

**MULTIPLE AWARD
INDEFINITE DELIVERY-INDEFINITE QUANTITY (IDIQ) CONTRACT
ADVANCED PLANNING SERVICES (APS)
IN SUPPORT OF MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY
SOLICITATION: HQ085426RE004**

GENERAL INFORMATION.

Document Type: Combined Synopsis/Solicitation
Posting Date: 21 Sep 2026
Response Date & Time: 21 October 2026
Title: Missile Defense Facility Advanced Planning Services (APS) 1.0
NAICS: 541330 Engineering Services
Product Service Code: C1BF – Missile System Facilities

CONTRACTING OFFICE ADDRESS:

Missile Defense Agency (MDA)
Building 5222 Martin Rd
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-0001

CONTRACT INFORMATION:

Multi-disciplined A-E services are required from advanced planning and initial site investigation through engineering support services during construction for various U.S. military projects primarily within the U.S. but may also include projects at other locations in which U.S. Forces have a mission. Projects located outside the Continental United States (OCNUS) and the required services will demand extensive knowledge of applicable host nation design codes and standards. The services that may be required will consist of, but are not limited to missile control buildings, industrial workshops, power plants, communications facilities, administration buildings, new and rehab road work, utility work, and building systems work, and various other facilities as needed to meet the Missile Defense mission. The designs require expertise in determining the facility and weapons system interface requirements and the follow-on design of radar, missile launch, tactical support facilities and various other facilities that may be required. (See table on p.4 for more Specific Requirements)

This acquisition is being procured in accordance with (IAW) the 40 United States Code (U.S.C.) Chapter 1101 et. seq, "Selection of Architects and Engineers" statute (formerly known as the Brooks Act) as implemented per the Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation Overhaul (RFO) 36.202 and Defense Acquisition Regulations Supplement (DFARS) 236.202.

The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) plans to award a multiple-award Indefinite Delivery Contract (IDC) on an unrestricted basis. Firms will be selected for negotiation based on demonstrated competence and qualifications for the required work.

The multiple-award IDC will have one 12-month base period, four 12-month option periods and a 6-month option to extend. RFO 52.217-9, "Option to Extend the Term of the Contract" and RFO 52.217-8, "Option to Extend Services" will be included in the contract. Except

when it is determined, IAW RFO 17.202(b), “Evaluation and award,” not to be in the Government’s best interests, the firms’ maximum rates will be evaluated for the multiple award IDC base period, four 12-month optional ordering periods, and RFO 52.217-8, “Option to Extend Services,” not to exceed six months. Evaluation of option period(s) will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s). Note: If the four 12-month optional ordering periods are not exercised and RFO 52.217-8, “Option to Extend Services,” is exercised to extend services beyond the base period, the maximum rates/pricing for the base period will apply to RFO 52.217-8. Work will be issued by negotiated Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) task orders. It is anticipated that the Government will award at least three IDCs; however, the Government reserves the right to award more or none, if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code for this procurement is 541330—Engineering Services with a small business size threshold of \$25,500,000.00. This announcement is open to all businesses regardless of size. The applicable Product Service Code for this acquisition is “C1BF - Missile Systems Facilities”. The total capacity to be shared among all awardees not to exceed \$95,000,000.00. The contract is anticipated to be awarded in fiscal year 2027. The Government's minimum guarantee for each contract awarded is \$1,500.00.

To be eligible for the contract award, a firm will be registered in System for Award Management (SAM) via sam.gov at the time of their submission. In addition, RFO 52.236-23, Responsibility of the Architect-Engineer Contractor, applies to this acquisition.

The main activities that comprise the selection process for this A-E IDC are as follows:

1. Public Announcement
2. Receipt of Standard Form (SF) 330, Architect-Engineer Qualifications
3. Conduct Pre-Selection Evaluation Board (if determined necessary)
4. Conduct Selection Evaluation Board
5. Approval of Selections by the Selection Authority
6. Issuance, Evaluation, and Negotiation of Price Proposals
7. Preparation of Contract Award Documents

Submission of Questions: Questions relative to these documents will be submitted no later than **3:00 p.m.** Central Time, **28-SEP-2026**, to ensure adequate time is allotted to form an appropriate response and amend the solicitation, if necessary. Offerors will submit questions and/or comments by email. No questions will be accepted via phone. Individual meetings with firms will not be scheduled. Voicemails with questions and/or requests for meetings will not receive a response. Responses to Questions will be posted. If questions are received, an amendment may be issued to address said questions. The Government reserves the right not to respond to any questions received concerning this solicitation after the question receipt date and time above.

Non-Governmental personnel from the contractors identified below:

The Government may release submitted proposal data to non-Government advisors for review, analysis, and evaluation. The following firm(s) may assist in the proposal evaluation process in

an advisory capacity. The Government may also employ administrative and engineering support services contractors in the handling of solicitation documentation for purposes of security and document control. All such personnel will be required to execute a statement to preserve and protect from disclosure any source selection and contractor proprietary information disclosed to them during the course of these evaluations. It is anticipated that the following firm(s) will be involved in the source selection process:

Hive Group
1785 Greensboro Station Pl. #700
McLean, VA 22102
Point of Contact: Thomas Eckl, teckl@hive-llc.com

The support contractor advisors are subject to contractual Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) restrictions and are expressly prohibited from competing on this acquisition in any fashion, i.e., being a prime, subcontractor, or teaming partner. Contractor personnel supporting this acquisition have signed Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) and are subject to OCI restrictions. Individuals will be authorized access only to those portions of the proposal data and discussions that are necessary for them to perform their respective duties.

Objections to disclosure of proposals, or specific portions, to the non-Government advisors listed above must be provided in writing to the PCO within five (5) business days of solicitation issuance. If no objections are submitted, the Offeror(s) and its subcontractors must enter into a non-disclosure agreement with the non-Government advisor(s), or with the company employing the non-Government advisor before the non-Government advisor(s) are given access to the Offeror(s) proprietary or source selection information.

WRITTEN OBJECTIONS MUST INCLUDE A DETAILED STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR THE OFFEROR'S OBJECTION AND IDENTIFY SPECIFIC PORTIONS OF THE PROPOSAL THE OFFEROR OBJECTS TO DISCLOSE TO NON-GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS ADVISORS.

REQUIREMENTS INFORMATION.

Services. Multi-disciplined A-E services are required from advanced planning and initial site investigation through engineering support services during construction for various U.S. military projects primarily within the U.S. but may also include projects at other locations in which U.S. Forces have a mission. Projects located outside the Continental United States (OCONUS) and the required services will demand extensive knowledge of applicable host nation design codes and standards. The services that may be required will consist of, but are not limited to missile control buildings, industrial workshops, power plants, communications facilities, administration buildings, new and rehab road work, utility work, and building systems work, and various other facilities as needed to meet the Missile Defense mission. The designs require expertise in determining the facility and weapons system interface requirements and the follow-on design of radar, missile launch, tactical support facilities and various other facilities that may be required.

Specific requirements are expected to include, but will not be limited to the following:

Feasibility Studies	Conceptional Development of Facilities
Trade Studies	Conceptional Development of Infrastructure
Land Use Planning	Analysis
Infrastructure Planning	Cost Estimates
Environmental Assessments	Specification Development
Design Criteria	Reliability, Availability, Maintainability Studies
Facility Requirements	Value Engineering Studies
Topographic Survey	RFI Support
Geotechnical Survey	Economic Analysis
HAZMAT Survey	
Power Development Studies	
Power Coordination Studies	
Transient Studies	
Acoustic Studies	
Power Development Studies	
Transportation Planning	
NEPA & Environmental Studies & Reviews	

Location.

This acquisition will require the contractors to have the capability to respond to multiple task order requests for work for diverse locations. This IDC has a broad geographic scope that includes the United States, U.S. Territories and Possessions, and Outlying Areas (as defined in RFO 2.101), as well as foreign locations such as Germany, Denmark, Turkey, Bulgaria, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom, Japan, Australia, Canada, and Czech Republic. Excluding site visits for fact-finding, consultation, and information gathering, all work for foreign locations will be at the contractors' United States place of performance. Other foreign jurisdictions outside the Continental United States may be added to the geographic scope of the IDCs if deemed appropriate after an analysis of relevant statutes and regulations. However, the bulk of the work is expected to be performed in the home offices of the A-E firm.

Security Considerations.

All A-E firms and all associated sub-contractors' employees will comply with applicable installation, facility and area commander installation/facility access and local security policies and procedures (provided by Government representative). The firm will also provide all information required for background checks to meet installation/facility access and control requirements to be accomplished by installation Provost Marshal Office, Director of Emergency Services or Security Office. The A-E firms' workforce must comply with all personal identity verification requirements IAW RFO 52.204-9, "Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel." In addition to authorized changes, should the Force Protection Condition (FPCON) at any installation facility change, the Government may require changes in A-E firm security matters or processes.

Firms are required to hold a facility security clearance at the time of proposal submission. It is anticipated that some task orders will involve classified data and work in Secret and potentially

Top-Secret secure areas. A facilities clearance is required. The firm will be required to store and generate classified material. At a minimum, all documents submitted to the Government will be marked Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) IAW the Controlled Unclassified Information sections of DoD Manual 5200.01 DoD Information Security Program. The A-E firm will put into place a system to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of data, photographs, reports, and other material generated or acquired because of this contract. Access to data, maps, photographs, and similar material under the firm's control will be limited to those with a valid need.

Facility Security Clearance:

The A-E prime and each member of a JV partner firm shall possess and maintain a FCL granted by the DCSA. The Contractor shall notify the COR and MDA Industrial Security of all changes to the FCL. The notifications include but are not limited to: changes in foreign ownership, control, or influence; upgrades to Safeguarding or Clearance level; downgrades of Safeguarding or Clearance level, removal of safeguarding; termination of FCL regardless of circumstances, voluntarily, for business reasons; or any other reason. All parts of 32 CFR Part 117 and all other parts of Federal Law, DoD regulations and any additional security conditions shall be complied with.

The prime firms and each member of a JV partner firm will also demonstrate employee secret security clearances as well as ability to store and process classified material. This acquisition will not be acquiring information technology products or services.

All offerors must possess an active Facility (Secret / Top Secret) Clearance at the time of submittal. Any offers submitted by an offeror without an active clearance will not be evaluated or considered for award.

Primary Selection Criteria.

- Criteria A – Specialized Experience & Technical Competence
- Criteria B – Professional Qualifications
- Criteria C – Past Performance
- Criteria D – Capacity
- Criteria E – Knowledge of Locality

Criteria A: Specialized Experience & Technical Competence

The Government will evaluate the specialized experience and technical competence of each firm as demonstrated by three (3) recent and relevant key projects associated with advance planning and siting for new construction and two (2) relevant key projects associated with facility system engineering studies in specialized competency areas. The projects provided do not need to encompass all the specialties identified but will demonstrate competency in at least two (2) unique areas (at least one (1) per project). Additional projects will not be evaluated. A project is defined as efforts leading to the completion of a specific A-E service requirement. Individual task orders from an IDC can be submitted as one (1) project. Single projects that were completed using multiple task orders may be submitted as a key project. However, multiple projects performed under a multiple-award contract may not be submitted as a single key project and will be disqualified from further evaluation. Each project will be submitted

using one (1) SF330 Part I, Section F form. Projects that do not fall into the specified work will not be considered relevant. Proposals that have fewer than three relevant and recent projects will be considered non-responsive and will be rated “Unsatisfactory” for this criterion.

It is not required that the submitted key projects be in support of a missile systems program, but the key projects should demonstrate recent and relevant experience in the planning of facilities and infrastructure. Facility engineer expertise demonstrating core competencies and specialized analytical techniques such as FMECA, RAM analyses, HEMP survivability, Anti-Terrorism Force Protection, explosives safety, prediction of explosive effects, protective construction to mitigate explosive effects, extreme environmental conditions, TEMPEST, Secret Compartmentalized Information Facilities, physical and electronic security systems, power plants, radar facilities, standard and critical communication facilities, and intrusion detection systems requirements are required.

A key project will only be considered recent, if the contractor demonstrates through documentation that the completed designed product has been accepted by the project owner within the last ten (10) years. At least two (2) of the submitted key projects should have led to construction. Otherwise, the key projects that were completed more than 10 years ago and without a construction award will be evaluated less favorably.

Greater relevance will be assigned to key projects: (1) that demonstrate greater complexity; (2) where the firm has demonstrated greater depth of involvement; (3) where the firm has performed a greater portion of the design; (4) and where the project involves a greater number of core competencies and specialized analytical techniques as described above. Projects with greater relevance may be evaluated higher than those with lesser relevance.

Key projects are defined as performed by the prime A-E firm, JV partners, or key subcontractors that are being proposed as team members for this synopsis submission. A key subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor which is expected to perform 10% or more of the total contract effort across all task orders awarded in this contract. The effectiveness of the proposed project team (including management structure; coordination of disciplines, offices and/or subcontractors; and prior working relationships) will be demonstrated.

Criteria B: Professional Qualifications

Certificate of Authorization (or equivalent): If the firm has not provided a Certificate of Authorization, an equivalent certification, or (otherwise) a letter explaining why the firm may, by law, practice architecture and/or engineering in at least one state, territory, or jurisdiction of the United States as required by RFO 36.202-3(d), “Award”, the firm will be disqualified for further consideration.

Evaluation of Key Personnel: The qualifications of proposed personnel must meet the minimum requirements as outlined in this synopsis. Key personnel will be evaluated in terms of education, professional credentials, training, registration, relevant and specialized experience, career longevity with the firm, and teaming experience among key personnel. If the firm has not provided a resume for each of the required key disciplines the submission will be considered non-responsive and will be rated “Unacceptable” for this criterion. The lack of a required credential for any key discipline will constitute an “Unacceptable” rating for this

criterion. Dual-Hatting of key discipline positions is not acceptable. The key personnel to be evaluated are as follows:

- Lead Program Manager
- Lead Project Manager
- Lead Architect
- Lead Civil Engineer
- Lead Geotechnical Engineer
- Lead Structural Engineer
- Lead Environmental Engineer
- Lead Mechanical Engineer
- Lead Fire Protection Engineer
- Lead Electrical Engineer
- Lead Communications Systems Professional.
- Lead Quality Control Manager.
- Lead Cost Engineer or Cost Estimator.
- GIS Management/GIS Operation
- Lead Scheduler
- Lead Electronic Security System Designer

Evaluation of Work Management and Teaming: A team will be rated stronger whose matrices demonstrate team experience where a greater percentage of its members have worked together on more Key Projects.

Joint Venture Partnership Agreement: If the firm proposes a joint venture partnership, it must include a copy of their signed agreement.

Mentor Protégé Agreement: If the firm is proposing under a Mentor-Protégé program, it must include a copy of their signed agreement.

Evaluation of the Organization Chart: The organization chart will be evaluated for potential performance risks and opportunities related to organizational structure.

Evaluation of Quality Control (QC) Process: The QC Process will be evaluated for potential performance risks and its ability to maintain a level of quality consistent with the industry standard.

Criteria C: Past Performance.

Past Performance will be evaluated primarily upon official information available about the key projects that have been submitted under Criteria A, the Specialized Experience & Technical Competence criteria.

For key projects Government will review the submitted Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) or Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs). The Government reserves the right to evaluate past performance evaluation information from any other relevant sources for recent and relevant projects performed by the prime A-E firm, JV Partners, and Key

Subcontractors. The Government may elect to consider any credible and reliable information obtained from other sources. The relevance of such past performance information will be evaluated prior to consideration. If adverse past performance information is obtained from the PPQ or other sources, the firm will have the opportunity to respond to any adverse information received which it had not had a previous opportunity to comment on.

Past performance information does not include ratings of [PPQs] reached during this source selection.

Criteria D: Capacity

The A-E firm, at a minimum, must demonstrate capacity or an effective organization structure, project team and quality management plan to accomplish up to an estimated three (3) task orders simultaneously, with an estimated value of \$5 million each in a one (1) year period. Further, the Offeror should describe its approach to down ramping or above and beyond work as requirements increase or decrease during the period of performance of this IDC. The evaluation will consider the management approach, coordination of disciplines and subcontractors, and quality control procedures to complete the task orders. Those firms which cannot demonstrate this capacity will be rated Unsatisfactory for this criterion.

More consideration may be given to firms who can effectively demonstrate a greater capacity for their proposed team to effectively handle additional work of the type demanded of this contract compared to their present workload.

Capacity is not simply a measure of the depth of the overall resources available to the A-E firm, but rather a measure of the proposed team's ability to provide the volume of expertise required under this specific contract (e.g., architecture and engineering services supporting missile systems).

Criteria E: Knowledge of Locality

Greater consideration may be given to firms who have demonstrated greater geographic diversity of project experience and capability.

Greater consideration may be given to firms with experience and capability of performing work on projects located in:

- (a) the United States and its territories;
- (b) in geographically remote locations;
- (c) in area of extreme environmental and weather conditions including wind and earthquake.

Extreme wind environments include areas with design wind speeds exceeding 160 mph. Extreme seismic environments include areas where the Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) exceeds 0.5g for an event with a 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years.

The firm will provide a logical narrative explanation (with charts or other aids as necessary) to

demonstrate their familiarity and capabilities.

Criteria A, B, D, and E will be evaluated using the following adjectival rating methodology:

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength.
Purple	Good	Proposal demonstrates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal demonstrates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is un-awardable.

Criterion C will be evaluated using the following two-part adjectival rating scheme of recency, relevancy and confidence ratings:

The Government will conduct a performance assessment on recent and relevant contracts based upon the quality of the Offeror's past performance.

Recency Assessment:

The Government will only consider recent work, which is defined as a completed designed product that has been accepted by the project owner within the last ten (10) years.

Relevancy Assessment:

If the past performance information is recent, a relevancy assessment will be conducted on the Offeror’s past contracts. Relevancy is defined as a key project: (1) that demonstrate greater complexity; (2) where the firm has demonstrated greater depth of involvement; (3) where the firm has performed a greater portion of the design; (4) and where the project involves a greater number of core competencies and specialized analytical techniques as described above.

For a description of the characteristics or aspects the Government will consider in determining relevancy, see the Table below:

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

Quality Assessment:

The quality assessment is an evaluation that determines how well the Offeror performed on recent and relevant past contracts. The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review this past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to the Past Performance factor evaluation. A quality assessment will only be conducted against the Offerors' contracts assessed as recent and at least somewhat relevant.

The Past Performance Evaluation Team will utilize the quality definitions in the table below in assessing quality of performance relative to contract performance information obtained from other sources to include but not limited to: PPQs, PPIRS/CPARS, FAPIIS, eSRS, or other databases; interviews with Government POCs (e.g. Program Managers, PCOs, and Fee Determining Officials) or commercial equivalents; and the Defense Contract Management Agency.

Rating	Rating Definition
Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
Satisfactory	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.
Not Applicable	No information or did not apply to your contract. Unable to provide assessment.

Past Performance Rating:

Based on the recency, relevancy, and quality ratings assessed for the contracts, an overall Performance Confidence Assessment, as defined in the table below will be assessed for each Offeror.

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.

Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

Secondary Criteria.

The secondary criteria will only be used as a "tiebreaker," if necessary, in ranking the most highly qualified firms. The secondary criteria will not be commingled with the primary criteria in the evaluation. The secondary criteria are listed in the order of importance are:

Criteria F - Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business Participation

The Government will evaluate the extent of participation of small businesses (including Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), HUBZone, Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (DSVOSB). Criteria F will be evaluated using the same adjectival rating methodology as Criteria A, B, D, and E listed above.

1

<u>Category</u>	<u>Goals FY26</u>
Small Business	10.04%
<u>Socio-Economic Categories</u>	
Small Disadvantaged Business	2.33%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	1.20%
Women-Owned Small Business	1.20%
HUBZone Small Business	0.24%

Criteria G Volume of DoW Contract Awards

Greater consideration may be given to those firms who have been awarded a lesser total dollar amount of stand-alone DoW contracts and task orders in the last 12 months than those who have been awarded a greater total amount. This will be evaluated via the firm's total dollar value of all stand-alone contracts and task orders as provided in Part I, section H of the SF330. This consists of those requirements awarded by DoW in the last 12 months to the Prime A-E firm or Joint-Venture Partnership IDC. Capacity of unawarded options will not be considered under this criterion. Contracts may include those for the Missile Defense Agency.

Submission Requirements.

Offerors are to submit an SF330 Architect-Engineer Qualifications package. SF330's and supporting information will be submitted via the Solicitation Module of PIEE at <https://piee.eb.mil>. Offerors must be registered in PIEE to submit a proposal. All firms are encouraged to register in the PIEE Solicitation Module as soon as possible. The registration instructions are available at: https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/dpc/ce/cap/docs/piee/PIEE_Solicitation_Module_Vendor_Access_Instructions.pdf.

Failure to successfully register in PIEE will prevent the firm from completing the submission for this acquisition. For instructions, please refer to the Posting Offer demo available at: https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf. Questions about how to submit your proposal will be directed to the PIEE help desk at 866-618-5988. In the event of a PIEE System outage within 24 hours of the proposal due date that prevents the Offeror from submitting a timely proposal, the Offeror will notify the Contract Specialist and Contracting Officer, via email.

For the purposes of establishing a timely proposal submission, the Government will use the date and time an Offeror's entire submission is successfully uploaded in PIEE Solicitation Module. A proposal will be considered timely if there is acceptable evidence establishing that it was received at the initial point of entry to the Government's IT infrastructure prior to the time set for receipt of proposals. The Government cautions Offerors that electronic submissions are not instantaneous, and file uploads are subject to system connectivity. Submissions may take several minutes or hours, and Offerors should print confirmation information for their files.

All submissions will be submitted in searchable Adobe PDF format with no smaller than 10-point font. It is the responsibility of the firm to ensure that all files contained therein are readable, complete, and accessible without a password.

The Government will not accept printed proposals. Facsimile transmissions will not be accepted.

It is the Offeror's responsibility to check the online posting at the address provided for any posted changes to this solicitation and all amendments.

The penalty for making false statement in the SF330 Architect-Engineer Qualifications package is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

The A-E firm's SF330 documentation must conform to the following special instructions.

SF330 Part I - Contract Specific Qualifications. The SF 330 Part I presents the corporate team members and their roles in the proposed contract, an organization chart, resumes of the key

personnel to be assigned to the contract, projects which illustrate the team's experience in the required type of work, the key personnel's participation in the example projects, and any other qualifications relevant to the announced contract. A single SF 330 Part I is submitted for the entire team. The contents of Part I will not exceed 62 pages (8.5" X 11") including no more than 12 pages for Section H. Charts, graphs, etc., may have only that amount of text to explain the item and will not contain excessive text that circumvents the page and font limits. Pages that extend beyond this limit will be removed from the submittal and will not be evaluated. This page limitation only applies to the official contents of Sections A through I of Part I. Cover letters, tab pages, acronym tables, and other such pages do not count against this limit. Firms may use no smaller than 10-point font for narrative, organizational charts, graphs, tables, or matrices. Charts, graphs, etc., may have only that amount of text to explain the item.

- A. Part I – Section A: General Information. Fill out completely.
- B. Part I – Section B: General Information. Fill out completely. Include the prime firm's POC name, email address, and contractor A-E firm CAGE and Unique Entity ID (UEI) number in this Section.
- C. Part I – Section C: Partner Firms. Fill out completely. Only the Prime contractor A-E firm, JV Partners, and Key Subcontractors are required to be listed. For work not performed by the prime, JV Partner or Key Subcontractor, do not identify any other firms in the accomplishment of the work.
- D. Part I – Section D: Organization Chart. The firm will submit an organization chart of the proposed team that clearly demonstrates the team and organizational relationships among key personnel, delineates responsibility, and identifies for which firm each person directly works. The organization chart will not exceed one page. Non-key personnel may also be referenced on the organization chart.
- E. Part I – Section E: Key Personnel. The firm will submit one resume for each of the key personnel listed below. Multiple personnel will not be submitted for a single key personnel position. Dual-Hatting of key discipline positions is not acceptable allowed (e.g., John Smith cannot be both the Lead Project Manager and the Lead Architect). Firms will clearly identify the role of every individual on each resume submitted specifically to the roles specified herein.
 - Lead Program Manager - Registered Architect or registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
 - Lead Project Manager – Registered Architect or registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
 - Lead Architect - Registered Architect in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
 - Lead Mechanical Engineer - Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
 - Lead Electrical Engineer -Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
 - Lead Civil Engineer -Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory

- Lead Geotechnical Engineer - Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
- Lead Structural Engineer - Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
- Lead Environmental Engineer - Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
- Lead Fire Protection Engineer - Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
- Lead Communications Systems Professional - Registered Communications Distribution Designer (RCDD)
- Lead Quality Control Manager - Registered Architect or registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory
- Lead Cost Engineer or Cost Estimator. This person will demonstrate proficiency with the 2nd Generation Micro-Computer Aided Cost Engineering System (MII) cost estimating software.
- GIS Management/GIS Operation - Minimum 5 years' experience and Geographical Information Systems Professional (GISP) Certification or Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) ArcGIS Certification.
- Lead Scheduler -Ten (10) years of experience with Primavera and construction scheduling and demonstrate proof that the individual currently holds one (1) of the two (2) below certifications:
 - AACE – PSP: Planning & Scheduling Professional
 - PMI – SP: Project Management Institute Scheduling Professional
- Lead Electronic Security System Designer -Registered Professional Engineer in at least one (1) U.S. state or territory, with six (6) years of experience and must demonstrate proof that the individual currently holds of one (1) of the three (3) below certifications:
 - Physical Security Professional (PSP)
 - Certified Protection Professional (CPP), or
 - Registered Communication Distribution Designer (RCDD)

Additionally, the resumes submitted will demonstrate the following credentials/competencies are possessed by 1- key personnel above or by another identified discipline whose resume is separately submitted:

- Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection. Minimum of 6- years' experience required.
- Experience in the prediction of explosive effects and protection construction design to mitigate explosive effects
- Experience in High-Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) design

If a submitted key discipline works for a subcontractor to the primary firm, then they should demonstrate successful project execution as a subcontractor with the primary firm for a minimum of one (1) year.

F. Part I – Section F: Example Key Projects. Firms proposing must submit five (5) key projects that demonstrate recent and relevant experience in the planning and engineering studies of facilities in support of the deployment of Mission Critical and Mission Essential Operations for the Government. Key relevant projects are expected to include specialized

analytical techniques and features such as FMECA, RAM analyses, HEMP survivability, Structural, seismic Risk Category V, Anti-Terrorism Force Protection, explosives safety site plans, prediction of explosive effects, protective construction to mitigate explosive effects, extreme environmental conditions, TEMPEST, Secret Compartmentalized Information Facilities, physical and electronic security systems, power plants, facilities in support of the missile systems, radar facilities, communication facilities, and intrusion detection systems requirements. A project is defined as efforts leading to the completion of a specific requirement. Individual task orders from an IDC can be submitted as one (1) project. Each project will be submitted using one (1) a separate SF330 Part I, Section F form. Recent projects are those that the designed product has been accepted by the project owner within the last ten (10) years. At least two (2) of the submitted key projects should have led to construction. Otherwise, the key projects that were completed more than 10 years ago and without a construction award will be evaluated less favorably.

G. Part I – Section G: Key Personnel Participation Matrix. Fill out completely.

H. Part I – Section H: Additional Information. The contractor A-E firm may provide any additional information they deem helpful in describing their qualifications. It may also be used to provide information specifically requested by the Government. Any information requested by the Government and the firm is uncertain of where to place will be placed in this section. Further, information specifically requested to be provided in Section H includes:

- a. Quality Control Process. Describe the A-E firm's Quality Control Management approach tailored to this procurement. The approach should include:
 - i. The name and contact information of the individual responsible for safety and quality control implementation and oversight.
 - ii. Comprehensive description and explanation of the system that will be in place at the time of contract award to ensure quality is maintained.
 - iii. A process that allows the Government to verify sufficient internal contractor A-E firm review was performed.
 - iv. A systematic review process that ensures quality of deliverables is tracked for all TOs awarded under this IDC to note trends in overall quality over the period of performance.
- b. Capacity Demonstration. The firm must provide a logical narrative explanation to analytically demonstrate their capacity to perform additional workload above and beyond work on other contracts projected to be performed during the period of performance of this IDC. This is not simply a measure of the depth of a team's resources (i.e., number of people), but a measure of the proposed team's ability to provide the specific expertise required under this specific contract. Use charts, aids, and a narrative of the calculations in a way that simply but effectively explains how the firm's additional capacity was derived. The analysis should discuss capacity in terms of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees. The analysis of capacity should discuss a firm's ability to effectively schedule projects to maximize available resources while considering deadlines. It should also discuss the ability of the prime to bring on and manage subcontractors to meet demand. Further, the firm will

discuss how it would ramp down work in the event the work is decreased.

- c. Knowledge of Locality. The firm must provide a logical narrative explanation (with charts or other aids as necessary) to demonstrate their familiarity and capability of working in multiple geographic locations to include locations Outside the Continental United States.
 - d. Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business. The firm must provide their intended subcontracting targets (as a percentage of Total Acquisition Value of the contract) in several small business categories.
 - e. Volume of DoW Contract Awards. The firm must provide the total dollar value of all stand-alone contracts and TOs awarded by the Department of War in the last 12 months to the Prime Contractor A-E firm or JV Partnership. Do not include IDC capacity or capacity of unawarded options.
 - f. Safety. The firm must provide information on programs for safety training while on Government installations and how safety training is tracked.
- I. Part I – Section I. An authorized representative of the firm must sign the document confirming that the information in Part I of the SF330 is factual.

SF330 Part II: Architect-Engineer General Qualifications: Part II provides basic information about the capabilities and experience of a firm and is not specific to a contract. The firm must provide one updated and signed form for each Prime Contractor A-E firm, JV Partnership, and Key Subcontractor on the proposed team and is prepared on a branch office basis. It must include the type of ownership, small business type (if applicable), point of contact, number of personnel in each discipline, profile of the firm's experience, and annual volume of work. There is no page limit to Part II, however, it must only include Architect-Engineer General Qualifications information.

Supplemental Information: Supplemental information being requested by the Government will be provided after Part II information in a separate tabbed section. There is no page limit to the Supplemental Information section, however, it should only include the information specifically requested below (as applicable). The following items will be included, each identified with the appropriate file name:

- State Certificate of Authorization to Practice Engineering or Architecture: The submitting A-E firm (as Prime Contractor A-E firm or one JV Partner) will provide a Certificate of Authorization, an equivalent certification, or (otherwise) a letter explaining why the firm may, by law, practice architecture and/or engineering in at least one state, territory, or jurisdiction of the United States as required by RFO 36.202-3(d).
- Past Performance Information: For each Key Example Project provided in Part I – Section F, the A-E will provide past performance information (described below) in the order provided in Section F (above).

- For each Key Example Project performed for the U.S. Federal Government by any team member of the A-E firm in the role of the Prime Contractor A-E firm or JV Partner, the A-E firm will provide a copy of the most recent (preferably “final”) signed performance evaluation from the CPARS.
- For each Key Example Project performed by any team member of the A-E firm in the role of Prime Contractor A-E firm or JV Partner which did not require a CPARS evaluation, the A-E firm will solicit a PPQ to be completed by the customer representative of the project who was directly involved in the oversight of the A-E firm’s work.
- For each Key Example Project performed by any team member of the A-E firm in the role of a subcontractor to the prime, the A-E firm will solicit a PPQ to be completed by the ultimate customer representative of the project who was directly involved in the oversight of the A-E firm’s work (NOT the prime contractor A-E firm). The customer representative will be requested to focus their evaluation to that of the specific subcontractor’s contribution rather than the project as a whole. The prime contractor A-E firm for whom the subcontractor worked directly for may not fill out the PPQ.
- In lieu of requesting a new PPQ from the customer, the A-E may include a PPQ previously provided by the customer for the same Key Example Project from a previous proposal.
- These questionnaires must include instructions to send the responses back to the proposing firm for timely inclusion into their proposal. A PPQ template (Attachment 2) has been provided for use. The solicitation number and A-E firm’s name will be clearly indicated on the PPQ. Provide the Government with a list of contacts that were provided a PPQ identifying the key project title, solicitation number, company, contract number, agency, last name, first name, job title, phone number, email address, and the date contacted.
- Each firm should follow-up with clients to ensure timely submittal of the PPQ. The purpose of the list is to allow the Government an opportunity to investigate performance in the event that a PPQ is not returned by the customer representative in a timely manner.
- Joint-Venture Partnership Agreement: If proposing as a JV, all members of the JV will sign a written agreement designating one firm with the authority to bind the other members of the JV. Failure to comply with the foregoing requirements may eliminate the proposal from further consideration. If this is an 8(a), HUBZone, or Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned JV, the Offeror should ensure that it complies with the applicable requirements of 13 CFR Part 124, 13 CFR Part 125, and 13 CFR Part 126 respectively.

In addition, a small business JV offeror must submit, with its offer, the representation required in paragraph (c) of RFO solicitation provision 52.219-1, Small Business Program Representations, for the following categories:

- Small Business;
 - Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business.
 - Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB) under the WOSB Program.
 - Economically Disadvantaged Women-Owned Small Business under the WOSB Program; or
 - Historically underutilized business zone Small Business.
- Mentor-Protégé Agreement: If proposing as part of a Mentor-Protégé Agreement, include a signed copy of the agreement and the Small Business Administration approval of the agreement with the SF330.

Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ), Attachment L-02

Information provided on the PPQs assists the evaluation team in determining the performance confidence assessment. The Offeror is responsible for, not later than 4 days prior to proposal due date, sending Attachment L-02 to respondents listed in the PPI who will subsequently complete and submit information to the Government to be received by the proposal due date. The Offeror shall complete the PPQ (Attachment L-02) consistent with the PPQ instructions and then forward the entire questionnaire to the POCs listed in the PPI for completion.

Once the PPQs are completed by the POCs, the information contained therein shall be considered source selection sensitive and shall not be released to the Offeror. The Offeror shall instruct each of the POCs to email the completed PPQs (signed in PDF) directly to the Contracting Officer with “APS PPQs” and the name of the Offeror in the subject line. The Government reserves the right to contact these sources if they do not submit responses by the RFP closing date and consider them in making a quality assessment.

Consent Letters, Attachment L-03

Past performance information concerning subcontractors will not be disclosed to a private party without the subcontractor's consent. Because a Prime Offeror is a private party, the Government will need that consent before disclosing subcontractor past performance information to the prime during exchanges. The Offeror shall provide a consent letter for each proposed subcontractor using the format provided at Attachment L-03, Consent Letter. This letter allows the release of adverse past performance information on a subcontractor to the Offeror so the Offeror can respond to such information. The Offeror shall provide signed consent letters for each subcontractor and/or joint venture partner. Once the consent letter is received, the Government will discuss past performance only with the Offeror under review. If the Offeror fails to submit consent letters with the proposal, the Government will only be able to notify the Offeror that it has discovered adverse past performance information for one of its subcontractors, but that it cannot disclose or discuss the adverse past performance.

Client Authorization Letters Attachment L-04

Each Offeror, subcontractor, and joint venture shall execute a Client Authorization Letter for

commercial customers authorizing release to the Government of requested information on its respective performance using the format provided at Attachment L-04, Client Authorization Letter. The Offeror shall provide signed client authorization letters for the Offeror and each subcontractor and/or joint venture. If the client authorization letter is not submitted with the proposal on time, the Government will not contact the specified client and will deem the failure to submit the authorization letter to constitute a waiver of any Government obligation to obtain or consider any past performance information that the client may have been able to provide during the evaluation process.