and facsimile numbers.

(5) If an Offeror is utilizing or relying on experience or past performance information from affiliates/ subsidiaries/parent companies/LLC/LTD member companies (where their name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm/LLC/LTD member companies will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract in order for the experience, past performance, and/or key personnel information of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm/LLC/LTD member companies to be considered. The proposal shall state the specific resources (e.g., workforce, management, facilities, or other resources) that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will commit toward the performance of the contract. If meaningful involvement is not demonstrated in the proposal, the affiliate, subsidiary or parent company's experience or past performance and/or key personnel information will not be considered.

(6) A subcontractor's experience and past performance will not be given the same level of consideration as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner because there is no direct legal relationship between the Government and a subcontractor. The Government may consider the experience or past performance 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. However, the level of consideration will depend on the extent to which the proposal demonstrates the subcontractor's commitment to the project and legal accountability and will not be accorded the same level of consideration as a prime contractor's experience or past performance.

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

b. <u>EVALUATION FACTOR 1, EXPERIENCE</u>

(1) The Offeror will demonstate its technical experience performing the type, complexity, and quantity of specific tasks described in Section C paragraphs 3.1 to 3.27. This technical factor will be used to measure the probability of successful accomplishment of the work contemplated under this contract.

(2) Solicitation Submittal Requirements. Offerors shall:

A. Use Attachment J-11 to describe experiences with no more than **ten (10)** relevant projects completed within the last five (5) years that individually or collectively are similar in scope and complexity to the specific tasks described in Section C, paragraphs 3.1 to 3.27. The Offeror shall not submit more than 2 pages that are single-sided per project.

B. Use Attachment J-12 to describe capability and capacity to deliver on-schedule products similar to the type and complexity of the specific tasks described in Section C of this solicitation assuming a workload of up to 5 projects with an aggregate amount of at least $1M at multiple locations within the solicitation area of responsibility occurring concurrently in addition to ongoing work for other clients.

C. Use Attachment J-14 to detail experience for each person who will be assigned as Key Personnel who work on this contract. Key personnel are the Principal and Project Managers for each specific task described in Section C paragraphs 3.1 to 3.27 of this solicitation. Key Personnel and their minimum qualifications are described in Attachment J-2. The Offeror shall provide information on a maximum of four (4) recent, relevant projects that were completed by each Key personnel that would demonstrate their project experience. The Offeror shall not submit more than 3 pages single-sided per Key Personnel. Experience that is not related to the specific tasks described in Section C paragraphs 3.1 to 3.27 of this solicitation should not be included in Attachment J-14. A letter of commitment shall be provided for each proposed key personnel, and shall include the key personnel's role in the contract. Offerors shall not submit Attachment J-14 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.

D. Use Attachment J-18 to detail the roles of each key personnel, the company they work for, and assigned specific tasks that are described Section C of this RFP.

(3) Contractors are required to use the attachments listed above to document experience. Experience that is provided outside the furnished attachments will not be considered.

(4) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates recent relevant corporate and key personnel experience by the Offeror (including an evaluation of the applicable credentials such as training, education, and experience of Key Personnel) in performing the depth, breadth, and volume of specific tasks in Section C of this solicitation. Experience will be evaluated on the (1) complexity, (2) scope, (3) contract volume/ project size and/or (4) location of the work performed as compared to the requirements contemplated under this solicitation and described in Section C paragraphs 3.1 through 3.27.

A. Minimum Required Experience: To be considered for this contract, the Offeror must demonstrate experience (in project AND key personnel experience) in the following seven (7) specific tasks described in Section C of this solicitation:

- Section C 3.2: Avian surveys
- Section C 3.8: Live capture trapping
- Section C 3.9: Focused botanical surveys
- Section C 3.10: Vegetation surveys
- Section C 3.11:Vegetation restoration
- Section C 3.14: Wetland restoration planning
- Section C 3.21 (Subsections 3.21.1 and 3.21.1.1 to 3.21.1.3): Invasive Species Management

B. The offeror will be evaluated more favorably on experience that involves the following types of specific tasks from Section C, listed below by section. For each additional task the offeror will be given an additional strength.

- Section C 3.19: Regulatory Wildlife Assessments
- Section C 3.5: Herpetological surveys
- Section C 3.23: Invasive species fencing

C. Minimum Key Personnel Requirements: Key personnel must meet the education, training, and experience qualifications described in Attachment J-2 to be considered for this contract.

D. Letters of commitment shall be submitted for all key personnel including subcontractor key personnel.

E. The government may evaluate more favorably project experience working in Guam, Hawaii, or the Northern Marianas Islands.

F. Offerors that demonstrate experience working for the Navy/Marine Corps may be evaluated more favorably.

G. Failure to use and completely fill out the templates referenced above or provide the required information may result in proposals being considered deficient for this Factor 1 Experience.

c. EVALUATION FACTOR 2 – SAMPLE PROJECT

(1) The Offeror will demonstrate its technical approach for the sample project described in Attachment J-9. This technical factor will be used to measure the Offeror's understanding of and probability of successfully accomplishing the effort. The sample project is for evaluation purposes only and will not be awarded or result in a task order.

(2) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

A. **Technical Approach**: Submit a narrative describing the Offeror's proposed technical approach for accomplishing each task described in the sample project. The Offeror will submit the work plans and schedule of deliverables.

B. **Staffing Plan**: Use Attachment J-18, Key Personnel Assignments, to list key personnel assigned to specific tasks in the sample project, including subcontractors. Experience of Key personnel assigned to the project shall be provided using Attachment J-14 Key Personnel. Offerors that have already provided Attachment J-14 under Factor 1 for the Key Personnel they want to assign to this Sample Project do not need to submit a second copy of Attachment J-14. Offerors may state which key personnel will be used for the sample project and reference the Attachments J-14 submitted under Factor 1.

C. **Assumptions**: The offeror shall not make assumptions. If the offeror is not clear on the scope of the project, they shall clarify the scope with the contract specialist.

(3) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's technical approach for the sample project (1) demonstrates an understanding of the scope of work, and (2) is a realistic approach for successful completion of the sample project within a reasonable time frame. Proposals that demonstrate a thorough understanding of the technical and logistical complexities of the work will be evaluated more favorably. Proposals that offer added value through unique approaches to the scope of work will also be evaluated more favorably. Proposals that cannot realistically or successfully accomplish the required tasks with the proposed approach/labor hours will be evaluated less favorably. Offerors failing to provide clarifying descriptions/details on how they intend to implement each task (beyond what is described in Attachment J-9 will be deemed to have failed to demonstrate an understanding of the work and will be evaluated less favorably.

d. EVALUATION FACTOR 3 - SAFETY

(1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements. Note: For any partnership (JV, LLC, LTD, etc.), the following submittal requirements must be provided for each partner firm; however, only one safety narrative is required. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors. The Offeror shall submit the following information:

A. Experience Modification Rate (EMR): For the *three* previous complete calendar years 2012, 2013, 2014, submit your EMR for each of these years (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.

B. 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 for each of these years, 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.

C. 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 two (2) pages.

(2) **Basis of Evaluation**: 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, and any 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:

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

e. EVALUATION FACTOR 4 – <u>SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION</u>

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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 Central Contractor Registration (CCR) website at www.ccr.gov. It is the responsibility of the prime contractor to periodically check the CCR as certifications are subject to change.

(4) SUBFACTOR 4A – PAST PERFORMANCE IN UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

A. Solicitation Submittal Requirements: Proposals that do not include responses addressing ALL elements of the requirements stated below (a. through g.) must include an explanation why that element is not addressed.

(i) 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 contracts 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. If more than five evaluation ratings are provided, only the first five will 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)).

(ii) Provide information on national 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.

(iii) 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.

(iv) Provide information on past use of Community Rehabilitation Program (CRP) organizations certified under the AbilityOne Program by NISH 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.

(v) Provide small business subcontracting history. Large businesses with Federal contracting experience shall provide completed or most recently approved SF294s "Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts" or Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISRs) on all contracts referenced under Factor 5 Past Performance. Reports for recently completed projects are desired, however, in the absence of recently completed project reports, interim reports may be considered if the project is at least 80% complete. If more than five (5) reports are provided, only the first five (5) will be considered. If goals were not met on submitted contracts, provide an explanation as to why. Newly established Large Businesses, or Large Businesses with no prior SF294/ISR history shall submit a subcontracting history on Attachment J-15, Small Business Past Performance.

(vi) Small Business proposers shall provide a subcontracting history on Attachment J-15, Small Business Past Performance.

(vii) 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 business entity, provide past performance information, elements a. through f., for each individual business entity(ies) that will be responsible for managing the subcontracting program/plan.

B. Basis of Evaluation:

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.

(5) SUBFACTOR 4.B – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

A. 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-16 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-17 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).

B. Basis of Evaluation:

The following will be evaluated on all proposals:

(i) The extent to which the proposal demonstrates maximum practicable participation of SBs in terms of the total value of the acquisition, including options.
(ii) 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.
(iii) The extent to which the proposal demonstrates SB participation in a variety of industries expected during the performance of work.
(iv) The realism of the proposal to meet the proposed goals.

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

(i) 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:

(Include interim targets for all option years when applicable)

	FY 2015-2019 ACTUAL/PROJECTED TARGETS				
	FY2015	**FY2016**	**FY2017**	**FY2018**	**FY2019**
Subcontracting					
Small Business	**66.80%**	66.94%	67.07%	67.20%	67.33%
HUBZone Small Business	**8.94%**	9.03%	9.12%	9.21%	9.30%
Small Disadvantaged Business	**17.27%**	17.44%	17.62%	17.79%	17.97%
Women-Owned Small Business	**15.30%**	15.45%	15.61%	15.77%	15.93%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned SB	**3.03%**	3.06%	3.09%	3.12%	3.15%

(ii) 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:

C. A copy of the blank forms to be used for offeror submission of Small Business Utilization are included as follows:

Attachment J-15 – Small Business Past Performance
Attachment J-16 – Small Business Subcontracting Plan
Attachment J-17 – Small Business Participation Breakdown

f. EVALUATION FACTOR 5 – PAST PERFORMANCE

(1) The Offeror's past performance evaluation will be based upon customer satisfaction in the execution of the same recent relevant projects submitted for Factor 1 (Experience) and completed or substantially completed projects within the last five (5) years that are similar to the specific tasks described in Section C. Customer satisfaction will include assessing quality control and timely performance.

(2) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

A. IF A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION IS AVAILABLE, IT SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. IF THERE IS NOT A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation as Attachment J-13 is provided for the offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 1, Experience of The Firm. AN OFFEROR SHALL NOT SUBMIT A PPQ WHEN A COMPLETED CPARS IS AVAILABLE.

B. IF A CPARS EVALUATION IS NOT AVAILABLE, ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed PPQs 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 (Attachment J-13), which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Jean Kuboyama, via email at jean.kuboyama@navy.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

C. Also include performance recognition documents received within the last five (5) years, such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

D. In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through 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.

E. 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.

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

A. A subcontractor's past performance may be submitted for evaluation where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement that creates legal responsibility on the part of the subcontractor.

B. Projects will be compared against the requirements of Section C in complexity, volume/size, scope, and location. The more they are similar to the requirements in this solicitation, the more relevancy will be attributed to the past performance.

C. A subcontractor's past performance will be given less consideration than a prime contractor's past performance. The level of consideration will depend on the extent to which the proposal demonstrates the subcontractor's commitment to the contract and legal accountability. Prime-subcontractor or JV arrangements with a demonstrated history of working successfully together on prior projects may be considered more favorably than arrangements without such history.

g. EVALUATION FACTOR 6 - PRICE

(1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

A. A sample project will be utilized for the price evaluation (Attachment J-9). Offerors are required to use the template sample project price sheet (Attachment J-10) and include all pricing information as specified for the five (5) subline items 0001AA through 0001AE and the Total Amount.

B. Offerors shall submit their completed sample project price sheet for sample project 1 in their Price Proposal binder/folder (see Section L for additional information).

(2) Basis of Evaluation:

A. The offeror's proposed prices will be evaluated to verify the offeror's understanding of the requirements and to assess the accuracy with which the proposed prices represent the most probable cost of performance for each of the sample projects. An offer may be declared unbalanced if its prices are found to be either unreasonably high or unrealistically low in relation to the proposed work, which may result in a less than favorable rating.

B. The Government will evaluate each offeror's Total Price. Total Price consists of the sum for all offered amounts for the following four (4) subline items 0001AA, AB, AC, and AE for the sample project. Subline item 0001AD will be reviewed to understand how offerors price travel and per diem. However, because firms situated at the execution site of the sample project will not incur travel and per diem costs, the Basis of Evaluation will not include subline item 0001AD to determine the most advantageous price offered. The Government may utilize one of more of the following price analysis techniques:

(i) Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation.
(ii) Comparison of proposed prices with the Independent Government Estimate.
(iii) Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.
(iv) Comparison to market survey results.

M9 PRE-AWARD SURVEY/RESPONSIBILITY DETERMINATION

1. FAR §9.104 requires prospective contractors to demonstrate, among other things, that they have adequate financial resources to perform the contract or the ability to obtain them, capability to comply with the required performance schedule, a satisfactory performance record, and be otherwise eligible to receive an award under applicable laws and regulations. The pre-award survey is not a part of the technical evaluation. The following information shall be submitted as part of your Price Proposal:

a. Company financial statements (balance sheets and income statements) for past three years.

b. Financial resources available to perform the contract. Submit evidence of availability of working/operating capital that will be used for the performance of the contract. If the offeror plans to rely on financial support from other sources, identify the maximum lines of credit that will be available to include documentation to support the amounts. The maximum lines of credit should be based upon the inclusion of this contract effort. For joint ventures, discuss the financial responsibilities among companies and provide same information for each partner.

c. Newly-formed entities (e.g. limited liability companies ("LLC's"), limited partnerships ("LTD's") and newly-created corporate subsidiaries) that are responsible and liable for the contract ordinarily have no record–or an insufficient record–of relevant experience, past performance, and financial capability to support a responsibility determination. In such cases, the offeror may rely on the resources of the LLC member, parent, limited partner, or other entities related to the offeror for responsibility purposes where the offeror submits a guaranty from the entity providing the resources.

d. A list of existing commercial and government business commitments to include contract numbers, names of Contracting Officers, telephone numbers, value of contracts, completion dates and percent complete. If the list of existing commitments is extensive, provide the required information on at least five projects of similar dollar value and a summary of the existing commitments to include number of contracts, total dollar value of all contracts, and total dollar value of work remaining.