

I. PURPOSE

It is the intent of this Request for Offer (RFO) to provide criteria for evaluation of offers submitted in response to Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest Request for Offer N62473-19-D-4321 X100 Repair Aviation Supply Building 7000 at MCAS Oorah, Oorah CA.

II. TASK/DELIVERY ORDER EVALUATION BOARD

Task/Delivery Order Evaluation Authority (TOEA): Artie Choke, Procuring Contracting Officer

Task/Delivery Order Evaluation Board (TOEB) Membership (comprised of preferably only one technical representative. If necessary, client participation maybe added to the board.)

Chairperson –	Rick O’Shea, Contract Specialist
Technical Member–	CDR Ima Kettle, PWD Director
Technical Member –	Dan Druff, Project Manager

The following personnel are non-voting advisors:

Advisor –	Justin Case, Design Manager
Advisor –	Owen Cash, Engineering Project Manager
SW Advisor –	Shaunda Lear, Interior Designer

III. BASIS FOR AWARD

This request for offer is conducted under the fair opportunity guidelines of FAR 16.5, which outlines the ordering procedures of orders issued under IDIQ contracts. Award will be based on a determination of best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered. “Best Value” means the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government’s estimation, provide the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement. Best value evaluation is, in and of itself, a subjective assessment by the Government of the offered solution that provides the optimal results to the Government.

This method does not use any aspects of FAR subpart 15.3. The use of this fair opportunity process does not obligate the Government to determine a competitive range, conduct discussions with any offerors, solicit offers or revisions thereto, or use any other source selection techniques associated with FAR subpart 15.3. The Government anticipates selecting the best-suited offeror from the initial responses, without engaging in interchanges. Offerors are strongly encouraged to submit their best technical solution and price in the response to this RFO. Evaluation will consider non-price factors and price.

Evaluation will consider non-price factors and price. In the evaluation, non-price factors combined are approximately equal to price. The government will perform a price/non-price trade-off analysis to select the best suited contractor that provides the best value.

The government will evaluate the written responses and price submissions to select the best-suited contractor. The contractor that, in the government’s estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement will be selected for the task order

award. The government will base this determination of which contractor provides the greatest overall benefit in terms of the evaluation factors stated below and will use the evaluation process described below to arrive at this determination.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The government shall perform a side-by-side comparative analysis (comparing contractor responses to one another) to select the contractor that is best suited to fulfill the requirements, based on the contractors' responses to the factors outlined in the RFO and their relative importance. An initial competitive pool of contractors to be evaluated will be established by including those that provide an offer below a natural break in prices between the lowest two to five contractors. The government may, at its sole discretion, expand the competitive pool by any number of additional offerors at any stage of the procurement process as many times as it sees fit. If the competitive pool is to be expanded by less than the total number of responsible offerors, inclusion will be based on lowest price. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint.

BEST VALUE TRADEOFF (BVTO)

The Proposed Task Order will be awarded to the responsible Offeror with the submission determined to represent the best value—the submission most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. To make a determination of Best Value, the Government shall first perform a comparative analysis of the submission of each Offeror in the competitive pool, as described above, in response to the non-price factors to determine technically Best Suited. Then, the Government will compare the submission of each Offeror in the competitive pool considering price and perform Tradeoffs (if any), to determine the overall Best Suited offeror. The non-price factors are approximately equal in importance to each other and when combined, are approximately equal in importance to Price in the Tradeoff.

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

1. Members of the TOEB will evaluate each offer received to assess the Offeror's ability to perform the prospective task order successfully. The evaluators shall perform a side-by-side comparative analysis (comparing contractor responses to one another) on the offers received below to select the offer that is best suited to fulfill the requirements, based on the Offerors' responses to the non-price factor and its relative importance.
2. Upon conclusion of the TOEB offer evaluation process, the TOEB will present its findings and recommendation to the TOEA for consideration.

V. EVALUATION FACTORS

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Factor 1: Technical Solution is approximately equal to Factor 2: Price

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. The solicitation requires the evaluation of the Technical Factors and Price.
2. The relative order of importance is the non-price factor is to be approximately equal to price.

Factor 1 – Technical Solution

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

A narrative that discusses the Contractor's approach to:

- maintaining pedestrian/forklift/emergency egress pathways in relation to the new permanent bracing and temporary scaffolding required for the interior seismic strengthening
- relocating each unit's respective administrative staff within temporary facilities while accommodating warehouse staff within active construction areas and keeping warehouse operational during construction activities
- coordinating the setup/location of temporary trailers to be used by building occupants and continuous power to keep building operations functional

Narrative shall not exceed three (3) double-sided pages (or six (6) single-sided pages), size 8-1/2" x 11", with minimum 10 point font size.

A schedule must accompany the narrative. The schedule will include the tasks and timeframes that each unit's portion of the building will be under active construction and will include length of time each unit will have their respective administrative and warehouse staff temporarily relocated as needed to keep the building operations functional. The schedule shall consist of a Gantt chart and shall not exceed four (4) single-sided pages, size 11"x 17", with minimum 10pt font size.

A color coded floor plan shall be provided to show pedestrian, forklift, and egress pathways amid permanent seismic strengthening bracing and temporary scaffolding and the necessary phasing throughout the three units within the building. At least three (3), but no more than six (6) conceptual drawings, size 11" x 17", shall be provided to supplement the narrative.

(b) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government will evaluate each offeror against each of the other offerors in the competitive pool in addressing the Submittal Requirements. Specifically, the Government will evaluate the narrative, schedule, and conceptual drawings for the most practical and efficient technical solution to keep the building operational for necessary warehouse staff with continuous power to necessary building systems, while maintaining required pathways, egress, and life safety amidst temporary construction

scaffolding and permanent seismic bracing. In addition, providing the most cost effective and conveniently located temporary facilities with all utility connections needed to create usable office space, conference space, bathroom and shower room areas for administrative staff.

The Government will not use any form of scoring schema nor use any adjectival grading in its evaluation. It will base its overall determination of suitability on the quality and completeness of responses compared to the other offerors, resulting in an offeror considered technically Best Suited, an offeror considered second Best Suited, and so on for all Offerors in the competitive pool.

Factor 2 – Price

(a) Solicitation Submittal Requirements

Price shall be submitted on the Offer Schedule included in the RFO with a bid bond conforming to the requirements of the RFO. Failure to submit a bid bond conforming to the requirements of the RFO may result in an Offeror's submission being rejected.

Price submission shall be submitted in a separate file from the Technical submission via email to the Contract Specialist by the time and date noted in the RFO, and shall include:

- 1) A signed Offer Schedule. Offer Schedule must be completed in its entirety, including acknowledgement of all amendments, and signature of the Offeror.
- 2) A Bid Bond (in the amount of 20% of the submission price or \$3,000,000, whichever is less).
- 3) Current VETS-4212 registration. Upon the successful submission of a VETS-4212 report, federal contractors will receive an email confirmation of receipt notification for their records. Offerors shall include a copy of their confirmation notification email in their offer as verification of submission for the current reporting period. DO NOT SUBMIT A COPY OF THE REPORT ITSELF.
- 4) Completed provision, 52.204-24 Representation Regarding Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment (OCT 2020).

The following FAR deviations are incorporated within this solicitation:

52.228-11, Pledges of Assets (DEVIATION 2020-O0016), which removes the requirement for the Standard Form 28 to be sworn and notarized.

52.228-15, Performance and Payment Bonds—Construction (DEVIATION 2020-O0016), which removes the requirements for seals on Standard Forms.

(b) Basis of Evaluation

1) The Government will evaluate the price for Base Item 0001. Submissions that provide prices that are greater than the Construction Cost Limitation (CCL) may be rejected.

The CCL for Base Item 0001 is **\$34,046,220.00**.

2) Analysis will be performed by one or more of the following techniques to ensure a fair and reasonable price:

- Comparison of offered prices received in response to the RFO
- Comparison of offered prices with the Government Estimate (GE)
- Comparison of offered prices with available historical information
- Comparison of offered prices with resources proposed
- Information/reports obtained from DCAA or other outside agencies as required

Price analysis will include a determination of whether or not the offer is fair and reasonable and within the limitation stated in the RFO. For pricing that is considered higher than what the Government may consider fair and reasonable, the Offeror shall provide clear supporting rationale in the price offer. For example, if unique and innovative approaches are the basis for a higher priced offer, the nature of these approaches and their impact on price must be completely documented and clearly referred back to and made obvious in the non-price factor responses where appropriate. The burden of proof of price reasonableness rests solely with the Offeror. However, any price over the CCL, regardless of any unique or innovative approaches claimed, may be rejected.

INTERCHANGES

The Government reserves the right to conduct interchanges if determined by the Contracting Officer to be necessary. Interchanges can be conducted verbally or in writing.

Interchanges may be conducted with one, some or all Offerors, at the Government's discretion. Once the Government determines the Offeror that is best-suited to meet the stated requirements, the Government reserves the right to interact with only that Offeror to address any issues, if necessary, and finalize an order with that Offeror. If the parties cannot successfully resolve outstanding issues with that Offeror's submission, to the Government's satisfaction, the Government may interact with the next best-suited Offeror. If the Government begins interactions with the next best-suited Offeror, no further interactions concerning the order will be conducted with the previous Offeror. This process will continue until an agreement is successfully reached and an order is awarded.

Past performance is not included as an evaluation factor. FAR 16.505(b)(v)(A)(1) only states that past performance on earlier orders under a multiple award contract should be considered in task order awards.