Other Information, as applicable: Prior arrangements must be made to attend the pre-proposal conference. Please submit an email request to Teresa Marshall at Teresa.A.Marshall@nasa.gov. Information needed to reserve a visitor's badge is 1) Full name of attendee; 2) Name of firm the attendee is representing; 3) Attendee must be a U.S. Citizen; and 4) A picture ID is required to obtain a visitor's pass.

(b) Attendance at the preproposal/pre-bid conference is recommended; however, attendance is neither required nor a prerequisite for proposal/bid submission and will not be considered in the evaluation.

(End of provision)

### L.13 SAFETY AND HEALTH PLAN (NFS 1852.223-73) (NOV 2004)

- (a) The offeror shall submit a detailed safety and occupational health plan as part of its proposal (see NPR 8715.3, NASA Safety Manual, Appendices). The plan shall include a detailed discussion of the policies, procedures, and techniques that will be used to ensure the safety and occupational health of Contractor employees and to ensure the safety of all working conditions throughout the performance of the contract.
- (b) When applicable, the plan shall address the policies, procedures, and techniques that will be used to ensure the safety and occupational health of the public, astronauts and pilots, the NASA workforce (including Contractor employees working on NASA contracts), and high-value equipment and property.
- (c) The plan shall similarly address subcontractor employee safety and occupational health for those proposed subcontracts that contain one or more of the following conditions:
- (1) The work will be conducted completely or partly on premises owned or controlled by the government.
- (2) The work includes construction, alteration, or repair of facilities in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold.
- (3) The work, regardless of place of performance, involves hazards that could endanger the public, astronauts and pilots, the NASA workforce (including Contractor employees working on NASA contracts), or high value equipment or property, and the hazards are not adequately addressed by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) or Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (if applicable).
- (4) When the assessed risk and consequences of a failure to properly manage and control the hazards warrants use of the clause.
- (d) This plan, as approved by the Contracting Officer, will be included in any resulting contract.

(End of provision)

### L.14 BID BOND (NFS 1852.228-73) (OCT 1988)

- (a) Each bidder shall submit with its bid a bid bond (Standard Form 24) with good and sufficient surety or sureties acceptable to the Government, or other security as provided in Federal Acquisition Regulation clause 52.228-1, in the amount of twenty percent (20%) of the bid price, or \$3 million, whichever is the lower amount.
- (b) Bid bonds shall be dated the same date as the bid or earlier.

(End of provision)

### L.15 PROTESTS TO NASA (NFS 1852.233-70) (OCT 2002)

Potential bidders or offerors may submit a protest under 48 CFR Part 33 (FAR Part 33) directly to the Contracting Officer. As an alternative to the Contracting Officer's consideration of a protest, a potential bidder or offeror may submit the protest to the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, who will serve as or designate the official responsible for conducting an independent review. Protests requesting an independent review shall be addressed to Assistant Administrator for Procurement, NASA Code H, Washington, DC 20546-0001.

(End of provision)

### L.16 MAGNITUDE OF REQUIREMENT (NFS 1852.236-74) (DEC 1988)

The Government estimated price range of this project is between \$20,000,000.00 and \$25,000,000.00.

(End of provision)

### L.17 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

(a) <u>Proposing Entity</u>. Offerors proposing as a team, or other such business arrangement, shall fully describe this team or arrangement by outlining the relationship, commitment, and responsibilities of the parties. This documentation shall be provided, as appropriate, in the proposal and as requested in paragraph (b)(2) below.

### (b) Format.

(1) Offerors shall submit proposals in three volumes as specified below. Each part of the proposal shall be complete, and prepared in accordance with solicitation instructions to enable concurrent and separate evaluation of each part. Unless otherwise noted, all proposal components shall be submitted as printed (paper) copies.

Proposal Component	Location in RFP	Required Copies to NASA- ARC Addressed per SF 1442, Block 9
Cover Letter		
Contact Information		
Teaming Arrangements		
Standard Form (SF) 1442		
Section B	L.17(b)(2)	Original and 4 Copies
Section H		1
Section I		
Standard Form (SF) 3881		
Section K		
Volume I, Mission Suitability Proposal	L.19(a)	Original and 4 Copies
A. Management Approach	L.19(a)(2)	
Approach to Contract Administration		
Requirements Including LEED	L.19(a)(2)(A)	
Documentation Requirements		•
Key Personnel	L.19(a)(2)(A)	-
Approach to Subcontract Management	L.19(a)(2)(A)	
Approach to Quality Assurance	L.19(a)(2)(A)	
Proposed Construction Schedule	L.19(a)(2)(A)	

Utilization of Various Software Tools Such as Electronic Submittals,		
Scheduling Software, AutoCad, BIM	L.19(a)(2)(A)	
AutoDesk Revit on this Requirement		
B. Safety and Health Plan	L.19(a)(2)(B)	·
C. Small Business Utilization	L.19(a)(2)(C)	
Volume II, Past Performance Proposal	L.19(b)	Original and 4 Copies
Volume III, Price Proposal	L.19(c)	Original and 2 Copies

- (2) Include a cover letter in Volume I of the proposal. The cover letter must be signed by an official authorized to contractually bind your company. As part of that letter, please provide the following information and/or attachments.
  - The names, address(es), telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, and email addresses of persons to be contacted for clarification of questions.
  - A complete description of any proposed teaming arrangements.
  - A Standard Form 1442 with Blocks 14A through 20C completed and signed by an official authorized to contractually bind the offeror. Include written acknowledgement of any solicitation amendments.
  - A completed response to Section B, Clause B.1, SUPPLIES/SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED, for the Base Offer Item, Option Items, and Period of Performance.
  - A completed response to Section H, Paragraph H.3, NFS Clause 1852.235-71, "KEY PERSONNEL AND FACILITIES," the proposal number to complete Clause H.7,"INCORPORATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PROPOSAL," and completion of Clause H.6, "SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION CONTRACT TARGETS."
  - A completed Request for New/Change Procurement KRED Vendor Master Record if this contract could be the offeror's first contract with NASA Ames Research Center or if information regarding your company has changed from a prior submission (see Attachment J-9).
  - A COMPLETED Standard Form 3881, ACH Vendor/Miscellaneous Payment Enrollment Form (see Attachment J-9).
  - A completed response to Section K, "REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS."

### Also include:

- A statement that the proposal is firm for a period of not fewer than 120 calendar days.
- A statement of acceptance of the anticipated contract provisions and proposed schedule, or specific exceptions taken to any of the terms and conditions.
- (3) Address and forward the proposal package in accordance with the instructions specified on SF 1442, Block 9.
  - (4) RESERVED

(5) The pages of each proposal volume shall be numbered and identified with the Offeror's name, RFP number, and date. The table of contents must list figures and tables separately. Where necessary, a cross-reference sheet to other volumes shall be included. Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify Sections. Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, with an explanation for each. Title pages, table of contents, cross-referencing matrix, list of figures and list of tables, blank dividers, tabs, and glossaries do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes. Small Business Subcontracting Plan, if required, is also excluded from the page count limitation. Further page limitations are set forth in this Section L, Paragraph L.18, "Proposal Page Limitations."

### (6) RESERVED

- (7) Proposals shall be submitted in a format that addresses all evaluation factors. Information pertinent to the factors shall be included in their respective proposal volumes. The proposal content must provide a basis for evaluation against the requirements of the solicitation.
- (8) BINDING AND LABELING: 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 shall be bound in each book, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, solicitation identification, and the Offeror's name. The same identifying data shall be placed on the spine of each binder. The Offeror shall apply all appropriate markings including those prescribed in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(e), "Restriction on disclosure and Use of Data," and FAR 3.104-5, "Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information."
- (9) LATE SUBMISSION: Any volume submitted after the specified time will cause the entire proposal to be considered late in accordance with provision FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition."
- (c) <u>Mission Suitability (Volume I)</u>. Both management and technical information shall be included in the Mission Suitability Proposal. No price data shall be included. Information shall be precise, factual, current, detailed, and complete. Offerors shall not assume that the Source Evaluation Committee is aware of company abilities, capabilities, plans, facilities, organization, or any other pertinent fact that is important to the accomplishment of the work. The evaluation will be based on the information presented in the written presentation. The proposal must specifically address each listed evaluation subfactor.
- (d) <u>Past Performance Proposal (Volume II)</u>. The Past Performance factor indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of each Offeror's record of performance on projects of similar size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition.
- (e) <u>Price Proposal (Volume III)</u>. Price proposals must contain pricing for all line items.

(End of provision)

### L.18 PROPOSAL PAGE LIMITATIONS

(a) The following page limitations are established for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this solicitation.

Proposal Component	F	age Limit <sup>1</sup>
Cover Letter		No limit
Volume I – Mission Suitability Proposal		See below
A. Management Approach		20
B. Safety and Health Plan	,	No limit
C. Small Business Utilization		No limit
Volume II – Past Performance Proposal		12 <sup>2</sup>
Volume III – Price Proposal		No limit

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Paragraph L.17(b)(5) lists page types which are not affected by this limit.

- (b) A written page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides and shall contain a font text with a size not smaller than 12 point. Foldouts shall not exceed 11" x 17" and each page shall count as two 8-1/2" x 11" pages. Diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs shall contain font text in a size no smaller than 10 point.
- (c) Title pages, tables of contents, cross-referencing matrix, list of figures and list of tables, blank dividers, tabs, and glossaries are excluded from the page counts specified in paragraph (a) of this provision. In addition, Volume III of your proposal is not page limited. However, Volume III is to be strictly limited to price information. Information that can be construed as belonging in one of the other volumes of the proposal will be so construed and counted against that volume's page limitation. In addition, the Safety and Health Plan and Small Business Subcontracting Plan are not page limited.
- (d) If final proposal revisions are requested, separate page limitations will be specified in the Government's request for that submission.
- (e) Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified in this provision will not be evaluated by the Government and pages will be returned to the Offeror.

(End of provision)

### L.19 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

The contract award will be based on evaluation of the following factors:

- Mission Suitability
- Past Performance
- Price

Proposal shall be submit in a format that follows the format of the factors and their subfactors. Only information pertinent to the factors and subfactors shall be submitted in the Offeror's proposal volumes. (See the weighting for the factors and subfactors in Section M)

- (a) <u>Mission Suitability Proposal (Volume I)</u>: The Mission Suitability factor indicates, for each Offeror, the merit or excellence of the work to be performed or product to be delivered. Information must be precise, factual, detailed, and complete. Offerors must not assume that the evaluation team is aware of their company's abilities, capabilities, plans, facilities, organization, or any other pertinent fact that is important to accomplishment of the work.
- (1) The evaluation will be based on the information presented in the written subfactors. The proposal must specifically address each listed evaluation subfactor.
  - (2) The content of the Offerors' Mission Suitability Proposal shall provide the basis for evaluation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> These limits do not apply to past performance questionnaire responses.

of the Offeror's response to the technical requirements of the RFP.

The Mission Suitability Proposal shall address the following subfactors:

INDEX OF MISSION SUITABLITY SUBFACTORS

Para.	Subfactor Title	Elements	Format
Α	Management Approach	Approach to Contract Administration	-
		Requirements Including LEED	
		Documentation Requirements	Written
		Key Personnel	Written
		Approach to Subcontract Management	Written
		Approach to Quality Assurance	Written
		Proposed Construction Schedule	Written
		Utilization of Various Software Tools	Written
		Such as Electronic Submittals,	
		Scheduling Software, AutoCad, BIM	
		AutoDesk Revit on this Requirement	1
В	Safety and Health Plan		Written
·C	Small Business Utilization		Written

Note: The following outline should not be construed as an indication of the order of importance or relative weighting within individual elements of Mission Suitability subfactors as there are no discrete point values to any of the elements.

- A. <u>Management Approach (Subfactor)</u>: This subfactor will be used to evaluate the Offeror's management approaches. Under this subfactor, an evaluation will be made of the Offeror's overall management approach to assess how well the management plan demonstrates the Offeror's ability to manage this contract to insure that the government will receive responsive, quality and cost effective services under this contract. The Offeror's proposal shall specifically address the following:
- Approach to Contract Administration Requirements Including LEED Documentation Requirements: The Offeror shall describe its approach to contract administration requirements including LEED documentation requirements. Describe your approach and effective experience in dealing with the myriad of administrative requirements (ex. Material submittals, progress payments, work plans, labor/wage reports, schedules, etc.) that are associated with Government construction contracts. The Offeror shall describe its process for meeting the U. S. Green Building Council LEED requirements for all LEED credits associated with the building construction. The Offeror shall describe the proposed plan to ensure LEED credits are attained and procedures for tracking and maintaining the necessary LEED documentation.
- **Key Personnel**: The Offeror shall describe its organizational structure and staffing plan for the key personnel and significant subcontractors providing clear internal and external lines of authority and lines of communication. Identify the key personnel and their specific duties and roles in the management of this project. The key personnel shall include at a minimum:
  - (1) Project Manager the overall manager responsible for this project.
- (2) Site Superintendent the overall field manager responsible for the Contractor's Quality Control Program.
- (3) Quality Control Manager the manager responsible for the Contractor's Quality Control Program.
- (4) Commission Agent the person responsible for the coordination and implementation of the Commission Plan

- (5) LEED Manager the individual responsible for the oversight and implementation of the LEED requirements.
  - (6) Safety Manager the manager of the Contractor's on-site Safety Program.

The Offeror shall describe the amount of time allocated to a function if personnel are part-time or have more than one area of responsibility.

The Offeror shall provide individual resume information for the key personnel highlighting specific experience and qualifications on projects of a similar type, size, and technical complexity. At a minimum the resume information shall include:

- (1) Position of employment and job duties in employment history.
- (2) Description of the last seven (7) years of employment, including any periods of non-employment longer than three (3) months.
  - (3) Education background.
  - (4) Specialty training, certifications, and registrations.
  - (5) Number of years with the current company and current role.
- (6) Describe how this individual contributed to the successful performance of the projects described in the Past Performance factor.

The Offeror shall describe how lessons learned from previous similar projects will be integrated to achieve success on this project and mitigate potential risks for this construction project.

- Approach to Subcontract Management: The Offeror shall describe its approach to subcontract management; percentage of work to be performed between the prime contractor and each major subcontractor; and the work to be self performed by the prime contractor. The Offeror shall describe its approach and effective experience in managing subcontractors. Also, identify or list subcontractors that your firm would plan to use for various specialty requirements under this contract (ex. Electrical, mechanical, plumbing, roofing, painting, etc.) and describe your past working relationship with the subcontractor and why they are a preferred service provider for your firm.
- Approach to Quality Assurance: The Offeror shall describe its approach and effective experience in making sure that quality work is done correctly the first time in the majority of instances and your approach to corrective actions in the event that work needs to be redone. At a minimum, address the Quality Control organization, submittal reviews, testing, identification and resolution of deficiencies, reporting procedures, procedures for procuring, tracking, receiving, and acceptance of materials, and identification of nonconforming materials or work.
- Proposed Period of Performance: The Government estimates 600 calendar days for this contract from the date the contractor receives the notice to proceed. The Offeror shall propose a period of performance and provide a schedule in Gantt chart format. The schedule shall be from the date the contractor receives the notice to proceed until contract completion. The schedule shall be in sufficient detail, including time for major project activities, to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements and shall not exceed more than 60 activities per 11" x 17" page and a total of 120 activities. Schedules proposing a shorter amount of time for the period of performance with a logical approach to the work will be considered a strength of the proposal.

L-12

• Utilization of Various Software Tools Such as Electronic Submittals, Scheduling Software, AutoCad, BIM AutoDesk Revit on this Requirement: The Offeror shall describe its previous experience using various software tools such as electronic submittals, scheduling software, AutoCad, BIM AutoDesk Revit and provide a plan for how the software tools will be used to improve the effectiveness of your firm's project management relative to schedule, price, and quality and reduce the construction schedule.

### B. Safety and Health Plan (Subfactor):

The Offeror shall submit a detailed written safety and health plan that includes a complete and comprehensive responsive to the safety and health hazards that can be expected during the course of this contract. Safety items to be covered in the plan can be found in the current version of NPR 8715.3 (<a href="http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/displayDir.cfm?t=NPR&c=8715&s=3C">http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/displayDir.cfm?t=NPR&c=8715&s=3C</a>) and APR 1700.1 (see L.2 for location), and shall include, at a minimum, those listed below. Additional items may be included if appropriate.

- (1) Statement of corporate policy and program goals concerning safety and health.
- (2) Safety and Health program management structure. The plan shall clearly define safety assignments and specific safety roles to individuals by name and title.
- (3) Safety management program elements. The plan shall cover techniques for achieving program goals and shall include:
  - Methods to make certain that clear statements of hazardous situations and necessary cautions are in documents which detail operations, such as inspection, test, and operating procedures.
  - Means for ensuring that every employee understands how to re cognize hazards and how to avoid having mishaps.
  - Procedures for training and certification of personnel potentially hazardous operations. Identify certifications and corresponding training requirements and/or physical conditions that are required to perform work.
  - Controls over the procurement, storage, issuance, and use of hazardous substances and procedures for management of hazardous waste.
  - Controls for special hazardous materials and process, such as lasers, explosives, biohazards, power-actuated hand tools, high-pressure devices, etc.
  - Method of making sure that emergency plans and procedures are current and sufficient.
  - Method for making sure that employees consistently perform their work safely and in accordance with the plan.
  - Method for reporting and investigating accidents and incidents (mishaps).

This plan, as approved by the Contracting Officer, shall be included in any resulting contract as Attachment J-5. The Offeror shall provide any applicable Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) certification.

### C. Small Business Utilization (Subfactor):

All Offerors, except small business concerns, must complete the Small Business Subcontracting Plan according to instructions described below. Although small businesses are not required to submit Small Business Subcontracting Plans, the instructions below request "Other" information that needs to be addressed, if applicable. See Paragraph 2.b below. Small businesses shall address small business participation to the extent that subcontracting opportunities exist. See FAR 52.219-8, UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

- 1. <u>Small Business Subcontracting Plan (the Plan) required by the FAR (this applies ONLY to Large Businesses:</u>
- a. This solicitation contains FAR Clause 52.219-9, SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACT PLAN ALTERNATE II. The Subcontracting Plan described and required by the clause, including the associated subcontracting percentage goals and subcontracting dollars, must be submitted with your proposal. This applies ONLY to large businesses.
- b. The Contracting Officer's assessment of appropriate subcontracting goals for this acquisition, EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE (basic and all options combine), are as follows:

Total Small Business (SB) Goal	40%
*Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Concerns	12.5%
Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB) Concerns	3.0%
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)	0.0%
HUBZone Small Business Concerns	2.0%
Veteran-owned Small Business Concerns	2.5%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns	1.5%
** Other Small Business Concerns	18.5%

- \* Although 15 U.S.C. 637(d) requires subcontracting plans to contain information about SDB concerns, case law prevents the Government from giving evaluation credit to business types based on race or ethnicity unless those businesses are in under represented industries. The Section M evaluation for SDB participation ensures that the Government only evaluates participation of SDB's in industries that are designated by the Department of Commerce as under represented. For purposes of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, the proposed subcontracting goal for SDB's will be evaluated based upon the SDB's status as a small business.
- \*\*Those Small Business Concerns that are not Small Disadvantaged, Women-Owned, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, HUBZone Small Business Concerns, Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns, or Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns.
- c. Offerors are encouraged to propose goals that are equivalent or greater than those recommended by the Contracting Officer. However, Offerors should perform an independent assessment. The goals included in the submitted Subcontracting Plan may be higher, lower, or the same as the recommended goals, depending upon the Offeror's independent assessment. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan shall separately address business, HUBZone small business concerns, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns.
- d. The Plan submitted with the proposal shall be incorporated in Section J as Attachment J-6 in the resulting contract. The requirements in the Plan must flow down to first tier large business subcontracts expected to exceed \$550,000 or \$1,000,000 for construction of a public facility. Although these first tier large business subcontractors are encouraged to meet or exceed the stated goals, it is recognized that the subcontracting opportunities available to these subcontractors may differ from those suggested in the solicitation based upon the nature of their respective performance requirements.

- e. Offerors are advised that a proposal will not be rejected solely because the submitted plan does not meet the NASA recommended goals that are expressed in paragraph 1.(b) above in terms of percent of total contract value. Offerors shall discuss the rationale for any goal proposed that is less than the Contracting Officer's recommended goal in any category. In addition, the Offeror shall describe the efforts made to establish a goal for that category and what ongoing efforts, if any, the Offeror plans during performance to increase participation in that category.
- f. In addition to submitting a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with the Section I FAR clause 5.219-9, Alternate II, Offerors (Large Businesses) shall complete Attachment J-6, SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN GOALS, which provides a breakdown of the offeror's proposed goals, by small business category, expressed in terms of a percent of the TOTAL PLANNED SUBCONTRACTS.

(NOTE: FOR PURPOSES OF THE SUBCONTRACTING PLAN, THE PROPOSED GOALS MUST BE STATED AS A **PERCENT OF TOTAL SUBCONTRACTS**, NOT AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE. REFER TO THE BELOW EXAMPLE)

### Begin example

Assume a proposed total contract value of \$20M and proposed goals that equate to the following which are EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE:

Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns		4.5%
Women Small Business Concerns		2.0%
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	•	0.5%
HUBZone Small Business Concerns		0.5%
Veteran Owned Small Business Concerns		1.0%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns		0.5%
Other Small Business Concerns		<u>11.0%</u>
Total Small Business Subcontracting		20.0%
(as a percent of total contract value)		

Then, the resulting statement of dollars that the Offeror would include in the Subcontracting Plan, as required by Paragraph (d)(2) of FAR Clause 52.219-9, would be as follows:

Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns	900,000
Women Small Business Concerns	400,000
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	100,000
HUBZone Small Business Concerns	100,000
Veteran Owned Small Business Concerns	200,000
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns	100,000
Other Small Business Concerns	2,200,000
	,
Total Small Business Subcontracting	4,000,000

HOWEVER, the Subcontracting Plan must express goals as a percent of total planned subcontracts. Assuming total subcontracting of \$10M, the resulting percentage goals, EXPRESSED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL SUBCONTRACT DOLLARS, and which would be stated in the Subcontracting Plan as required by paragraph (d)(1) of FAR Clause 52.219-9 would be:

Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns	9.0%
Women Small Business Concerns	4.0%
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	1.0%
HUBZone Small Business Concerns	1.0%

Veteran Owned Small Business Concerns	•		2.0%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns			1.0%
Other Small Business Concerns		•	22.0%
•			
Total Small Business Subcontracting		•	40.0%

(End of example)

- (b) Past Performance (Volume II): This portion of the technical evaluation factor assesses the Offeror's record of performing construction services and completing projects that are similar in size, scope and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition. Recent contracts are defined as current contracts (at least 50% complete) and contracts completed within the last three (3) Years. Offerors are encouraged to provide information on any problems encountered during performance of these contracts and any corrective actions taken by the Offeror. In evaluating past performance, the Government shall consider information in the Offeror's proposal and information from other sources including references, customers, Government agencies, and other sources deemed appropriate. The Government may also evaluate subcontractor's past performance on relevant projects. The following information will be evaluated:
- (1) Provide specific examples that demonstrate the Offeror's experience and successful past performance on projects, in particular LEED projects, of similar size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition. Provide up to six (6) project examples in the following format:

Contract Number:

Project Title, Location, and Description:

LEED Certification Level:

Owner and Point of Contact – Agency:

Contact Name:

Address:

Phone:

E-mail Address:

Contract Award Date and Price:

Original Contract Completion Date:

Current or Actual Completion Date:

Provide explanation if actual completion date exceeded or exceeds original contract completion date:

Percentage of Completion and Current Price:

Performance Evaluation Rating Received:

Description of Requirements and/or Complexity of the Project and an explanation as to how performance on the identified requirement relates to this particular requirement and demonstrates the Offeror's capabilities to perform this requirement:

Major Problems Encountered on Project and Resolution:

Awards/Recommendations Received:

Role on Project of Proposed Key Personnel:

- (ii) Provide up to six (6) letters of commendation and/or recommendation on projects completed in the last three (3) years. Annotate the contract description, price, and completion date on each letter.
- (iii) Offerors shall provide a Past Performance Questionnaire, Attachment J-7 to this solicitation, to each past performance Contracting Officer or customer contact equivalent identified in its Past Performance information summary. Offerors shall request its customers to submit the completed questionnaires to the below address, by mail, facsimile, or e-mail, to arrive no later than the due date for offers. Past Performance Questionnaires will not be accepted directly from Offerors.

### Questionnaires should be forwarded to:

NASA Ames Research Center Attn: Teresa Marshall, Code JAC

Mailstop: 213-13

Moffett Field, CA 94035 Phone: (650) 604-5257 Fax: (650) 604-2593

E-mail: Teresa.A.Marshall@nasa.gov

### (c) Price Proposal (Volume III):

- (1) An original and two (2) copies of the price proposal shall be provided on the SF 1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award, and Section B included at the beginning of this solicitation. Blocks 14 through 20C of the SF 1442 shall be completed. A firm-fixed price will be required for the following:
- (a) The Contractor shall provide all resources (except as may be expressly stated in the contract as furnished by the Government) necessary to deliver and/or perform the items below in accordance with the Description/Specifications/Statement of Work incorporated in Section J as Attachments J-1 and J-2.

1. Item No	2. Description	3. Qty	4. Unit	5. Price
01	Base Offer Item 0001, All work identified in the			
	plans and specifications to construct the		٠.	
*	Collaborative Support Facility, Building N232,	1	JB	<b>\$</b>
	Except work identified as an option			

### (b) OPTION ITEMS

If Option Items are exercised pursuant to Clause 52.217-7, "OPTION FOR INCREASED QUANTITY – SEPARATELY PRICED LINE ITEM," the contractor shall provide all resources (except as may be expressly stated in this contract as furnished by the Government) necessary to furnish the items below in accordance with the Description/Specification/Work Statement in Section C.

1. Item No	2. Description	3. Q	4. Unit	5. Price
02	Option Item 0001, All work identified in the	* 1 5		
:	specification and drawings to provide and install			
	Building Integrated Photovoltaic Canopy (BIPV).	1	JВ	<b> </b> \$
1	This option shall consist of replacing the ceramic			
	frit pattern glass panels mounted at the roof level	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		·
	between column lines X and Y on the north side			
	of the north wing, with an array of glass substrate			
	photovoltaic panels. This option includes all		•	
	labor, materials, and equipment required to			-
	provide an operational photovoltaic system with			
	a peak output of at least XX kilowatts of power at			
	12 volts. This option includes the photovoltaic	, ,		
	panels, terminal and combiner box(es), quick-		,	*
	connect electrical connectors, DC wiring, DC			
	disconnect, grid-connected inverter, AC			
	disconnect, a data acquisition and monitoring			
	system (DAS) and isolation transformer. The	·		
. `	option also includes connecting the photovoltaic			
	system inverter into the building's electrical			:
	system. This work is shown on Drawings A107			
	and E111 and described in Specification Section			i ·
	136400.			
03	Option Item 0002, All work identified in the	7		
05	specification and drawings to provide and install	1		: :
	Extruded Aluminum Sun Control Shade Louvers.	-1	JВ	\$
	This option shall consist of the fabrication and		J	<b> </b>
	installation of aluminum louvers designed to			
	shade the windows on the west, east and south		, '	· .
	sides of both wings of the building. These louver			
	shades consist of aluminum airfoil shapes			
	fabricated into a framework and mounted			
	vertically in front of the building windows. This			
	option also includes the installation of steel tube			
	shapes that are mounted to the building structural			
	framework and provide support for the sun			*
	shades. The details of the shade louver construc-			
, :	tion is shown on Drawings A106 and A705 and			
	described in Specification Section 089100.	1, 4		
04	Option Item 0003, All work identified in the	* ,		
01	specification and drawings to provide and install			
	Horizontal Sun Shade Structures. This option	1	ЈВ	\$
	consists of the fabrication and installation of		, JD	Ψ
	horizontal shade structures that are designed to			,
	shade the windows on the west, east, and south		:	
	sides of both wings of the building. At the roof	, '	. "	
	level, these horizontal shade structures consist of			
	perforated, stainless steel, sheet metal panels			
	mounted in a steel frame. At the second floor		-	
*	level, the horizontal shade structures are		-	
· .	constructed of an aluminum bar grating material,			
	to allow access for future window cleaning. The			*
)	structural steel members that support the			
	horizontal shade structures are included in the			
	Base Item and are not a part of Option Item 0003.		İ	<u> </u>

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	I ·			
	The details the horizontal shades are shown on	i		
	Drawing A107 and described in Specification			
	Sections 055300 and 057000.			
05	Option Item 0004, All work identified in the			
	specification and drawings to provide and install			
	Light Shelf Daylighting Panels. This option	1	JВ	\$
	consists of the fabrication and installation of light			
	shelves. Light shelves are aluminum shelves			
	approximately 30" wide and mounted on the			
	interior side of the north wall only, just below the			
	upper row of operable windows, at both the first			
<b>'</b>	and second floor levels. Light shelves for this			
	project are fabricated from an extruded aluminum			
	chassis system and aluminum panel surface.		·	
	Light shelves for this project shall be provided by	-		
	the curtain wall manufacturer and shall be		٠.	·
	designed to be integrated with the curtain wall as			
	an interior extension to the curtain wall horizontal	<u> </u>		
-	mullion. The details of the horizontal light			
	shelves are defined in Specification Section			
	107301 and the installation location is shown in			
06	Detail 8/A802.			
06	Option Item 0005, All work identified in the	ļ	•	
	specification and drawings to provide and install		TD:	6
	Greywater Treatment System. The greywater	1	JB	\$
	treatment system is a packaged, skid-mounted			
	system designed to filter and treat greywater from			
-	lavatories and showers and pump the treated	1		r
	water back into the building for use flushing			
	toilets. This option includes all labor, equipment,			· ·
	and materials necessary to have a complete and			
	operational greywater treatment and supply		,	
	system, including pumps, tanks, filters, and			
	residual disinfection. This option also includes			
	all underground piping between the north wing	1		
	of the building and the location of the greywater	] .		
	system adjacent to the trash enclosure on the east			
	side of the project site. The following items are			\ \ \ \ \ \
*	included in the Base Item and are not part of	,		·
	Option Item 0005: The concrete masonry unit			
	enclosure for the greywater treatment system; the			
	recycled water supply piping to the toilets; the	<b> </b> .		
	greywater waste piping from the lavatories and		•	
	showers; and the underground conduit and wiring			
	to supply power to the greywater treatment			
	system. The work include in this Option Item is shown on Drawing P503 and is described in	1.1		<u> </u>
07	Specification Section 221319.	·		
07	Option Item 0006, All work identified in the			. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
· ·	specification and drawings to provide and install	,	т.	<b>.</b>
	Carpet and Base. This option includes all labor	1	JB	\$
	materials and equipment to install carpet and			
	resilient base for all areas of the building with			
	raised access flooring with the exception of the		. :	
	electrical and data communications rooms. The			
	areas to receive this carpet are shown on	1 .		

Drawings A211, A212, A221, and A222. The		
carpet material and installation requirements are		
defined in Specification Section 096813.		 

### (c) PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

1. Item No	2. Description	3. Qty	4. Unit	"5, Number of Calendar Days for Completion of Work
05	Number of Calendar Days for Completion of		i	
	Work in accordance with Paragraph F.2,			
	COMMENCEMENT, PROSECUTION, AND			
	COMPLETION OF WORK (FAR 52.211-10)	. 1		
	(APR 1984). The number of calendar days			
	offered here in Section B will have precedence	. •		
	if a discrepancy exists between the number of			
	days proposed in Section B and the			
	construction schedule portion of the offer.			

(End of provision)

# L.20 LIST OF AVAILABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (NFS 1852.245-81) (DEVIATION) (SEP 2007)

(a) The Government will make the following Government property available for use in performance of the contract resulting from this solicitation, on a no-charge-for-use basis in accordance with FAR 52.245-1, Government Property. This property must be used on the contract as shown in the plans and specification.

Item Description: Reclaimed oak flooring from a wind tunnel, approximately 7,500 square feet to be used as shown in the plans and specification

(b) The selected Contractor will be responsible for costs associated with transportation, and installation of the property listed in this provision.

(End of provision)

[END OF SECTION]

### **SECTION M** EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### M.1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FAR 52.252-1) (FEB 1998)

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions. the Offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this/these address(es):

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clauses: http://www.acqnet.gov/far

NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) clauses:

http://www.hg.nasa.gov/office/procurement/regs/nfstoc.htm

#### FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) I.

PROVISION	DATE	TITLE
NUMBER		
52.217-5	APR 1984	EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

#### II. NASA FAR SUPPLEMENT (48 CFR CHAPTER 18)

PROVISION NUMBER	DATE	TITLE		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
None included by reference					

(End of provision)

### M.2 EVALUATION APPROACH

- General. The contract award will be based on the evaluation of three factors: Mission Suitability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), and Price (Volume III).
- (1) This provision is intended to explain the rationale and precise criteria by which proposals will be assessed by the evaluation team. Offerors are to prepare proposals with these criteria in mind (i.e., in terms of both content and organization), in order to assist the team in determining the relative merit of proposals in relation to the requirements as defined in Section C.
- (2) The Government may award a contract based solely on the initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each Offeror shall submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint.
- (3) Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Offerors must recognize that the initial evaluation of proposals and the determination of the competitive range, if any, will be made upon a review of the proposals only, plus some independent investigations that may be made with regard to Past Performance. Discussions will be held only if award on the basis of initial offers is determined not to be in the Government's best interest. If written or oral discussions are conducted, the Government will seek revised proposals from Offerors within the competitive range.

- (4) At the conclusion of discussions (if applicable), as stipulated in FAR 15.307, a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be requested from all Offerors still within the competitive range. The FPR shall be submitted in the form of a contractual document (including revisions to the original proposal) that has been executed by an individual with the authority to bind the Offeror. Selection will be made in accordance with the evaluation criteria herein. Contract award may be made without subsequent discussions or negotiation.
- (5) The evaluation committee will present its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA). The SSA's decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation.
- (b) Evaluation Factors. There are three evaluation factors for this procurement: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price. Price is the single most important factor. Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal to each other and when combined, are approximately equal to Price. A general definition of these factors may be found at NFS 1815.304, "Evaluation factors and significant subfactors." Specific information regarding each factor is provided below:
- (1) <u>Mission Suitability Factor</u>. The Mission Suitability Factor evaluates the merit or excellence of the offeror's management approach, safety and health plan, and small business utilization. The overall Mission Suitability Factor will be numerically scored, and the Mission Suitability subfactors will be rated by adjective and numerically weighted and scored in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3), "Technical Evaluation," and the following table:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS	PERCENTILE RANGE (Subfactor Only)
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists	91-100
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates overall competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.	71-90
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response.	51-70
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.	31-50
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.	0-30

Overall, the Offeror's Mission Suitability proposal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements. The compatibility between the proposed technical approach and proposed total compensation to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor.

(2) <u>Past Performance Factor</u>. This factor indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of each Offeror's record of performing services or delivering products similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition. The Government may also evaluate subcontractors' past performance on relevant projects. This factor provides an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services provided by the Offeror to the agency and other organizations as either a prime or subcontractor.

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the contractor's performance under previously awarded contracts. The past performance evaluation is an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation shall be in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and 1815.305(a)(2). When applying the definitions below to arrive at a confidence rating, the evaluation shall clearly document each Offeror's relevant past performance and the currency of the past performance to assess the Offeror's overall confidence rating assigned. Past Performance shall be evaluated for each Offeror using the following levels of confidence ratings:

### **Definition of Ratings**

germane (e.g. size, scope and complexity) to the requirement; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist. The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet this rating.)  High Level of Confidence  High Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is at least pertinent (e.g. size, scope, and complexity) to the requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or mor	Very High	The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is of exceptional merit that is highly
with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist. The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet this rating.)  High Level of Confidence  High Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is at least pertinent (e.g. size, scope, and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performan	Level of	germane (e.g. size, scope and complexity) to the requirement; indicating exemplary
record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist. The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet this rating.)  High Level of Confidence  High Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is at least pertinent (e.g. size, scope, and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve	Confidence	performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems
the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist. The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet this rating.)  High Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is at least pertinent (e.g. size, scope, and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance and the overall performance and the overall performance. Based on the Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one o		with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance
exist. The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet this rating.)  High Level of Confidence  Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is at least pertinent (e.g. size, scope, and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low		
High Level of Confidence  hat the Offeror's performance of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance and relevant past performance and the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Hey Level of Confidence  High Level of Confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Hey Level Of Confidence  High Level of Confidence that the Offeror		
High Level of Confidence  hat the Offeror's performance of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance and relevant past performance and the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Hey Level of Confidence  High Level of Confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Hey Level Of Confidence  High Level of Confidence that the Offeror		exist. The mere absence of a significant weakness does not make a proposal meet this
and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror will success		rating.)
and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror will success	High Level of	The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance is at least pertinent (e.g. size, scope,
timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low  Level of Confidence  Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or		and complexity) to the requirement; demonstrating very effective performance that would
timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low  Level of Confidence  Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or		be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a
little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for		
record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	•	
required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)  Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		
Moderate Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	. *	
Level of Confidence  scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		
Level of Confidence  scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	Moderate	The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size,
little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	Level of	
record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	Confidence	performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with
the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)  Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low  Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance
Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low  Level of Confidence  Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform
Confidence scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low  Level of  Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)
slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low  Level of  Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		
with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	Confidence	scope and complexity when compared to this acquisition, and it demonstrates meets or
with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems
Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the
be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist.  Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will
Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)  Very Low Level of Confidence  Confidence  Description:  Description:  Description:  Description:  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may
Very Low Level of Confidence  The Offeror's recent and relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. (One or more weaknesses exist.
Level of Confidence  not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	* .	Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)
Confidence one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		
performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	1 .	
confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)  Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated	Confidence	one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall
Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of
Neutral  In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		
information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated		
information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii) and (IV)]	Neutral	
I tayorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15 305(a)(2)(ii) and (IV)]		information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated
- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1		favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii) and (IV)].

(3) <u>Price Factor</u>. This factor is used to assess what each Offeror's proposal will cost the Government should it be selected for award. The proposed price is analyzed to determine the price and associated risks of doing business with an Offeror based upon the Offeror's proposed approach for the proposed price. It is not numerically scored.

- (c) <u>Mission Suitability Factor (Volume I)</u>: The Mission Suitability factor indicates, for each Offeror, the merit or excellence of the work to be performed or product to be delivered. The overall Mission Suitability Factor will be numerically scored and Mission Suitability subfactors will be rated by adjective and numerically weighted and scored. Information submitted in Volume I of the proposal that is not relevant to the Mission Suitability factor will not be evaluated.
  - (1) The evaluation will be based on the information presented in the written subfactors.
- (2) The content of the Offerors' Mission Suitability Proposal will provide the basis for evaluation of the Offeror's response to the technical requirements of the RFP.

The Offerors will be evaluated and scored based on the Mission Suitability subfactors set forth below. (Note: the following outline should not be construed as an indication of the order of importance or relative weighting within individual elements of the Mission Suitability subfactors as there are no discrete point values to any of the elements.)

INDEX OF MISSION SUITABLITY SUBFACTORS

Para.	Subfactor Title	Elements	Format
Α	Management Approach	Approach to Contract Administration	
		Requirements Including LEED	
		Documentation Requirements	Written
		Key Personnel	Written
		Approach to Subcontract Management	Written
		Approach to Quality Assurance	Written
		Proposed Construction Schedule	Written
		Utilization of Various Software Tools	Written
		Such as Electronic Submittals,	
		Scheduling Software, AutoCad, BIM	
		AutoDesk Revit on this Requirement	
В	Safety and Health Plan		Written
C	Small Business Utilization		Written

- A. <u>Management Approach (Subfactor)</u>: This subfactor will be used to evaluate the Offeror's management approaches. Under this subfactor, an evaluation will be made of the Offeror's overall management approach to assess how well the management plan demonstrates the Offeror's ability to manage this contract to insure that the Government will receive responsive, quality and cost effective services under this contract. The evaluation will specifically address the following:
- Approach to Contract Administration Requirements Including LEED Documentation Requirements: The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on how well it demonstrates its approach to contract administration requirements including LEED documentation requirements. The evaluation will include the Offeror's approach and effective experience in dealing with the myriad of administrative requirements (ex. Material submittals, progress payments, work plans, labor/wage reports, schedules, etc.) that are associated with Government construction contracts; the Offeror's process for meeting the U. S. Green Building Council LEED requirements for all LEED credits associated with the building construction; and the Offeror's proposed plan to ensure LEED credits are attained and procedures for tracking and maintaining the necessary LEED documentation.
- **Key Personnel**: The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on how well it demonstrates the Offeror's organizational structure and staffing plan for the key personnel and significant subcontractors and how they provide clear internal and external lines of authority and lines of communication. Proposed key personnel and their specification duties and roles in the management of this project will also be evaluated The key personnel shall include at a minimum:

- (1) Project Manager the overall manager responsible for this project.
- (2) Site Superintendent the overall field manager responsible for the Contractor's Quality Control Program.
- (3) Quality Control Manager the manager responsible for the Contractor's Quality Control Program.
- (4) Commission Agent the person responsible for the coordination and implementation of the Commission Plan
- (5) LEED Manager the individual responsible for the oversight and implementation of the LEED requirements.
  - (6) Safety Manager the manager of the Contractor's on-site Safety Program.

The amount of time allocated to a function if personnel are part-time or have more than one area of responsibility will be evaluated.

Individual resume information for the key personnel will be evaluated with emphasis on specific experience and qualifications on projects of a similar type, size, and technical complexity. The following resume information for the key personnel will be evaluated at a minimum:

- (1) Position of employment and job duties in employment history.
- (2) Description of the last seven (7) years of employment, including any periods of non-employment longer than three (3) months.
  - (3) Education background.
  - (4) Specialty training, certifications, and registrations.
  - (5) Number of years with the current company and current role.
- (6) Describe how this individual contributed to the successful performance of the projects described in the Past Performance factor.

The evaluation will include how the Offeror integrates lessons learned from previous similar projects to achieve success on this project and mitigate potential risks for this construction project.

- Approach to Subcontract Management: The percentage of work to be performed between the prime contractor and each major subcontractor will be evaluated and work to be self performed by the prime contractor. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for its approach and effective experience in managing subcontractors, the subcontractors that the Offeror would plan to use for various specialty requirements under this contract (ex. Electrical, mechanical, plumbing, roofing, painting, etc.), and the Offeror's past working relationship with the subcontractor and why they are a preferred service provider for the firm.
- Approach to Quality Assurance: The Offeror's approach and effective experience in making sure that quality work is done correctly the first time in the majority of instances will be evaluated and its approach to corrective actions in the event that work needs to be redone. At a minimum, the evaluation will address the Quality Control organization, submittal reviews, testing, identification and resolution of deficiencies, reporting procedures, procedures for procuring, tracking, receiving, and acceptance of materials, and identification of nonconforming materials or work.

- Proposed Period of Performance: The Government estimates 600 calendar days for this contract from the date the contractor receives the notice to proceed. The Offeror's proposed period of performance will be evaluated from the date the contractor receives the notice to proceed until contract completion. The schedule will be evaluated on how well the schedule demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirements. Schedules proposing a shorter amount of time for the period of performance, with a logical approach to the work will be considered a strength of the proposal.
- Utilization of Various Software Tools Such as Electronic Submittals, Scheduling Software, AutoCad, BIM AutoDesk Revit on this Requirement: The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated regarding previous experience using various software tools such as electronic submittals, scheduling software, AutoCad, BIM AutoDesk Revit. The Offeror's plan for how the Offeror will use the software tools to improve the effectiveness of your firm's project management relative to schedule, price, and quality and reduce the construction schedule will also be evaluated.
- B. <u>Safety and Health Plan</u>: The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for a complete and comprehensive response to the management of safety and health hazards that will be expected during the course of this contract in accordance with NPR 8715.3A and APR 1700.1. The Offeror's approach and understanding to the following will be evaluated to determine soundness, technical merit, innovativeness, efficiency, and effectiveness.
  - (1) Statement of corporate policy and program goals concerning safety and health.
- (2) Safety and Health program management structure. The plan shall clearly define safety assignments and specific safety roles to individuals by name and title.
- (3) Safety management program elements. The plan shall cover techniques for achieving program goals and shall include:
  - Methods to make certain that clear statements of hazardous situations and necessary cautions are in documents which detail operations, such as inspection, test, and operating procedures.
  - Means for ensuring that every employee understands how to re cognize hazards and how to avoid having mishaps.
  - Procedures for training and certification of personnel potentially hazardous operations. Identify certifications and corresponding training requirements and/or physical conditions that are required to perform work.
  - Controls over the procurement, storage, issuance, and use of hazardous substances and procedures for management of hazardous waste.
  - Controls for special hazardous materials and process, such as lasers, explosives, biohazards, power-actuated hand tools, high-pressure devices, etc.
  - Method of making sure that emergency plans and procedures are current and sufficient.
  - Method for making sure that employees consistently perform their work safely and in accordance with the plan.
    - Method for reporting and investigating accidents and incidents (mishaps).

### C. Small Business Utilization:

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting applies to all Offerors. Although small business concerns are not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as required by FAR 52.219-9, SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN and its ALTERNATE II, NASA will evaluate small business subcontractor participation to the extent that subcontracting opportunities exist.

### 1. <u>Small Business Subcontracting Plan:</u>

The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated in terms of the Offeror's proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by category) in comparison to the Contracting Officers assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of the reasonableness and soundness of the Offeror's independent assessment to achieve the proposed overall subcontracting goals and the individual subcontracting goals by category. The evaluation will include the reasonableness of rationale for any goal that is less than the Contracting Officer's recommended goal for any category, the reasonableness of efforts made to establish a goal for that category, as well as on-going efforts, if any, the Offeror plans during performance to increase participation in that category. This evaluation of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements.

### Additionally, NASA will evaluate:

- The reasonableness and quality of the rationale provided to substantiate the proposed goals in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.
- The reasonableness and quality of the rationale specific to work that will be performed by the small business subcontractor(s). NASA will also evaluate the extent to which SB concerns are specifically identified and the extent of commitment to use SB firms (for example, enforceable commitments vs. non-enforceable commitments.)
- The quality of Offeror's past performance in small business utilization as an indicator of commitment to utilize small business concerns.
- The reasonableness and quality of information demonstrating the extent of commitment to utilize small business concerns and to support their development.

Small Businesses are not required to submit a Subcontracting Plan.

A proposal will not be rejected solely on the basis of an Offeror proposing subcontracting goals that are less than those listed in Section L.19(a)(2)C.1.b, "Small Business Subcontracting Plan"; however, if the proposed goals are less than the NASA stipulated goals, an explanation must be provided and will be evaluated.

### 2. Other:

- a. For large businesses, NASA will evaluate the reasonableness of the following:
  - Rationale to substantiate the proposed goals in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.
  - If appropriate, plans to allocate contracting to Small Business concerns.

- b. For small businesses, NASA will evaluate the reasonableness of the following:
  - Rationale to substantiate the anticipated subcontracting.
- 3. SDB Participation Contract Targets:

Separately from Small Business Subcontracting, NASA will evaluate SDB participation.

This evaluation applies to both large businesses and small businesses.

4. SDB Participation – Other:

Additionally, NASA will evaluate other information as follows. The information below will only be evaluated to the extent that it pertains to SDBs in the authorized NAICS Industry Subsectors.

This evaluation applies to both large businesses and small businesses.

NASA will evaluate the reasonableness of the following:

- Rationale to substantiate the proposed targets for SDB participation.
- The Offeror's established or planned procedures and organizational structure for SDB outreach, assistance, counseling, market research and SDB identification, and relevant purchasing procedures. For large business Offerors, this information should conform to its submitted Small Business Subcontracting Plan.
- (d) Past Performance (Volume II): This technical evaluation factor assesses the Offeror's record of performing construction services and completing projects that are similar in size, scope and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition. Recent contracts are defined as current contracts (at least 50% complete) and contracts completed within the last three (3) Years. Offerors are encouraged to provide information on any problems encountered during performance of these contracts and any corrective actions taken by the Offeror. In evaluating past performance, the Government shall consider information in the Offeror's proposal and information from other sources including references, customers, Government agencies, and other sources deemed appropriate. The Government may also evaluate subcontractor's past performance on relevant projects. The following information will be evaluated:
- (1) Specific examples provided by the Offeror that demonstrates its experience and successful past performance on projects, in particular LEED projects, of similar size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition based on the information provided for up to six (6) project examples in the following format:

Contract Number:

Project Title, Location, and Description:

LEED Certification Level:

Owner and Point of Contact - Agency:

Contact Name:

Address:

Phone:

E-mail Address:

Contract Award Date and Price:

Original Contract Completion Date:

Current or Actual Completion Date:

Provide explanation if actual completion date exceeded or exceeds original contract completion date:

Percentage of Completion and Current Price:

Performance Evaluation Rating Received:

Description of Requirements and/or Complexity of the Project and an explanation as to how performance on the identified requirement relates to this particular requirement and demonstrates the Offeror's capabilities to perform this requirement:

Major Problems Encountered on Project and Resolution:

Awards/Recommendations Received:

Role on Project of Proposed Key Personnel:

- (2) Six (6) letters of commendation and/or recommendation on projects completed in the last three (3) years.
- (3) Past Performance Questionnaires from references addressing the following:

### PROJECT MANAGEMENT:

Overall project management including management of resources and personnel.

Ability to effectively manage and control subcontractor performance.

Ability to build effective working relationships with associate contractors, subcontractors and the Government in a team environment.

Overall responsiveness to Government requests.

Communicating and interfacing with Government.

Staffing levels for key personnel and key subcontractors.

Effectiveness of jobsite supervision.

Compliance with technical requirements and performance standards.

Timely identification and resolution of issues.

Timely resolution of contract modifications.

Adherence to contract schedule requirements.

Timeliness, quality, and accuracy of schedule and schedule of values.

Ability to deliver the project that meets or exceeds performance requirements within schedule.

Compliance with labor standards.

Ability to comply with LEED standards and credits to ensure LEED certification.

### COST:

Timely payment to subcontractors or suppliers.

Ability to establish realistic cost estimates.

### QUALITY CONTROL (QC):

Overall project quality.

Adequacy of QC Plan.

Effectiveness and responsiveness of QC staff.

Adequacy of QC testing.

Adequacy of QC documentation.

Identification/Correction of deficient work in a timely manner.

### SAFETY AND SECURITY:

Adequacy of Safety Plan and implementation of plan. Adherence to established safety and health procedures. Overall Safety and Health injury/illness record. Cooperation with Owner's safety personnel. Adherence to established security procedures.

### SMALL BUSINESS:

Ability to meet Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goals.
Timeliness, quality, and accuracy of Small Business Subcontracting Plan reporting (SF 294s/295s)
Ability to meet Small Disadvantaged Business goals

### OVERALL CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

- (e) Price (Volume III): This factor is used to assess what each Offeror's proposal will cost the Government should it be selected for award. The Government will review the price in accordance with FAR 52.217-5, EVALUATION OF OPTIONS. Price evaluation will not be based upon absolute standards or given an adjectival rating, but will be an assessment of the reasonableness of the proposed price. The Government will evaluate the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed price using one or more of the following price analysis techniques:
  - Comparison of proposed price with the independent Government estimate;
  - Comparison of proposed price to all other proposed prices
  - Analysis of price for unbalanced items.

(End of provision)

### M.3 WEIGHTING AND SCORING

- (a) The essential objective of this procurement process is to identify and select the contractor able to successfully meet the Government's need in the manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. The evaluation factors are described in M.2, Evaluation Approach.
- (b) The overall Mission Suitability Factor will be numerically scored, and the Mission Suitability subfactors will be rated by adjective and numerically weighted and scored in accordance with the numerical system established below. The other factors (i.e., Past Performance and Price) are not similarly weighted or scored. Past Performance is assigned a level of confidence rating. Price will be evaluated for reasonableness. The Source Selection Authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals pursuant to source selection criteria prescribed in this solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment.
- (c) Price is the single most important factor. Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal to each other and when combined, are approximately equal to price.
- (d) The numerical weight assigned to Mission Suitability subfactors are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas. Mission Suitability subfactors to be evaluated are weighted for purposes of assigning numerical scores as follows:

## MISSION SUITALITY FACTOR

Subfactors				Assigned Weig	ht
Management Approach		4			
Approach to Contract Administr	ration Requirement	nts Including LE	EED		*
Documentation Requirements	3				
Key Personnel					
Approach to Subcontract Manag	gement	•		700	•
Approach to Quality Assurance	•				
Proposed Construction Schedule	•				
Utilization of Various Software	Tools Such as Ele	ectronic Submitt	als,	· .	
Scheduling Software, AutoCad					20
Requirement					
Safety and Health Plan	1			200	· · · · · ·
Small Business Utilization				100	
TOTAL				1000	

(End of provision)

[END OF SECTION]

Subject: RE: NAS2-02060 Submitter's letter

Date: Friday, May 7, 2010 5:30 PM

From: Horan, Thomas F. (ARC-JCE)[AECOM] < thomas.f.horan@nasa.gov>

To: "Garcia, Kelly L. (ARC-VCP)" <kelly.l.garcia@nasa.gov>

Hello Kelly,

AECOM has no objections to the release of the information in the referenced request. Thank you.

Regards,

Tom Horan, AIA
Vice President, Site Director
AECOM Design
D 650.604.0974
thomas.f.horan@nasa.gov

### **AECOM**

NASA Ames Research Center
Tom Horan/Mail Stop 213-8
Bldg. N213, Rm. 213
P.O Box 1
Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001
T 650.604.4285 F 650.968.2069
www.aecom.com <a href="http://www.aecom.com">http://www.aecom.com</a>

From: Garcia, Kelly L. (ARC-VCP)

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 05, 2010 9:09 AM **To:** Horan, Thomas F. (ARC-JCE)[AECOM] **Subject:** NAS2-02060 Submitter's letter

Importance: High

Hi Tom,

Per our phone conversation earlier, attached is the submitter's letter and information being requested. Please note that the deadline to respond is COB Friday, May 7, 2010.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks in advance! Kelly