

Chilled Water Plant Replacement & Site Utility Improvements (Phase A2)

VA Connecticut Healthcare System

950 Campbell Ave, West Haven, Connecticut

W912WJ26RA008

Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria

22 September 2026

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

New England District, North Atlantic Division

A. Basis for Award

A contract will be awarded to the Offeror whose proposal represents the “Best Value” to the Government. The best value determination will be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation, considering recommendations and minority opinions presented to the SSA. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. Offerors are cautioned that the award may not necessarily be made to the lowest priced offer.

B. Factors to be Evaluated

The following factors will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Factor	Description	Relative Importance
1	Past Performance	Factor 1 is more important than Factor 2.
2	Management Approach	Factor 2 is more important than Factor 3.
3	Small Business Participation Commitment Document	Factor 3 is more important than Factor 4.
4	Price	Factor 4 is the least important factor. All non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

Each proposal will be reviewed in accordance with the RFP's Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria. A detailed explanation of the criteria is set forth in the “Evaluation Approach,” Paragraph C of this section. During evaluations of each proposal, the Government will assign each factor an adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings.

C. Evaluation Approach/Proposal Submission

All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by the Source Selection Team (SST).

Procedures for Submittal of Offers and Proposal Evaluation Criteria

1. Overview

The intent of this solicitation is to select one contractor for the Chilled Water Plant Replacement & Site Utility Improvements (Phase A2) at VA Connecticut Healthcare System (VACHS) in West Haven, Connecticut. The Government will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the criteria described herein and award a firm fixed price contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforms with all the terms and conditions of the solicitation and whose proposal is determined to represent the overall best value to the Government.

The basis of award is the Tradeoff Process. The Contracting Officer will award the contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines conforms to the solicitation, is fair and reasonable, and offers the best overall value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to accept other than the lowest priced offer or to reject all offers.

2. Proposal Submission Instructions

All submissions to this announcement shall be submitted electronically through the Army's electronic file sharing service, **Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE)**

(<https://piee.eb.mil/>), using the Solicitation module and the open solicitation associated with this solicitation number. The Government **will not** accept: paper copies, CD-ROMs, emails, facsimile submissions, proposals uploaded to any other module of PIEE, or any other method of submission. These proposals will not be retrieved or evaluated.

Information regarding how to set up a vendor registration is included in this link:
<https://piee.eb.mil/xhtml/unauth/web/homepage/vendorGettingStartedHelp.xhtml>

Information regarding role assignment during vendor registration is included in this link:
<https://sam.gov/opp/2b0a3d5c4c454beb8fefa3d844544a1d/view>

File Size Limitations: Offerors are advised to follow the PIEE instructions for uploading files.

PIEE supports delivery up to 1.9 GB per file, with no limit on the number of files, as well as multiple file formats. If needed, Offerors may break the files down into smaller sections in order to upload. In such cases, please divide the sections as logically as possible and be sure to clearly name the files as specified below.

File Naming Convention: To ensure your submission is processed appropriately, each file name should begin with the solicitation number followed by the firm's name and a brief file description.

Adhere to the following naming convention:

W912WJ26RA008-FIRMNAME-VOLUME I
W912WJ26RA008-FIRMNAME-VOLUME II
W912WJ26RA008-FIRMNAME-VOLUME III

File Packaging: All of the proposal electronic files shall be submitted in their native formats (e.g., docx, xlsx, ppt) and uploaded electronically to the PIEE website. CDs, DVD, Zip disks or USB drives are not permitted.

****Please note – Self extracting exe files are not acceptable.**

****In addition, copies of all files in PDF format shall also be provided. All price breakdown information to aid in the price evaluation shall be submitted in Microsoft Office Excel Read/Write format and viewable in Microsoft Excel 365.**

Upload Completion and Deadline: Interested parties shall submit proposals no later than the date and time specified on the solicitation document. The time and date of proposal receipt will be the upload completion/delivery time and date recorded within the PIEE, Solicitation module, open solicitation associated with this solicitation number. Do not assume that electronic submission will occur instantaneously. Large files (e.g., 10MB or more) will take some time to upload. Offerors should time their upload effort and not wait until the last minute to submit as there may be delays in the transmittal process. Offerors are encouraged to keep a copy of the PIEE upload confirmation for their records.

It is the responsibility of the Offeror to confirm timely receipt of proposals. All proposals received after the exact time specified for receipt (as confirmed by the date/time recorded within the PIEE Solicitation module), shall be treated as late submissions and will not be considered.

3. Proposal Structure Requirements

Proposals shall contain the following:

Volume	Item	Page Limit
Volume I	Past Performance Narratives	Yes (35 Pages Total)
Volume I Appendix	CPARS Reports, Past Performance Questionnaires	No

	Joint Venture Agreements, Letters of Commitment, Partnership Agreements, Mentor-Protégé Agreements (if applicable)	
Volume II	Small Business Participation Commitment Document	No
Volume III	- SF1442 - Bid Schedule - Acknowledgement of Amendments - Certificate of Corporate Authority - Other required proforma information	No

Pages that exceed the above noted page limitations will be removed, not read, and will not be evaluated by the Government. Every page within the proposal will be included in the page calculation unless specifically excluded in the table above. Examples of pages that will be counted include but are not limited to: Cover letters, cover pages, dividers, blank pages, Table of Contents pages, tables, illustrations, and appendices.

4. Proposal Formatting Requirements

The submission should be clearly indexed and logically assembled. Each volume should be clearly identified and begin at the top of a page. All pages of each volume should be consecutively numbered and identified by the complete company name, date, and solicitation number in the header and/or footer. Microsoft Word (doc/docx) files should use the following page setup parameters:

Margins – Top, Bottom, Left, Right – 1”

Gutter – 0”

From Edge – Header, Footer 0.5”

Page Size, Width – 8.5”

Page Size, Height – 11”

11” x 17” pages are acceptable for tables/graphic representations; however, each 11” x 17” page counts as two pages.

Each volume should be single spaced. Each paragraph should be separated by at least one blank line. A standard, 12-point minimum font size applies. Do not use condensed character spacing or a scale below 100%. Arial or Times New Roman fonts are required. Tables and illustrations may use a reduced font size no less than 9-point and may be landscape oriented. Proposals shall not contain classified data. The use of hyperlinks and QR codes in proposals is prohibited.

Revisions. Any pages that are changed (as a result of discussions/negotiations or proposal revisions) should be of a different color and should have changed information clearly marked by a vertical line in the right margin of the page. The revised pages should be dated. Each volume should be clearly labeled with its title.

5. Other

Not applicable.

6. Proposal Evaluation Process

A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) comprised of representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Veterans Affairs (VA) and a Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) will evaluate the proposals. Offerors are advised that the technical evaluation and rating of proposals will be conducted in strict confidence. Technical proposals will be reviewed and rated without knowledge of the price offered. The number and identities of Offerors are not revealed to anyone who is not involved in the evaluation and award process or to other Offerors. Proposals will be evaluated based on the factors described herein, and the basis of award is the Tradeoff Process. The evaluation process essentially consists of four parts: proposal compliance review, technical evaluation, price evaluation, and price/technical trade-off analysis.

- **Proposal Compliance Review:** This is an initial review to ensure that all required forms and certifications are complete and that both a technical and price proposal were received.
- **Technical Evaluation:** The SSEB will evaluate and rate the technical proposals (i.e., Volume I) against the RFP requirements. Past Performance will be rated based on confidence in performance, with the final confidence assessment rating based on the extent of recent, relevant past experience, and how well the Offeror performed on that experience.
- **Price Evaluation:** The Price Evaluation Board (PEB) and SSA will evaluate price proposals independently of the technical evaluation. The SSEB will not have access to price information until completion of the technical evaluation.
- **Price/Technical Trade-off Analysis:** After all above evaluations are complete, the SSA will compare the relative advantages and disadvantages of technical proposals and compare prices. The SSA will then consider all factors to select the proposals offering the best value to the Government.

7. Evaluation of Factors

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the factors below. To be eligible for award, Factor 1, Past Performance, must be rated at least Satisfactory or Neutral Confidence. To be eligible for award, Factors 2 and 3 must be rated at least "Acceptable."

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contracts without negotiations with Offerors (except clarifications as described in RFO 15.202). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct negotiations if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

Factor	Description	Relative Importance
1	Past Performance	Factor 1 is more important than Factor 2.
2	Management Approach	Factor 2 is more important than Factor 3.
3	Small Business Participation Commitment Document	Factor 3 is more important than Factor 4.
4	Price	Factor 4 is the least important factor. All non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

Factor Ratings:

Evaluators will apply the adjectival rating for the definition that most closely matches the evaluation.

NOTE: For submission requirements designated as “shall” or “must,” failure to provide the requested information will be considered a deficiency and the specified factor will be rated red/unacceptable, and the proposal will be considered un-awardable unless revised. For submission requirements designated as “should,” failure to provide the requested information will result in a lower rating for the specified factor and may result in a deficiency and unacceptable rating. Offerors are cautioned that award may be made without discussions/negotiations and Offerors may not have the opportunity to submit revised proposals.

Table 1 - Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Table 2 - Past Performance Confidence Assessments Ratings	
Rating	Definition
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 successfully perform the required effort.

Table 3 - Technical Assessment Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

Table 4 - Small Business Participation Commitment Document Ratings	
Rating	Definition

Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the small business objectives.

Definitions:

- **Deficiency.** Any part of an offer that does not conform to a material requirement of a RFP. A material requirement is one that affects price, quantity, quality, or delivery, or that the RFP requires to be met at the time of proposal submission. See RFO 15.001.
- **Strength.** An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
- **Significant Strength.** An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
- **Weakness.** A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See RFO 15.001.
- **Significant Weakness.** A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See RFO 15.001.
- **Uncertainty.** Any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the Offeror is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission or mistake).
- **Clarification.** Exchanges between the Government and Offerors where offerors are given the opportunity to resolve minor or clerical errors or clarify certain aspects of their proposal. Clarifications can be used to enhance the Government's understanding of a proposal, allow reasonable interpretation of a proposal, or facilitate the Government's evaluation process. See RFO 15.202(a)(2).
- **Discussions/Negotiations.** Exchanges between the Government and the Offeror that are undertaken with the intent of allowing the Offeror to revise its proposal.

Volume I – Factor 1 – Past Performance

Submission Requirements:

Offerors shall submit no more than five (5) recent and relevant projects to demonstrate past performance. This factor includes:

1. A narrative description for each project
2. A performance report/questionnaire for each project

NOTE: If more than five (5) projects are submitted, only the first five projects will be evaluated. If any of the first five projects are later disqualified (e.g. a project is too old to meet the submission criteria), the excess projects will not be returned to the proposal.

A project is defined as a construction project performed under a single task order or contract. For multiple award and indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity type contracts, the contract as a whole shall not be submitted as a project; rather, Offerors must submit the work performed under a task order as a project.

Recency: Each project must have been 100% completed within the last ten (10) years. For the purposes of this solicitation, ten (10) years shall be determined from the date solicitation was initially released. Projects completed more than ten (10) years ago will not be reviewed and will not count towards the Offeror's past performance. Incomplete projects will not be reviewed and will not count towards the Offeror's past performance.

Relevancy: Each project submitted for the prime contractor must meet all of the following criteria to receive a rating of "Somewhat Relevant" or higher:

1. New construction or renovation of facilities with a total construction cost of \$40,000,000 or more
2. Project scope included heavy utility (campus distribution or utility plant) construction
3. At least three (3) of the following disciplines contributed to the project: civil/site, mechanical, electrical, life safety, structural, and/or telecommunications

Each project submitted for key subcontractors (see definition below) must meet all of the following criteria to receive a rating of "Somewhat Relevant" or higher:

1. New construction or renovation/upgrade of specialty systems of chilled water, fuel oil, underground site utilities, or medium voltage system with a specialty system construction cost similar to the specialty system value of this project
2. The specialty discipline must be clearly demonstrated for the project and similar to the scope of this project

Projects for the prime contractor and key subcontractors may be more highly rated for relevancy if they meet the relevancy requirements above and any of the following:

1. New construction or renovation of facilities with construction costs of \$80,000,000 or more
2. Project was performed at a Federal facility, especially VA Medical Center campus
3. Project performed at an occupied, operational campus or major facility (e.g. hospital, college, factory) and had schedule constraints such as advanced notification for shutdowns and coordination with other construction projects
4. Construction was performed in an area with constrained site, with limited laydown and staging area, and/or adjacent to other active construction projects
5. Project demonstrates previous experience working with key subcontractors successfully

Prime Contractor: At least one project shall be provided for the prime Offeror (the entity signing the SF1442).

If an Offeror utilizes the past performance of affiliates, subsidiaries, parent, LLC, LTD member companies (i.e. Offeror's name is not exactly as stated on the Standard Form 1442 (SF1442)), the proposal should clearly demonstrate how that affiliate, subsidiary, or parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of this contract. The relevant consideration is whether the resources of the parent or affiliated company – its workforce, management,

facilities, and/or other resource – will be provided or relied upon for contract performance, such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. If an Offeror is utilizing the experience of a parent or affiliate, then that parent's or affiliate's submitted project(s) must show them performing recent work similar to the work they intend to perform on the upcoming contract in order to receive credit for the past performance.

Key subcontractors: If a subcontractor will be responsible for any of the following activities, to include any portion of the contributing physical work, it will be considered a “key subcontractor”: Installation of chilled water system, installation of fuel oil system, installation of underground site utilities, and/or installation of medium voltage system. If utilizing key subcontractors, the Offeror must submit a minimum of two (2) projects performed by these key subcontractors. (Offerors are not required to submit two projects for EACH key subcontractor, just two projects for key subcontractors overall.)

Joint Ventures: If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience shall be submitted for projects completed by the JV entity. If the JV does not have experience, projects shall be submitted for each JV partner. See Evaluation Criteria for additional Joint Venture and/or Mentor-Protégé agreement submittal requirements.

New Corporate Entities: New corporate entities may submit data on prior contracts involving their officers and employees. However, in addition to the other requirements in this section, the Offeror shall discuss in detail the role performed by such persons in the prior contracts cited. Information on their proposed roles should be included in the Past Performance Narratives.

An Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC), Utility Energy Services Contract (UESC), or any Multiple Services contracts may be submitted but shall only reflect the relevant work as described above. The price/cost associated with such project shall only reflect relevant work as described above and exclusively the construction portions of work.

Past Performance Narratives:

For all submitted projects, the following information must be included within the past performance narratives. It is NOT sufficient for the information to be in the Offeror's past performance reports/questionnaires. If any of the following items are missing from the narrative, the submitted project will not be considered:

1. Project Description
2. Type of Contract (e.g., Design-Build (DB) or Design-Bid-Build (DBB))
3. Role on the Contract (i.e., Prime or Sub) for each member of the proposed team who participated in the project execution
4. Month and year that construction started, and date construction completed
5. Total cost of construction for project (if Prime) or the final cost of construction portions completed for project (if Sub)
6. All applicable relevancy criteria

Past Performances Reports/Questionnaires:

For each project, Offerors should submit past performance information as follows:

1. For Federal Government projects with a Past Performance Information Retrieval System/Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Evaluation: In the Volume I Appendix, Offerors should provide the contract number, contract place of performance, and UEI or DUNS number for each project. In the case of Indefinite Delivery type contracts, GSA contracts, and Blanket Purchase Agreements, include Task or Delivery Order Numbers.

2. For non-Federal Government projects, commercial projects, and Federal Government projects without a CPARS Evaluation: In the Volume I Appendix, provide Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) (Attachment A) for each project. The Offeror should complete Blocks 1 – 4 of the PPQ and send it to the non-Federal project client or commercial project client. The client should complete Blocks 5 – 8 along with the two-page questionnaire. If the client previously completed a PPQ for the project, the Offeror may submit the existing PPQ or obtain an updated/new PPQ from client.

The standard PPQ for USACE is Form PPQ-0 (9/30/11) provided in the solicitation. Alternative forms will not be accepted. In cases where the validity of the completed PPQ is questioned, contracting personnel may contact the reference for verification or additional information. The Offeror may retain PPQs in its files for submission on future procurements. USACE does not intend to create or maintain a database of PPQs submitted by Offerors. Therefore, it will be the Offeror's responsibility to ensure the submission of PPQs in its proposal that are relevant to the solicitation.

If the Offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project before the proposal closing date, the Offeror should complete and submit, with the proposal, the first page of the PPQ, which will provide contract and client information. The Government may make reasonable attempts to contact the client noted for that project to obtain the PPQ information. However, Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to help ensure timely submittal of questionnaires.

Evaluation Criteria:

Factor 1 will be rated using the rating shown in the Past Performance Relevancy and Past Performance Confidence Assessment ratings tables.

For Past Performance, the Government is assessing (1) the degree of how similar (relevant) the Offeror's recent past performance effort is compared to the scope and size, and the effort and complexities this solicitation requires, and (2) how well the Offeror performed on that effort.

The SSEB will first evaluate the relevancy of recent past performance identified in the proposal, using the identified criteria to determine how similar a past project is compared to the scope and size, and to the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. A relevancy rating will be assigned to each submitted project using the Past Performance Relevancy Rating Table. Any charts or other graphics used to show areas of similarity (e.g., checklists) will not be reviewed by the SSEB. The roles and responsibilities of work performed by the Offeror's team members will be considered when determining relevancy and should be clearly marked.

The SSEB will next review how well the Offeror performed on those projects. The Government reserves the right to check any or all cited references to verify supplied information and to assess owner satisfaction. The Government also reserves the right to not contact the provided references. In addition to the information submitted by the Offeror, the Government may review projects other than those submitted by the Offeror. The Government reserves the right to obtain past performance information from any source available and has the right to contact customers other than those listed by the Offeror to evaluate past performance. The Government reserves the right to verify statements the Offeror makes regarding its past performance to determine whether they are substantiated.

The SSEB will assign a final, overall Performance Confidence rating to each Offeror based on the relevancy and quality of performance on past contracts. Offerors are reminded that irrelevant experience does not support a finding of Satisfactory or Substantial Confidence, even if performance was exceptional.

Where 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 will receive a Neutral Confidence rating. This rating is neither favorable nor unfavorable.

Offerors unable to provide at least two recent/relevant projects will be assigned a "Neutral Confidence" rating.

Joint Venture and Mentor-Protégé Agreements:

All Joint Ventures (both small businesses and other-than-small businesses) must submit their Joint Venture Agreement or approved Mentor-Protégé Agreement with the proposal.

Small business Offerors (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone, SDVOSB, etc.) submitting a proposal as a Joint Venture or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture shall submit evidence from the Offeror's SBA Servicing Agency that the Offeror has notified and discussed the proposed joint venture for this specific project with the appropriate SBA Representative Business Opportunity Specialist. Joint Venture Agreements and Mentor-Protégé agreements must comply with the relevant regulations in Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Failure to comply with these regulations could result in the Offeror being found ineligible for award on acquisitions set-aside for small business concerns.

Volume I – Factor 2 – Management Approach

Submission Requirements:

Provide a management approach for the project that, at a minimum, includes the following:

1. Organizational chart
2. Summary schedule
3. Narrative plan about how to execute the project

Organizational Chart

Provide an expanded organizational chart (11"x17" page) and supporting description, as needed, of the Offeror's overall structure and management of the project team from the Offeror's Headquarters to the Offeror's site office(s). (Reminder – each 11"x17" page will count as two pages for the purposes of the page limit.)

The chart and supporting description, as needed, should:

1. Identify all offices anticipated to be involved in this contract.
2. Clearly show the lines of authority for all job positions involved in executing the project.
3. Include all proposed team members, such as JV partners, proposed key subcontractors, and consultants. Include the lines of reporting and the team members' technical areas of responsibility under the contract.
4. For all job positions:
 - a. Identify the employer associated with the job position
 - b. State the physical location of the position
 - c. State whether the position is dedicated to the project or a shared resource (if shared, percentage dedicated to the project must be stated)
 - d. Do not include specific personnel names. Identify job positions by title only.

Summary Schedule

Provide a task-oriented summary schedule that indicates the number of calendar days after Notice to Proceed by which milestones are to be achieved. Schedule shall be 11"x17".

(Reminder – each 11"x17" page will count as two pages for the purposes of the page limit.) The schedule shall be graphically represented and include, at a minimum, Activity ID, Activity Description, Original Duration, Early Start and Early Finish, and Total Float for each activity. The schedule shall include all bid options.

Additionally, the schedule should:

1. Clearly identify phases of construction with the associated sequence of construction of each phase. Identify any overlap, inter-relationship, and/or transition between phases of work.
2. Identify activities for the chilled water plant work and the site utility upgrades in sufficient detail to demonstrate an understanding of the scope of work and substantiate the reasonableness of the proposed durations.
3. Identify activities and/or milestones which require coordination with other entities (Government or other active construction projects) during construction, demonstrate to understanding of the advanced coordination and utility shutdown requirements for the contract.
4. Indicate the anticipated overall critical path on the schedule.
5. Identify any project constraints.
6. Include submittal preparation and review/approval activities for long lead items and key construction submittals for mobilization to demonstrate an understanding of the submittal process and the minimum review times for Government-approved submittals.
7. Include activities related to Commissioning and turnover of phases of work.
8. Include closeout activities, to include Red Zone meeting, record drawings, and O&M manuals, to demonstrate understanding of the closeout requirements for the contract.

Narrative Plan

The narrative should describe the plan of how the Offeror will execute the project within the proposed duration, with consideration of the different definable features of work, required contractual and contractor-developed phasing, coordination and management of in-house personnel and key subcontractors, and the inter-related work efforts. The narrative should clearly identify any constraints on the schedule presented, including but not limited to, any labor or material availability, detailed coordination, permitting, weather, and/or other risks that the Offeror deems to be significant. The narrative should highlight the Offeror's capability and flexibility to plan and schedule the project to meet the proposed contractor period of performance.

Evaluation Criteria:

Factor 2 will be rated using the adjectival ratings shown in the Technical Assessment Ratings table, above.

The SSEB will evaluate the Management Approach to assess the strength of understanding of the project scope, to include the coordination and constraints which should be considered in the schedule (required phasing, long lead items, minimizing interruptions, maintaining operations and access, etc.). The Offeror's ability to coordinate, plan, and schedule resources to ensure successful execution of the work within the contract performance period will be considered. Plans will also be evaluated based on the level of involvement the Offeror will have in the management, oversight, control, and coordination of the work performed by subcontractors.

The SSEB will evaluate the clarity, adequacy, capabilities, and strengths of the Offeror's organizational chart for managing a successful project. An organizational chart that clearly

depicts a highly qualified on-site team supported by appropriate resources offsite and that clearly defines responsibilities will be considered to meet the RFP requirements.

The SSEB will evaluate the summary schedule for reasonableness, logic, constraints, and typical construction durations. The schedule will be evaluated to determine conformance with solicitation requirements, strength of understanding of the project scope, inclusion of restrictions and constraints (required phasing, long lead items, shutdown notifications, predecessor/successor activities). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's contract duration in the proposed schedule, not to exceed the duration listed in the RFP. The phases of work must be clearly identified and activities for each phase of work developed with defined durations. In assessing the reasonableness of the proposed durations for each phase of the work, the Government may take into account how well the summary schedule supports the proposed duration, as well as use other information, including but not limited to, independent judgment concerning logic, constraints, and typical construction durations.

The Management Approach may be more highly rated if the narrative describes in detail the unique strategies to specifically execute and/or reduce risk to the project and ensure the active operations of the Medical Center, which leads to the successful completion of the project within the contract performance period.

NOTE: Any identified strengths of the Management Approach, as it relates to the unique strategies described, will be incorporated into and made part of the contract upon award.

Volume II – Factor 3 – Small Business Participation Commitment Document

Submission Requirements:

This factor applies to both Other-Than-Small businesses and small businesses. Offerors shall use Attachment C (Small Business Participation Commitment Document) to demonstrate their proposed approach to meeting small business goals and objectives.

Offerors shall address the planned small business usage for this requirement. Offerors will be evaluated on the level of proposed small business participation in the performance of this acquisition relative to the goals, objectives, and requirements established herein.

Other-Than-Small business contractors may achieve small business participation through subcontracting to small businesses. Small business contractors may achieve small business participation through their own participation as a prime, as well as through joint ventures, teaming arrangements, and/or subcontracting to other small businesses. A small business prime whose own performance accounts for equal to or more than 10% of the Total Acquisition Value and demonstrates meaningful commitment to small business participation (through self-performance, teaming, and/or SB subs) may receive a rating of "Acceptable" or higher under Factor 3. Small businesses are not required to subcontract to other small businesses to achieve small business participation.

This factor is organized into the following sections via the Small Business Participation Commitment Document:

- Section 1 – Division of Work; Small Business Goals and Corresponding Dollars.
- Section 2 – Enforceable Commitments to Small Businesses.
- Section 3 – Past Performance Compliance with RFO Clause 52.219-8 (Utilization of Small Business Concerns) (SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY).
- Section 4 – Past Performance Compliance with RFO Clause 52.219-9 (Small Business Subcontracting Plan) (OTHER-THAN-SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY).

All supporting documentation for the Small Business Participation Commitment Document shall be included within Attachment C. Documentation not within the Small Business Participation

Commitment Document will not be considered. Documentation shall not be included in other volumes.

Evaluation Criteria:

Factor 3 will be rated using the adjectival ratings shown in the Small Business Participation Commitment Document Ratings table, above.

All Offerors (both Small Businesses and Other-Than-Small businesses), regardless of size status, should address their planned small business usage for this requirement and will be evaluated on the level of proposed participation of Small Businesses in the performance of this acquisition (as small business prime offerors or small business subcontractors) relative to the objectives, requirements, and goals established herein. The Government will evaluate the following:

Section 1 - Division of Work; Small Business Goals and Corresponding Dollars

- The extent of participation of small business prime offerors and small business subcontractors in terms of the percentage of the Offeror's Total Acquisition Value. **Total Acquisition Value is defined as the proposed base plus all option prices.**
- The extent to which the Offeror meets or exceeds the Minimum Quantitative Requirement of 10% for Small Business. There are no specific Socio-Economic Small Business Goals. The Offeror must provide goals for other Socio-Economic Small Business Categories as follows: Small Disadvantaged Business, Woman-Owned Small Business, HUBZone Small Business, Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business, and Veteran-Owned Small Business. The goals are a percentage of the Total Acquisition Value. Each Participation Goal is reflected off the Total Acquisition Value.
- Proposals that do not meet the Minimum Quantitative Requirement of at least 10% for Small Business will be rated "Unacceptable."

Section 2 - Enforceable Commitments to Small Businesses

- The extent of the Offeror's commitment to use small businesses as defined in RFO Part 19. Refer to Section 2 of Attachment C: Small Business Participation Commitment Document to understand what constitutes an enforceable commitment.

Section 3 - Past Performance Compliance with RFO 52.219-8 (Utilization of Small Business Concerns) (SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY)

- The Offeror's compliance with the requirements of RFO 52.219-8 on prior contracts. This applies only to small business Offerors. Proposing a combination of documentation showing past compliance with RFO 52.219-8 may be rated more favorably. Reference Attachment C for documentation information.

Section 4 - Past Performance Compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-9 (Small Business Subcontracting Plan) (OTHER-THAN-SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY)

- The Offeror's compliance with the requirements of FAR/RFO 52.219-9 on prior contracts. This applies only to Other-Than-Small Business Offerors.

Demonstrating past compliance with FAR/RFO 52.219-9 also demonstrates past compliance with FAR/RFO 52.219-8. Reference Attachment C for documentation information.

Submission Requirements:

Volume III should be submitted in a separate file from Volumes I and II. Volume III should be broken down into sections defined below:

Section 1: The name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) authorized to negotiate and sign a contract. Also, provide a Certificate of Corporate Authority or other applicable documentation of authorized signature(s) for each authorized individual.

Section 2: The Offer (the SF 1442) duly executed with an original signature by an official authorized to bind the company or Joint Venture.

Section 3: Acknowledgement of all amendments to the solicitation.

Section 4: Each Offeror is required to complete (in entirety) the bid schedule provided in the solicitation. All cost and pricing data supplied by Offerors will represent data other than certified cost or pricing data as defined by RFO 2.101.

Evaluation Criteria:

The contract will be a firm-fixed-price contract.

The Government will evaluate the price for price reasonableness.

- A price analysis will be performed by the Government to determine that the proposal prices offered are fair and reasonable, and that there is no unbalanced pricing.
- Price reasonableness will be determined in accordance with RFO 15.404. Normally, competition establishes price reasonableness. Comparison of the proposed prices is expected to satisfy the requirement to perform a price analysis; however, the Government may, if necessary, analyze the Offeror's Line Item structure to establish reasonableness of an otherwise successful Offeror's price.