

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE 1 OF 2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 06/25/03	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CODE US ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU CORPS OF ENGINEERS, BUILDING S-200 FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96858-5440 CONTRACT SPECIALIST: JODY MURAOKA		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DACA83-03-R-0010
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06/19/03
	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO
	10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers  is extended,  is not extended.

Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning \_\_\_\_\_ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

**12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If required)**

**13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc). SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

**E. IMPORTANT:** Contractor  is not,  is required to sign this document and return \_\_\_\_\_ copies to the issuing office.

**14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)**

Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) for Design-Build Construction Services and Design-Bid-Build Construction Services, Various Locations, Hawaii

See Page 2 of 2 Pages

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  (Signature of person authorized to sign)	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED

1. CHANGES TO THE SOLICITATION. Attached hereto are revised pages to the solicitation. The revision mark "(Am-0001)" is shown on each revised page.

a. REVISED PROVISIONS/CLAUSES/PAGES. Following are revised pages to the solicitation. Changes are indicated in **bold** print. Although the entire sections are being re-issued under Am-0001, only the following pages/paragraphs/provisions/clauses changed in these sections.

Section 00120

Paragraphs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.3.1, 2.4.3.2 and Attachment 2

Section 00130

Paragraphs 2.1.1, 2.4.3, 2.4.3.1, 2.4.3.2, 2.4.5.1 and Attachment 2

2. The proposal due date of July 21, 2003, 2:00 P.M., Hawaiian Standard Time, remains unchanged.

SECTION 00120

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS  
AND EVALUATION FACTORS  
FOR 8(a) SET ASIDE

1.0 GENERAL

1.1. Cost of Preparing Proposals

The Government will not reimburse any Offeror any costs incurred in the preparation and submittal of an offer in response to this solicitation.

1.2. Inquiries

Address all inquiries regarding this Request for Proposals to:

U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
Attn: Ms. Jody Muraoka (CEPOH-CT-C)  
Building S-200  
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440  
Phone No. (808) 438-8575  
Fax No. (808) 438-8588  
E-Mail: jody.muraoka@usace.army.mil

1.3 Submittal of Proposals

Submit proposal packages to the US Army Corps of Engineers ("the Government") as shown in Block 8 of Standard Form 1442.

Proposals received by the Government after the date and time set for receipt of proposals will be handled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition (May 2001)," subparagraph (c), found in Section 00100.

1.4 Contract Award

The Government intends to award a minimum of two contracts to 8(a) Offerors whose proposals have been determined to represent the best value to the Government, non-price and price factors considered. Award will be made to the Offerors whose proposals have the best non-price evaluation and the lowest price. However, if there are no Offerors meeting both these criterias, the Government intends to implement a "Best Value" process involving a cost-technical tradeoff process. In this case, awards may be made to other than the lowest price Offeror or other than the highest non-price-rated Offeror.

If an 8(a) offeror submits proposals in both the 8(a) set aside and under full and open competition, and the Government's evaluation finds the 8(a) offeror to provide the best value to the Government in both the 8(a) set aside and under full and open competition, only one award to the 8(a) offeror will be made. This award will be as an 8(a) set aside offeror.

1.4.1 Proposal Evaluation

Numerical scores and other point-scoring techniques will not be used in the evaluation process. Each factor will be rated on an adjectival rating system.

The Government will evaluate offers in accordance with the NON-PRICE EVALUATION FACTORS described in paragraph 2.4 of this section and the offeror's proposed total price.

Offerors are advised that the Government intends to award without discussions.

Upon completing the evaluation of all proposals, the Contracting Officer will, in accordance with the provisions of this solicitation and applicable acquisition regulations, proceed to award without discussions. However, if discussions are determined necessary, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range and conduct discussions with those Offerors only within the competitive range. Upon conclusion of discussions, if necessary, the Contracting Officer will request final proposal revisions from the Offerors remaining in the competitive range and may, upon receipt of final proposal revisions, proceed to award a contract without further discussions or notice.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT

### 2.1 General

Proposals shall be submitted in two (2) separate envelopes. Please ensure that the boxes/envelopes that the proposals are sealed in are labeled as submission under 8(a) set-aside. If proposals are being submitted for both 8(a) set-aside and full and open competition, please submit separate sets of proposals, sealed in separate boxes/envelopes and labeled as 8(a) set-aside or full and open competition (unrestricted) on the outside boxes/envelopes. Proposals shall be prepared in the English language.

#### 2.1.1 Volume I, Non-Price Proposal

One envelope shall be clearly marked, "VOLUME I, NON-PRICE PROPOSAL FOR 8(a) SET ASIDE, RFP NO. DACA83-03-R-0010." It shall contain an original and six (6) copies of the items provided in response to the Non-Price Factors listed in paragraph 2.3.

**Proposals shall completely address the requirements of the RFP. Elaborate format, special reproduction techniques, and the like are not necessary. However, the proposal shall be neatly organized and inserted in binder.**

Information presented should be organized so as to pertain to only the evaluation factor in which section the information is presented. Information pertaining to more than one evaluation factor should be repeated in the tab for each factor.

#### 2.1.2 Volume II, Price Proposal

The second envelope shall be clearly marked, "VOLUME II, PRICE PROPOSAL FOR 8(a) SET ASIDE, RFP NO. DACA83-03-R-0010." It shall contain one original and two copies of the Offeror's completed Standard Form (SF) 1442, using a printed copy of the SF 1442 included in this solicitation.

Volume II shall also include the following:

- One original and two copies of Section 00010, Price Proposal Schedule. Indicate whether or not Facilities Capital Cost of Money is included in the Offeror's costs of performing the work. Proposals that state that Facilities Capital Cost of Money is not included, or proposals that do not address Facilities Capital Cost of Money, will be deemed to have waived Facilities Capital Cost of Money.
- **One original and two copies (certified as a true copy) of the Offeror's letter to Small Business Administration requesting joint venture approval together with the proposed joint venture agreement Also, identify the size status for each member of the JV (if the Offeror is a joint venture).**
- One original and two copies of the Offeror's completed Section 00600, Representations and Certifications, using a printed copy of Section 00600 included in this solicitation.
- One original and two copies of the Offeror's completed, if applicable, SF LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, using a printed copy of the SF LLL included as Appendix A in Section 00600.
- One original and two copies of the offer guarantee in the form and amount that is required by the provision entitled "Penal Sum and Form of Offer Guarantee", in Section 00100 and other pertinent provisions and clauses in this solicitation.

### 2.1.3 Table of Contents

Proposal volumes shall be tabbed. Each of the proposal volumes shall include a Table of Contents that includes the title of the subject matter discussed therein and the page number where the information can be found. The volumes shall be organized in the same order described in paragraph 2.3 of this Section. Each evaluation factor shall be separately tabbed. Proposals that are not correctly tabbed may be considered non-responsive.

## 2.2 Proposal Content

Proposals shall be in a narrative format, organized and titled so that each section of the proposal follows the order and format of the factors set forth below in paragraph 2.4, "VOLUME I, NON-PRICE PROPOSAL".

Offeror is cautioned that "parroting" of the RFP requirements with a statement of intent to perform does not reveal the Offeror's understanding of the problem or his capability to solve it. The inclusion of "filler" material from previous proposals or commercial applications shall be avoided unless it has a direct application to the objective of this RFP.

Offeror shall include sufficient details in the proposal, and shall present the details in the same order in which they are requested in this Section to permit the Government to promptly, completely, and accurately evaluate the proposal from both a technical and a management standpoint. The Government will not make any assumptions concerning the Offeror's intent, capabilities, facilities, or experience. Clear identification of the pertinent details shall rest solely with the Offeror.

Legibility, clarity, coherence, and contents are important. Offerors shall not submit verbatim sections of this RFP as part of their proposal. Offerors that disregard these standards unnecessarily delay the evaluation process and may be rejected by the Government after initial evaluation without receiving any further consideration.

Any information, presented in a proposal that the Offeror wants safeguarded from disclosure to other parties must be identified and labeled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition (May 2001)," subparagraph (e), which is found in Section 00100 of this solicitation. The Government will endeavor to honor the restrictions against release requested by Offerors, to the extent permitted under United States law and regulations.

The proposal must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract. By submission of an offer, the Offeror agrees that all items in its proposal (minimum qualifications for key positions, management plans, etc.) will be used throughout the duration of the contract and any substitutions of any item will require prior approval of the Contracting Officer.

### 2.3 Evaluation Factors

All proposals will be evaluated on non-price and price factors. Offerors are required to provide data addressing all stated factors. If an Offeror does not have data relating to a specific factor, it shall be clearly stated. The Contracting Officer may use discretion in reasonably applying evaluation standards where Offerors provide information to explain or justify deviation from selection criteria listed in the solicitation. Offers that do not address all factors may be considered non-responsive and may not receive further consideration.

Non-price factors have equal importance. Non-price factors when combined are significantly more important than price.

#### VOLUME I - NON-PRICE PROPOSAL

Factor I, Past Experience

Factor II, Past Performance

Factor III, Management

#### VOLUME II - PRICE PROPOSAL

### 2.4 Volume I, Non-Price Proposal

Data provided in response to the non-price technical factors described below shall be included in Volume I, "Non-Price Proposal". All references to Offeror includes all proposed joint venture partners. All contractors in a joint venture must provide evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement, which creates legal responsibility on the part of all contractors in the joint venture. Information provided from potential sub-

contractors (not included in the joint venture) will not be considered or evaluated.

#### 2.4.1 Relevant Projects

Relevant projects have construction awards above \$500K. Relevant projects also involve general construction type work, which includes areas such as civil, architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical, security, communications, asbestos removal and lead abatement.

Single or Multiple Award task order contracts, such as Job order Contracts, Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity Contracts, Multi-trade Contracts etc. are not considered relevant projects, even if the total value of the contract is over \$500K. However, a task order with an individual project over \$500K may be considered as a relevant project.

Only relevant projects will be considered in the evaluation.

#### 2.4.2 Factor I, Past Experience

Offerors shall identify a maximum of 10 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects completed between June 1998 and June 2003 in which they were the prime contractor. Provide a Project Data Sheet for each of the projects identified. This sheet is included as Attachment 1 to this section. All requested information shall be provided. Failure to provide any of the requested data may be cause to eliminate a project from consideration in the evaluation.

##### 2.4.2.1 Evaluation Standards

The Government will evaluate the project data sheets provided by the offerors. If more than 10 Design-Bid-Build projects are submitted, only the first 10 projects identified in the proposal will be reviewed. Of those 10 projects, only the relevant projects will be evaluated. Therefore it is important that the offeror provide only 10 relevant projects in the proposal. Projects that are not relevant or that fall outside the timeframe between June 1998 and June 2003 will not be considered in the evaluation. Projects in which the offeror was not the prime contractor will not be considered in the evaluation. In addition:

- a. More weight will be given to the number of relevant projects submitted (up to 10 projects).
- b. More weight will be given to relevant projects that were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense
- c. More weight will be given to relevant projects that were constructed in Hawaii
- d. More weight will be given to the diversity of the relevant projects submitted. Diversity refers to the offeror's experience in managing various types of vertical construction, utilities and site work, as well as other types of work identified below:
  - Civil construction such as, grading, water lines, sewer lines, paving/repaving roadways, sidewalks, parking lots, shore protection, stream bank stabilization, and dredging.
  - Architectural construction such as, painting, roofing, renovation of interiors of existing buildings, new building construction.

- Mechanical construction such as, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and components, refrigeration systems, fire suppression systems, material transport systems, automatic box conveyor systems, incinerators, fuel lines, elevators, escalators, dumb waiters, as well as plumbing systems including water, solid and hazardous waste control.
- Electrical construction such as, power and service supplies, distribution, and utilization systems (including lighting), power generators and uninterrupted power supplies (UPS). Instrumentation work may include but is not limited to, plant management systems using direct digital technology, public address systems and fire alarm systems. Communications such as telephone and information management systems.
- Security construction such as intrusion detection and surveillance systems.
- Asbestos, lead-based paint, and petroleum-contaminated material abatement and disposal.
- Structural systems.

Outstanding	<p>The Offeror provided 10 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 5 of which were constructed in Hawaii and 5 of which were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has outstanding experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Above Average	<p>The Offeror has provided at least 8 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 4 of which were constructed in Hawaii and 4 of which were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has very good experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Satisfactory	<p>The Offeror has provided at least 6 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 3 of which were constructed in Hawaii or contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has good experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Marginal	<p>The Offeror has provided at least 4 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 2 of which were constructed in Hawaii or contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has marginal experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>

Unsatisfactory	The projects provided by the Offeror are either not relevant or do not meet the Marginal requirements above.
----------------	--

2.4.3 Factor II, Past Performance

The Offeror shall send Past Performance Evaluation Sheets, (Attachment 2 to this section), to the owners/owners representatives for all of the projects identified in Factor 1, Past Experience with a request that these evaluations be returned to the Government by Friday, August 1, 2003. Evaluations for Federal Government projects shall be sent to the Contracting Officer or his/her designated Representative.

Completed Past Performance evaluation sheets shall be mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the following address:

U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
 Attn: Ms. Jody Muraoka (CEPOH-CT-C)  
 Building S-200  
 Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440  
 Phone No. (808) 438-8575  
 Fax No. (808) 438-8588  
 E-Mail: jody.muraoka@usace.army.mil

2.4.3.1 Other Evaluation Sources

In addition to the information provided above, the Government may obtain and evaluate additional past performance information on other relevant projects completed by the offeror between June 1998 and June 2003. The Government may also obtain and evaluate existing past performance information on relevant projects between June 1998 and June 2003 from historical Government databases (CCAS, ACAS, etc.) or any other sources.

2.4.3.2 Evaluation Standards

Outstanding	None of the final performance ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory and at least half are outstanding.
Above Average	None of the final performance ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory and at least half are above satisfactory.
Satisfactory	None of the final performance ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory.
Marginal	None of the final performance ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Marginal.
Unsatisfactory	At least one of the final performance ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government received an Unsatisfactory final performance rating.

Neutral	Offerors will not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the Offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance. However, an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance history may be considered less favorably than an Offeror with a favorable past performance history.
---------	---

2.4.4 Factor III, Management Plan

At a minimum the management plan shall include the following:

1. Identify key positions required to successfully manage this contract. Key positions should include but is not limited to program manager, contractor quality control system manager (CQCSM), contract safety officer, project engineer, project superintendent, quality control representative, site safety representative, estimator, design manager and other technical staff. Provide the minimum qualifications for each key position. All personnel hired by the offeror for this contract will be required to meet the minimum qualifications identified in the contract and in the contractor's proposal for the contract.
2. Provide an organizational chart showing the lines of authority between key positions.
3. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage Design-Build projects.
4. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage Design-Bid-Build projects.
5. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage the quality and safety of all contractors.
6. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage multiple projects at different locations simultaneously without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality or safety.
7. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality or safety.

2.4.4.1 Evaluation Standards

Outstanding	The Offeror provided an excellent management plan, which included very well-qualified key positions with clear lines of authority. Management plan provided an unquestionable approach to managing Design-Build contracts, Design-Bid-Build contracts, quality, and safety. Management plan offers outstanding methods to manage multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, and managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Above Average	The Offeror provided a very good management plan, which included well-qualified key positions with clear lines of authority. The management plan provides a very good approach to managing Design-Build contracts, Design-Bid-Build contracts, quality, and safety. The management plan

	offers very good methods to manage multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, and managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Satisfactory	The Offeror provided an acceptable management plan, which included qualified key positions with clear lines of authority. Management plan provides a good approach to managing Design-Build contracts, Design-Bid-Build contracts, quality, and safety. Management plan offers good methods to manage multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, and managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Marginal	The Offeror provides a questionable approach to managing Design-Build and/or Design-Bid-Build contracts, managing quality and safety, managing multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, or managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Unsatisfactory	The Offeror does not address all requirements or does not provide an acceptable approach to managing Design-Build and/or Design-Bid-Build contracts, managing quality and safety, managing multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, or managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.

## 2.5 Volume II, Price Proposal

The Government will compare the price to the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) and the price of other offerors to determine reasonableness and affordability.

### 2.5.1 Price Evaluation

Data provided in response to price shall be included in Volume II, "Price Proposal".

#### 2.5.1.1 General

Offerors shall submit the cost data identified below that they are proposing to use in the development of all cost estimates that this contract may require. The proposed cost data, if awarded a contract, shall be used for the life of the contract, subject to review and resubmittal at the discretion of the Contracting Officer. Offerors shall indicate the start date of their fiscal accounting period. All cost data will be reviewed at least annually, generally coinciding with this accounting period. Adjustments to the cost data, based on current documentation, may be considered subject to approval of the Contracting Officer.

Offerors are reminded that the cost factors included in this proposal will be contractually binding and are cautioned not to "low ball" any of the numbers in its proposal and estimate in order to come out with a low total cost. If awarded one of the contracts, the factors shown in this proposal will be used in all future task orders.

#### 2.5.1.2 Workmen's Comp Insurance

Offerors shall submit premium statement(s) from their insurance company(ies) identifying all workmen's compensation insurance in effect at the time of this solicitation. Successful offerors will be required to maintain current premium statement(s) on file with the Contracting Officer throughout the life of the contract.

#### 2.5.1.3 Performance and Payment Bond

Offerors shall submit a statement from their surety defining the bond rate(s) in effect at the time of this solicitation. Successful offerors will be required to maintain current bond rates on file with the Contracting Officer throughout the life of the contract.

#### 2.5.1.4 Home Office Overhead

Offerors shall submit their proposed home office overhead rate, including all data and calculations used in arriving at that rate. Home office overhead components shall comply with FAR Part 31.

#### 2.5.1.5 Contract Management Fixed Costs

Offerors shall submit their proposed fixed cost elements relating to the management of the contract, i.e. Project Manager, CQCSM, Contract Safety Officer. These costs shall be complete, including labor, labor burden, fringe benefits, travel and transportation. Provide the daily (calendar day) rate and annual rate and a breakdown of all cost elements proposed for each of the key personnel proposed in Section 00010, Item No. 4.

#### 2.5.1.6 Field Office Management Fixed Costs

Offerors shall submit their proposed fixed cost elements relating to the management of task orders, i.e. Project Engineer, Project Superintendent, QCR, Site Safety representative. These costs shall be complete, including labor, labor burden, fringe benefits, travel and transportation. Provide the daily (calendar day) rate and annual rate and a breakdown of all cost elements proposed for each of the field office management key personnel proposed in Section 00010, Item No. 5.

#### 2.5.1.7 Determination of Relative Price

As a measure of relative price, the Government will apply the following formula to the cost factors submitted in Section 00010. (Offerors shall ensure the data in Section 00010 is complete and accurate. Failure to provide the requested data in Section 00010 in the requested format may be cause for a determination of non-responsiveness.) Offerors shall not compute Total Price. The Government will perform this calculation during its evaluation. The resultant number/total price will be used to compare the cost of doing business among all Offerors.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \text{Contract management cost} * \\ & + (\text{Field office management cost} * ) \\ & \times (1 + \text{Home Office Overhead rate} *) \\ & = \text{Total Price} \end{aligned}$$

\* from Section 00010, Proposal Summary

## 2.6 Proposal Revisions

If discussions are held and proposal revisions are requested by the Contracting Officer, all revisions shall be submitted as page replacements with revised text readily identifiable, e.g. bold face print or underlining. Proposal replacement pages shall be clearly marked "REVISED", shall show the date of revision, shall be submitted in the appropriate number of copies (e.g., if six copies of the original page was required, then six copies of the revised page will also be required), and shall be of a different color than the original pages they are to replace.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SHEET

The United States Army Corps of Engineers, Honolulu District is conducting a past performance evaluation of the contractor identified below. Please provide your evaluation of the contractor's performance on the contract identified below. **Please e-mail, fax or mail the evaluation to the following Address by Aug 1, 2003:**

**Contractor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu**  
**Attn: Ms. Jody Muraoka (CEPOH-CT-C)**  
**Building S-200**  
**Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440**  
**Phone No. (808) 438-8575**  
**Fax No. (808) 438-8588**  
**E-Mail: jody.muraoka@usace.army.mil**

Owner's / Owner's Representative's Name:

Phone Number:

Title:

Fax Number:

Address:

E-Mail Address:

Contract No:

Contract Title:

Location:

Contract Description:

Award Date:

Completion Date:

Award Amount:

Percentage of Contract Performed by the Contractor:

Type/scope of work performed by the Contractor:

Type/scope of work performed by other Subcontractors

Project Data Sheet

Contract No./Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Contractor: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Please evaluate the timeliness of contractor's work:

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Please evaluate the quality of the contractor's work:

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Please evaluate the cooperativeness of the contractor:

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. If you had another construction project in the future, would you use this contractor again?

Definitely      Probably      With Reservations      Probably Not      Definitely Not

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. How would you rate the overall performance of the contractor?

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please list any awards presented to the contractor for this project. Also identify any deficiencies, problems, or issues that you had with this contractor.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator (Print & Sign)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Evaluation

SECTION 00130

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS  
AND EVALUATION FACTORS  
FOR FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION

1.0 GENERAL

1.1. Cost of Preparing Proposals

The Government will not reimburse any Offeror any costs incurred in the preparation and submittal of an offer in response to this solicitation.

1.2. Inquiries

Address all inquiries regarding this Request for Proposals to:

U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
Attn: Ms. Jody Muraoka (CEPOH-CT-C)  
Building S-200  
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440  
Phone No. (808) 438-8575  
Fax No. (808) 438-8588  
E-Mail: jody.muraoka@usace.army.mil

1.3 Submittal of Proposals

Submit proposal packages to the US Army Corps of Engineers ("the Government") as shown in Block 8 of Standard Form 1442.

Proposals received by the Government after the date and time set for receipt of proposals will be handled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition (May 2001)," subparagraph (c), found in Section 00100.

1.4 Contract Award

The Government intends to award a minimum of three contracts under full & open competition to Offerors whose proposals have been determined to represent the best value to the Government, non-price and price factors considered. Award will be made to the Offerors whose proposals have the best non-price evaluation and the lowest price. However, if there are no Offerors meeting both these criterias, the Government intends to implement a "Best Value" process involving a cost-technical tradeoff process. In this case, awards may be made to other than the lowest price Offeror or other than the highest non-price-rated Offeror.

If an 8(a) offeror submits proposals in both the 8(a) set aside and under full and open - competition, and the Government's evaluation finds the 8(a) offeror to provide the best value to the Government in both the 8(a) set aside and under full and open competition, only one award to the 8(a) offeror will be made. This award will be as an 8(a) set aside offeror.

1.4.1 Proposal Evaluation

Numerical scores and other point-scoring techniques will not be used in the evaluation process. Each factor or subfactor will be rated on an adjectival rating system. The Government will evaluate offers in accordance with the NON-PRICE EVALUATION FACTORS described in paragraph 2.4 of this section and the offeror's proposed total price.

Offerors are advised that the Government intends to award without discussions.

Upon completing the evaluation of all proposals, the Contracting Officer will, in accordance with the provisions of this solicitation and applicable acquisition regulations, proceed to award without discussions. However, if discussions are determined necessary, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range and conduct discussions with those Offerors only within the competitive range. Upon conclusion of discussions, if necessary, the Contracting Officer will request final proposal revisions from the Offerors remaining in the competitive range and may, upon receipt of final proposal revisions, proceed to award a contract without further discussions or notice.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT

### 2.1 General

Proposals shall be submitted in three (3) separate envelopes. Please ensure that the boxes/envelopes that the proposals are sealed in are labeled as submission under full and open competition (unrestricted). If proposals are being submitted for both 8(a) set-aside and full and open competition, please submit separate sets of proposals, sealed in separate boxes/envelopes and labeled as 8(a) set-aside or full and open competition (unrestricted) on the outside boxes/envelopes. Proposals shall be prepared in the English language.

#### 2.1.1 Volume I, Non-Price Proposal

One envelope shall be clearly marked, "VOLUME I, NON-PRICE PROPOSAL FOR FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION, RFP NO. DACA83-03-R-0010." It shall contain an original and six (6) copies of the items provided in response to the Non-Price Factors listed in paragraph 2.3.

**Proposals shall completely address the requirements of the RFP. Elaborate format, special reproduction techniques, and the like are not necessary. However, the proposal shall be neatly organized and inserted in a binder.**

Information presented should be organized so as to pertain to only the evaluation factor in which section the information is presented. Information pertaining to more than one evaluation factor should be repeated in the tab for each factor.

#### 2.1.2 Volume II, Price Proposal

The second envelope shall be clearly marked, "VOLUME II, PRICE PROPOSAL FOR FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION, RFP NO. DACA83-03-R-0010." It shall contain one original and two copies of the Offeror's completed Standard Form (SF) 1442, using a printed copy of the SF 1442 included in this solicitation.

Volume II shall also include the following:

- One original and two copies of Section 00010, Price Proposal Schedule. Indicate whether or not Facilities Capital Cost of Money is included in the Offeror's costs of performing the work. Proposals that state that Facilities Capital Cost of Money is not included, or proposals that do not address Facilities Capital Cost of Money, will be deemed to have waived Facilities Capital Cost of Money.
- One original and two copies (certified as a true copy) of the Offeror's executed joint venture agreement and identify the size status for each member of the JV (if the Offeror is a joint venture).
- One original and two copies of the Offeror's completed Section 00600, Representations and Certifications, using a printed copy of Section 00600 included in this solicitation.
- One original and two copies of the Offeror's completed, if applicable, SF LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, using a printed copy of the SF LLL included as Appendix A in Section 00600.
- One original and two copies of the offer guarantee in the form and amount that is required by the provision entitled "Penal Sum and Form of Offer Guarantee", in Section 00100 and other pertinent provisions and clauses in this solicitation.

#### 2.1.3 Volume III, Subcontracting Plan (Large Business Concerns)

If the Offeror is a large business concern, the Offeror shall submit a subcontracting plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 (See Section 00100, Appendix A for a sample).

The third envelope shall be clearly marked, "VOLUME III, SUBCONTRACTING PLAN FOR FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION , RFP NO. DACA83-03-R-0010." Volume III will not be evaluated or rated. Only the selected Offeror's plan will be reviewed and must be approved prior to award of the contract.

#### 2.1.4 Table of Contents

Proposal volumes shall be tabbed. Each of the proposal volumes shall include a Table of Contents that includes the title of the subject matter discussed therein and the page number where the information can be found. The volumes shall be organized in the same order described in paragraph 2.3 of this Section. Each evaluation factor and subfactor shall be separately tabbed. Proposals that are not correctly tabbed may be considered non-responsive.

### 2.2 Proposal Content

Proposals shall be in a narrative format, organized and titled so that each section of the proposal follows the order and format of the factors and subfactors set forth below in paragraph 2.4, "VOLUME I, NON-PRICE PROPOSAL".

Offeror is cautioned that "parroting" of the RFP requirements with a statement of intent to perform does not reveal the Offeror's understanding of the problem or his capability to solve it. The inclusion of "filler" material from previous proposals or commercial applications shall be avoided unless it has a direct application to the objective of this RFP.

Offeror shall include sufficient details in the proposal, and shall present the details in the same order in which they are requested in this Section to permit the Government to promptly, completely, and accurately evaluate the proposal from both a technical and a management standpoint. The Government will not make any assumptions concerning the Offeror's intent, capabilities, facilities, or experience. Clear identification of the pertinent details shall rest solely with the Offeror.

Legibility, clarity, coherence, and contents are important. Offerors shall not submit verbatim sections of this RFP as part of their proposal. Offerors that disregard these standards unnecessarily delay the evaluation process and may be rejected by the Government after initial evaluation without receiving any further consideration.

Any information, presented in a proposal that the Offeror wants safeguarded from disclosure to other parties must be identified and labeled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition (May 2001)," subparagraph (e), which is found in Section 00100 of this solicitation. The Government will endeavor to honor the restrictions against release requested by Offerors, to the extent permitted under United States law and regulations.

The proposal must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract. By submission of an offer, the Offeror agrees that all items in its proposal (minimum qualifications for key positions, management plans, targets for utilization of eligible SDB concerns, etc.) will be used throughout the duration of the contract and any substitutions of any item will require prior approval of the Contracting Officer.

### 2.3 Evaluation Factors

All proposals will be evaluated on non-price and price factors. Offerors are required to provide data addressing all stated factors. If an Offeror does not have data relating to a specific factor, it shall be clearly stated. The Contracting Officer may use discretion in reasonably applying evaluation standards where Offerors provide information to explain or justify deviation from selection criteria listed in the solicitation. Offers that do not address all factors may be considered non-responsive and may not receive further consideration.

Non-price factors have equal importance. Subfactors of Factor IV are equal in importance. Non-price factors combined are significantly more important than price.

#### VOLUME I - NON-PRICE PROPOSAL

Factor I, Past Experience

Factor II, Past Performance

Factor III, Management

Factor IV, Small Business Program

Subfactor A - Extent of proposed Small Business participation in the performance of the proposed contract.

Subfactor B - Past performance in complying with Small Business Subcontracting Plan goals.

## VOLUME II - PRICE PROPOSAL

### 2.4 Volume I, Non-Price Proposal

Data provided in response to the non-price technical factors described below shall be included in Volume I, "Non-Price Proposal". All references to Offeror includes all proposed joint venture partners. All contractors in a joint venture must provide evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement, which creates legal responsibility on the part of all contractors in the joint venture. Information provided from potential subcontractors (not included in the joint venture) will not be considered or evaluated.

#### 2.4.1 Relevant Projects

#### 2.4.1 Relevant Projects

Relevant projects have construction awards above \$7M. Relevant projects also involve general construction type work, which includes areas such as civil, architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical, security, communications, asbestos removal and lead abatement.

Single or Multiple Award task order contracts, such as Job order Contracts, Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity Contracts, Multi-trade Contracts etc. are not considered relevant projects, even if the total value of the contract is over \$7M. However, a task order with an individual project over \$7M may be considered as a relevant project.

#### 2.4.2 Factor I, Past Experience

Offerors shall identify a maximum of 10 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects completed between June 1998 and June 2003 in which they were the prime contractor. Offerors shall also identify a maximum of 3 relevant Design-Build projects completed between June 1998 and June 2003 in which they were the prime contractor. Provide a Project Data Sheet (Attachment 1 to this section) for each of the projects identified. All requested information shall be provided. Failure to provide any of the requested data may be cause to eliminate a project from consideration in the evaluation.

##### 2.4.2.1 Evaluation Standards

The Government will evaluate the project data sheets provided by the offerors. If more than 10 Design-Bid-Build projects are submitted, only the first 10 Design-Bid-Build projects identified in the proposal will be reviewed. Of those 10 projects only the relevant projects will be evaluated. If more than 3 Design-Build projects are submitted, only the first 3 Design-Build projects identified in the proposal will be reviewed. Of those 3 projects only the relevant projects will be evaluated. Therefore it is important that the offeror provide the right number of relevant projects in the proposal. Projects that are not relevant or that fall outside the timeframe between June

1998 and June 2003 will not be considered in the evaluation. Projects in which the offeror was not the prime contractor will not be considered in the evaluation. In addition:

- a. More weight will be given to the number of relevant projects submitted (up to 10 Design-Bid Build projects and up to 3 Design-Build projects).
- b. More weight will be given to relevant projects that were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense
- c. More weight will be given to relevant projects that were constructed in Hawaii
- d. More weight will be given to the diversity of the relevant projects submitted. Diversity refers to the offeror's experience in managing various types of vertical construction, utilities and site work, as well as other types of work identified below:

- Civil construction such as, grading, water lines, sewer lines, paving/repaving roadways, sidewalks, parking lots, shore protection, stream bank stabilization, and dredging.
- Architectural construction such as, painting, roofing, renovation of interiors of existing buildings, new building construction.
- Mechanical construction such as, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and components, refrigeration systems, fire suppression systems, material transport systems, automatic box conveyor systems, incinerators, fuel lines, elevators, escalators, dumb waiters, as well as plumbing systems including water, solid and hazardous waste control.
- Electrical construction such as, power and service supplies, distribution, and utilization systems (including lighting), power generators and uninterrupted power supplies (UPS). Instrumentation work may include but is not limited to, plant management systems using direct digital technology, public address systems and fire alarm systems. Communications such as telephone and information management systems.
- Security construction such as intrusion detection and surveillance systems.
- Asbestos, lead-based paint, and petroleum-contaminated material abatement and disposal.
- Structural systems.

Outstanding	<p>The Offeror provided 10 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 5 of which were constructed in Hawaii and 5 of which were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>The Offeror provided 3 relevant Design-Build projects, 2 of which were constructed in Hawaii and 2 of which were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has outstanding experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Above Average	The Offeror has provided at least 8 relevant Design-Bid-

	<p>Build projects, 4 of which were constructed in Hawaii and 4 of which were contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>The Offeror provided at least 3 relevant Design-Build projects, 1 of which was constructed in Hawaii and 1 of which was contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has very good experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Satisfactory	<p>The Offeror has provided at least 6 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 3 of which were constructed in Hawaii or contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>The Offeror provided at least 2 relevant Design-Build projects 1 of which was constructed in Hawaii or contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has good experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Marginal	<p>The Offeror has provided at least 4 relevant Design-Bid-Build projects, 2 of which were constructed in Hawaii or contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>The Offeror provided at least 1 relevant Design-Build project which was constructed in Hawaii or contracted by an agency of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Projects identified shows the offeror has marginal experience managing diverse general construction projects.</p>
Unsatisfactory	<p>The projects provided by the Offeror are either not relevant or do not meet the Marginal requirements above.</p>

2.4.3 Factor II, Past Performance

The Offeror shall send Past Performance Evaluation Sheets, (Attachment 2 to this section), to the owners/owners representatives for all of the projects identified in Factor 1, Past Experience with a request that these evaluations be returned to the Government by Friday, August 1, 2003. Evaluations for Federal Government projects shall be sent to the Contracting Officer or his/her designated Representative.

Completed Past Performance evaluation sheets shall be mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the following address:

U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
 Attn: Ms. Jody Muraoka (CEPOH-CT-C)  
 Building S-200  
 Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Phone No. (808) 438-8575  
 Fax No. (808) 438-8588  
 E-Mail: jody.muraoka@usace.army.mil

2.4.3.1 Other Evaluation Sources

In addition to the information provided above, the Government may obtain and evaluate additional past performance information from owners or owners representatives on other relevant projects completed by the offeror between June 1998 and June 2003. The Government may also obtain and evaluate existing past performance information on relevant projects completed between June 1998 and June 2003 from historical Government databases (CCAS, ACAS, etc.) or any other sources.

2.4.3.2 Evaluation Standards

Outstanding	None of the Design-Bid-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory and at least half are outstanding. And None of the Design-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory and at least half are outstanding.
Above Average	None of the Design-Bid-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory and at least half are above satisfactory. And None of the Design-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory and at least half are above satisfactory.
Satisfactory	None of the Design-Bid-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory. And None of the Design-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Satisfactory.
Marginal	None of the Design-Bid-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Marginal. And None of the Design-Build performance evaluations (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government are less than Marginal
Unsatisfactory	At least one of the Design-Bid-Build final performance ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government received an Unsatisfactory final performance rating. OR At least one of the Design-Bid-Build final performance

	ratings (including those from other evaluation sources) evaluated by the Government received an Unsatisfactory final performance rating.
Neutral	Offerors will not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the Offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance. However, an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance history may be considered less favorably than an Offeror with a favorable past performance history.

2.4.4 Factor III, Management Plan

At a minimum the management plan shall include the following:

1. Identify key positions required to successfully manage this contract. Key positions should include but is not limited to program manager, contractor quality control system manager (CQCSM), contract safety officer, project engineer, project superintendent, quality control representative, site safety representative, estimator, design manager and other technical staff. Provide the minimum qualifications for each key position. All personnel hired by the offeror for this contract will be required to meet the minimum qualifications identified in the contract and in the contractor's proposal for the contract.
2. Provide an organizational chart showing the lines of authority between key positions.
3. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage Design-Build projects.
4. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage Design-Bid-Build projects.
5. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage the quality and safety of all contractors.
6. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage multiple projects at different locations simultaneously without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality or safety.
7. Provide a plan on how you will successfully manage peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality or safety.

2.4.4.1 Evaluation Standards

Outstanding	The Offeror provided an excellent management plan, which included very well qualified key positions with clear lines of authority. Management plan provided an unquestionable approach to managing Design-Build contracts, Design-Bid-Build contracts, quality, and safety. Management plan offers outstanding methods to manage multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, and managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Above Average	The Offeror provided a very good management plan, which included well-qualified key positions with clear lines of authority. The management plan provides a very good approach to managing Design-Build contracts, Design-Bid-

	Build contracts, quality, and safety. The management plan offers very good methods to manage multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, and managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Satisfactory	The Offeror provided an acceptable management plan, which included qualified key positions with clear lines of authority. Management plan provides a good approach to managing Design-Build contracts, Design-Bid-Build contracts, quality, and safety. Management plan offers good methods to manage multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, and managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Marginal	The Offeror provides a questionable approach to managing Design-Build and/or Design-Bid-Build contracts, managing quality and safety, managing multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, or managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.
Unsatisfactory	The Offeror does not address all requirements or does not provide an acceptable approach to managing Design-Build and/or Design-Bid-Build contracts, managing quality and safety, managing multiple projects in multiple locations simultaneously, or managing peaks in the workload without sacrificing timeliness, responsiveness, quality, or safety.

#### 2.4.5 Factor IV, Small Business Program

Offerors shall submit data that demonstrate its use of Small Business Concerns for Subfactors A and B. Small Business Concerns (SB) include small disadvantaged businesses (SDB), women-owned small businesses (WOSB), HUBZone small businesses (HZ), veteran-owned small businesses (VOSB) and service disabled veteran-owned small businesses (SDVO).

##### 2.4.5.1 Subfactor A - Extent of proposed Small Business participation in the performance of the proposed contract.

- Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total proposed contract price, the extent of the work the offeror will perform as the prime contractor. **(For the purpose of this evaluation factor, assume that the contract price equals \$50M)**
- If the offeror is submitting a proposal as a joint venture (JV), identify the size status of each member of the JV. Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total proposed contract price, the extent of the work each member of the JV will perform.
- Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the total proposed contract price, the work to be subcontracted to SB, SDB, WOSB, HZ, VOSB, SDVO concerns, and if applicable, historically black colleges or universities/minority institutions (HBCU/MI).

- Identify in terms of dollar value and percentage of the proposed subcontract price, the work to be performed by SB, SDB, WOSB, HZ, VOSB, SDVO concerns, and if applicable, (HBCU/MI).
- Provide a list of SB, SDB, WOSB, HZ, VOSB, SDVO concerns, and if applicable, (HBCU/MI) which the offeror proposes to use as a subcontractor if awarded a contract under this solicitation. The listing shall include the name, address, telephone number, and type of work each concern is anticipated to perform.

2.4.5.1.1 Evaluation Standards

Outstanding	Offeror's proposal shows extensive effort and commitment to utilize small business concerns for this project. All USACE subcontracting goals are exceeded. Specific SB, SDB, WOSB, HZ, VOSB, SDVO concerns, and if applicable, (HBCU/MI) to be utilized are identified.
Above Average	All USACE subcontracting goals are met and some exceeded. Specific SB, SDB, WOSB, HZ, VOSB, SDVO concerns, and if applicable, (HBCU/MI) to be utilized are identified.
Satisfactory	All USACE subcontracting goals are met. Specific SB, SDB, WOSB, HZ, VOSB, SDVO concerns, and if applicable, (HBCU/MI) to be utilized are identified. [Small Business concerns will be given at least a satisfactory rating.]
Marginal	Some USACE subcontracting goals are not met. Listing of subcontractors does not contain specific SB's.
Unsatisfactory	Most USACE subcontracting goals are not met. No listing of small businesses to be utilized is provided.

[NOTE: The USACE Small Business Subcontracting Goals for fiscal year 2003 are: 58% to SB, 9% to SDB, 8% to WOSB, 3% to HZ, 3% to VOSB, and 3% to SDVO. These are percentages of the total subcontracted amount.]

2.4.5.2 Subfactor B - Past performance in complying with Small Business Subcontracting Plan goals.

- Provide SF 294's, "Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts" for projects of similar scope and magnitude. Where subcontracting goals were not met, provide adequate justification why.
- Provide information on awards received for outstanding support of the small business program.
- Provide information on any existing or prior mentor-protégé agreements.

2.4.5.2.1 Evaluation Standards

Outstanding	All goals were exceeded or satisfactory justification provided. The Offeror has received awards for outstanding support of the small business program, and the Offeror is or has participated in mentor-protégé agreements or other outreach.
Above Average	All goals were met or exceeded or satisfactory

	justification provided. The Offeror has received award(s) for outstanding support of the small business program, or the Offeror is or has participated in mentor-protégé agreements or other outreach.
Satisfactory	All subcontracting goals were met or a satisfactory justification provided. Small business concerns will be given at least a satisfactory rating.
Marginal	Not all goals were met and no satisfactory justification provided.
Unsatisfactory	No goals were met and no satisfactory justification provided.
Neutral	Except in the case of small business offerors, offerors will not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance in complying with small business subcontracting goals.

## 2.5 Volume II, Price Proposal

The Government will compare the price to the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) and the price of other offerors to determine reasonableness and affordability.

### 2.5.1 Price Evaluation

Data provided in response to price shall be included in Volume II, "Price Proposal".

#### 2.5.1.1 General

Offerors shall submit the cost data identified below that they are proposing to use in the development of all cost estimates that this contract may require. The proposed cost data, if awarded a contract, shall be used for the life of the contract, subject to review and resubmittal at the discretion of the Contracting Officer. Offerors shall indicate the start date of their fiscal accounting period. All cost data will be reviewed at least annually, generally coinciding with this accounting period. Adjustments to the cost data, based on current documentation, may be considered subject to approval of the Contracting Officer.

Offerors are reminded that the cost factors included in this proposal will be contractually binding and are cautioned not to "low ball" any of the numbers in its proposal and estimate in order to come out with a low total cost. If awarded one of the contracts, the factors shown in this proposal will be used in all future task orders.

#### 2.5.1.2 Workmen's Comp Insurance

Offerors shall submit premium statement(s) from their insurance company(ies) identifying all workmen's compensation insurance in effect at the time of this solicitation. Successful offerors will be required to maintain current

premium statement(s) on file with the Contracting Officer throughout the life of the contract.

#### 2.5.1.3 Performance and Payment Bond

Offerors shall submit a statement from their surety defining the bond rate(s) in effect at the time of this solicitation. Successful offerors will be required to maintain current bond rates on file with the Contracting Officer throughout the life of the contract.

#### 2.5.1.4 Home Office Overhead

Offerors shall submit their proposed home office overhead rate, including all data and calculations used in arriving at that rate. Home office overhead components shall comply with FAR Part 31.

#### 2.5.1.5 Contract Management Fixed Costs

Offerors shall submit their proposed fixed cost elements relating to the management of the contract, i.e. Project Manager, CQCSM, Contract Safety Officer. These costs shall be complete, including labor, labor burden, fringe benefits, travel and transportation. Provide the daily (calendar day) rate and annual rate and a breakdown of all cost elements proposed for each of the key personnel proposed in Section 00010, Item No. 4

#### 2.5.1.6 Field Office Management Fixed Costs

Offerors shall submit their proposed fixed cost elements relating to the management of task orders, i.e. Project Engineer, Project Superintendent, QCR, Site Safety representative. These costs shall be complete, including labor, labor burden, fringe benefits, travel and transportation. Provide the daily (calendar day) rate and annual rate and a breakdown of all cost elements proposed for each of the field office management key personnel proposed in Section 00010, Item No. 5.

#### 2.5.1.7 Determination of Relative Price

As a measure of relative price, the Government will apply the following formula to the cost factors submitted in Section 00010. (Offerors shall ensure the data in Section 00010 is complete and accurate. Failure to provide the requested data in Section 00010 in the requested format may be cause for a determination of non-responsiveness.) Offerors shall not compute Total Price. The Government will perform this calculation during its evaluation. The resultant number/total price will be used to compare the cost of doing business among all Offerors.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \text{Contract management cost} * \\ & + (\text{Field office management cost} *) \} \\ & \times (1 + \text{Home Office Overhead rate} *) \\ & = \text{Total Price} \end{aligned}$$

\* from Section 00010, Proposal Summary

## 2.6 Proposal Revisions

If discussions are held and proposal revisions are requested by the Contracting Officer, all revisions shall be submitted as page replacements

DACA83-03-R-0010

00130-13

(Am-0001)

with revised text readily identifiable, e.g. bold face print or underlining. Proposal replacement pages shall be clearly marked "REVISED", shall show the date of revision, shall be submitted in the appropriate number of copies (e.g., if six copies of the original page was required, then six copies of the revised page will also be required), and shall be of a different color than the original pages they are to replace.

**PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SHEET**

The United States Army Corps of Engineers, Honolulu District is conducting a past performance evaluation of the contractor identified below. Please provide your evaluation of the contractor's performance on the contract identified below. **Please e-mail, fax or mail the evaluation to the following Address by Aug 1, 2003:**

**Contractor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
Attn: Ms. Jody Muraoka (CEPOH-CT-C)  
Building S-200  
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440  
Phone No. (808) 438-8575  
Fax No. (808) 438-8588  
E-Mail: jody.muraoka@usace.army.mil**

Owner's / Owner's Representative's Name:

Phone Number:

Title:

Fax Number:

Address:

E-Mail Address:

Contract No:

Contract Title:

Contract Type (Design-Bid-Build or Design-Build)

Location:

Contract Description:

Award Date:

Completion Date:

Award Amount:

Percentage of Contract Performed by the Contractor:

Type/scope of work performed by the Contractor:

Type/scope of work performed by other Subcontractors

Project Data Sheet

Contract No./Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Contractor: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Please evaluate the timeliness of contractor's work:

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Please evaluate the quality of the contractor's work:

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Please evaluate the cooperativeness of the contractor:

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

4. If you had another construction project in the future, would you use this contractor again?

Definitely      Probably      With Reservations      Probably Not      Definitely Not

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

5. How would you rate the overall performance of the contractor?

Outstanding      Very Good      Satisfactory      Marginal      Unsatisfactory

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Please list any awards presented to the contractor for this project. Also identify any deficiencies, problems, or issues that you had with this contractor.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator (Print & Sign)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Evaluation