

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (Date February 9, 2022)

M.1 PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA- TWO STEP SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES

General Requirements: The evaluation criteria to be used by the Contracting Officer for the selection of a contractor to perform the work specified herein are defined below. The criteria are divided into Technical and Price categories. In Step 2 the Technical Evaluation Criteria, when combined with each factor, are significantly more important than price. However, as the difference in technical merit between the proposals becomes less significant, the relative importance of the proposed prices will increase. In Step 2 the evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance with the most important listed first (i.e., Factor 3 is more important than Factor 4, etc.).

Proposal Evaluation Definitions:

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.

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

Risk: The potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or sub-factor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

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

Strength: An aspect of a proposal that appreciably decreases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance or that represents a significant benefit to the Government.

Offeror: The offeror includes the complete offeror's "team" – i.e., the prime firm and its subcontracting firms, taken as a whole.

Relevant: "Relevant" means having a logical connection with the requirements in this RFP; that is, featuring work that is similar in nature, magnitude, and complexity to the current requirement.

M1.1 Technical Evaluation Criteria

The criteria to be used in assessing the quality of each proposal are:

M.1.2 Corporate Experience and Expertise ((Equal in Importance to Past Performance)

Evaluation Factor #1:

The Government will evaluate the corporate experience and expertise of the prime offeror and its subcontractor to determine the extent of its experience and qualifications and its subcontractors in providing the construction to projects of similar scope, size, magnitude, and complexity during the last ten years. The

ability to self-perform warrants a proposal strength. Expertise with projects of higher complexity warrants a proposal strength. Additional consideration will be given to offerors whose experiences as a prime contractor with the proposed subcontractors is demonstrated together on previous projects similar in scope, size, magnitude and complexity.

M.1.3 Past Performance (Equal in Importance to Corporate Experience and Expertise)

Evaluation Factor #2:

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance to employ sound managerial, technical, construction and operational techniques and control risks to complete a project of the magnitude and complexity of this procurement.

The Government will evaluate the Past Performance Evaluations or letters of recommendation to determine whether, and to the extent which, the offeror, to include subcontractors have demonstrated a satisfactory record of conforming to contract requirements and to standards of good workmanship; a satisfactory record of forecasting and controlling costs; a satisfactory record of adhering to contract schedules, including administrative aspects of performance; breadth of experience, a satisfactory history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and, generally evidence of a business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

The Government will consider the relevancy and currency of the information, source of the information, and trends in contract performance. Additional consideration will be given for higher performance ratings on relevant projects. The Government will evaluate and the offeror shall provide performance assessments in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) for relevant projects completed in the last five years.

The contractor will be rated in accordance with the procedures outlined in Federal Acquisition Regulation 42.1503. Below is a table representation for how the past performance will be rated.

| Past Performance Relevancy Ratings | |
|---|--|
| Rating | Definition |
| Exceptional | Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective. |
| Very Good | Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was effective. |
| Satisfactory | Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory. |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Marginal | Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. |
| Unsatisfactory | Past performance not relevant. Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective. |

STEP 2

M.1.4 Project Management Plan with Technical Approach (Most Important Factor)

Evaluation Factor #3

The Government will evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and any deficiencies in the offeror's overall project management plan and technical approach, including the offeror's understanding of the solicitation and contract plans and specifications to execute the requirements of this solicitation. The Government will evaluate the offeror's Key management approaches, policies and procedures to be implemented on this project, Project management and quality control procedures, technical approach to complete the work while maintaining the Capitol Power Plant fully operational, project safety, steps to safely complete work on - time and within budget, identified challenges, risks and plans to overcome risks, plans to interact with the AOC, Designer, Construction Manager and Capitol Power Plant Operations, Project Communications plan, Risk Management Plan, Commissioning of work and systems and sub-contractor oversight plan.

The Government will evaluate clarity and strength of the overall organization and offerors and subcontractors ability to execute project requirements and the matrix of responsibilities for the offeror and each major subcontractor(s) in executing key activities,

The Government will evaluate the offerors proposed methods to streamline construction, manage labor and other resources in an effort to reduce costs and support an aggressive schedule. The Government will also consider whether the approach reduces on-site craft, susceptibility to inclement weather, addresses the unique challenges and its risks associated with this project in replacing large bore piping, project coordination and maintaining the Capitol Power Plant fully operational.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's Quality Control Plan to determine how well the offeror identifies and demonstrates capabilities to assure quality control in meeting the requirements of the solicitation

M.1.6 Proposed Contract Duration and Summary Schedule

Evaluation Factor #4

The Government will evaluate the contract duration, as proposed by the Offeror in the Contract Line Item Schedule, not to exceed the maximum allowed duration of as outlined in Section L, stating estimated 730 calendar days, assuming the Government will execute bid options 1 and 2. In assessing the reasonableness of the proposed contract duration, the Government may take into account how well the proposed summary

schedule supports the proposed duration, as well as use other information, such as but not limited to independent judgment concerning logic, constraints and typical construction durations.

The Government will consider an unreasonably condensed contract duration, which places additional cost or schedule risk on the Government or which may create a risk of contract or performance failure, as a significant weakness or a deficiency, depending upon the evaluators' judgment.

During the subsequent comparison between proposals, differences between proposed contract durations of at least four weeks (differences of 28 calendar days between proposals) will be considered an advantage to the Government, with greater differences also considered, accordingly. No advantage will be considered between proposals for differences less than 28 calendar days. This duration will become the contractually binding completion period.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror summary schedule to determine if it meets and corresponds to the Offeror's Management Plan and Technical Approach

M.1.7 Key Personnel

Evaluation Factor #5

The Government will evaluate the required information to determine how well the offeror identifies and demonstrates that its key personnel has the experience, education, skills and training necessary to successfully perform the role identified for this project.

The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror demonstrates that it has the necessary structure and experienced, qualified personnel within its organization to effectively manage, control, administer and execute the integrated construction operations, quality control program, commissioning and subcontracts.

Additional consideration will be given to offeror's whose proposed personnel have previous teaming experience on past projects meeting the minimum requirements of phased construction at a refrigeration plant, heavy mechanical and electrical work.

M.1.8 Sub-Contractor Experience

Evaluation Factor #6

The Government will evaluate the offeror's subcontractors relating to the requirements of this solicitation, the clarity and strength of the overall organization, the structure and staffing, and successfully completed projects to ensure they are relevant in type, size and complexity. Major subcontractors have been identified to include mechanical, electrical and controls. If the offeror self performs more than 50% of the work associated with a major subcontractor, that will be viewed as a strength but must be noted in the proposal.

M.2 PRICE CRITERIA. The Government will evaluate the price proposals of all Step 2 offerors found technically qualified. Price criterion measure not only actual dollars but reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed price and its position in the range of all prices.

A firm fixed-price shall be entered by each Step 2 offeror on the Schedule page for each line item (line item pricing, options, and unit prices) which shall represent the cost for performing the work required by this Solicitation. Currently there are eight (8) tasks in the solicitation to include a Base Item. Bid Option 1 includes the same eight (8) tasks with expanded scope as described in the construction documents. Bid Options 2, 3 and 4 are to be priced based on the same tasks as Bid Option 1, but with escalated costs based

on various delayed Bid Option Notice to Proceed dates from Base Bid Notice to Proceed. There are seven (7) Bid Sub Options which are to be priced as though awarded concurrently with the Base Bid. Option Items and Bid Sub Option Items will be awarded based on available Government funds. The Architect reserves the right to request from each Offeror information regarding the breakdown of all costs that are included in the total price, to include copies of all work sheets used in forming the proposed pricing. Erasures or other changes on any or all submissions shall be initialed by the signer of the proposal or by his duly authorized agent.

Reasonableness: The proposed prices will be evaluated for reasonableness. Analysis of price proposals may be performed using one or more of the techniques consistent with AOC Manual Order 34-1 Contracting Manual to determine price reasonableness. Reasonableness must represent a price to the Government a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques consistent with AOC Manual Order 34-1 Contracting Manual.

Realism: Proposed pricing may be evaluated for price realism. Proposed pricing will be evaluated to ensure an adequate understanding of the requirement and to ensure proposed pricing does not pose a risk to performance.

The Government will determine the best overall value.