

ELEVEN MILE CANYON ENTRANCE AND FEE BOOTH

A_08 - Technical Evaluation Criteria

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS.

The technical proposal will be used to make an evaluation and arrive at a determination as to whether the proposal will meet the requirements of the Government. Therefore, the technical proposal must present sufficient information to reflect a thorough understanding of the requirements and a detailed description of the techniques, procedures, and program for achieving the objectives of the specifications/statement of work. Proposals which merely paraphrase the requirements of the Government's specifications/statement of work, or use such phrases as "will comply" or "standard techniques will be employed" will be considered unacceptable and will not be considered further. As a minimum, the proposal must clearly provide the following:

Evaluation Criteria

A. Relevant Past Performance (NTE 3 pages): Furnish a list of three (3) projects of similar magnitude completed by the firm within the last three (3) years. The list should include work similar in nature and complexity to that required by this solicitation. Include contracts with the Federal Government, agencies of state, local governments, and commercial customers. For each project cited, provide the following:

Name and location of the project;

Project Point of Contact's name, phone, email address, and fax numbers;

Total cost of the project;

A brief narrative of the project (include size, i.e. acres, square feet; date of start, and completion or anticipated completion date).

The Government may or may not contact any or all references listed. For any projects listed that may report less than positive performance, you are encouraged to provide a description of the problems and efforts made to correct and prevent future occurrences. **Note: Firms lacking past performance will not be rated favorably or unfavorably in this area, but will receive a neutral rating.**

B. Experience/ Key Personnel (NTE 3 pages): The offeror will be evaluated by relevant experience on the basis of its extent and depth. The offeror shall provide a detailed summary of experience with work similar to the type of work required under this project. Provide a list of personnel with job titles and years of experience.

C. PRICE PROPOSAL, SCHEDULE OF ITEMS Schedule of Items included in the solicitation package, completed by the offeror will be considered the price proposal. **This solicitation requires submission of a proposal on all base and optional items. Failure to do so may result in the proposal being rejected without further consideration.** The offeror is also required to state their base of operations in order for the Government to determine cost-efficiency of mobilization. The Price Proposal will not be point scored but will be subjectively evaluated to determine the reasonableness, cost realism, affordability and value of the price data. The Government will perform a price analysis and evaluate price by determination of “**Best Overall Value.**”

PAGE LIMITATIONS: Pages that exceed limitation will not be evaluated. Do not provide blank pages, cover pages or pictures. A page is defined as one side of a sheet of paper containing information. Pages will be evaluated in order received.

1. For relevant past performance: one page per project for a maximum of three (3) pages.
2. For experience/key personnel: do not exceed three (3) pages.

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

52.217-5 Evaluation of Options. (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

EVALUATION FACTORS

This contract will be awarded on factors other than price (Best Value) and may be awarded without discussion. The Government will evaluate each proposal against the following factors: Past Performance, Experience/Key Personnel, and Price. When combined, these technical evaluation factors are approximately equal to cost. Each unit item bid price will be evaluated to determine if they are fair and reasonable. Technical proposals will be evaluated and ranked according to the following criteria.

EVALUATION RATINGS

Since an offeror's proposal(s) must be compliant in order for it to be eligible for award, compliance of the offer is a mandatory solicitation requirement. Each proposal will be evaluated strictly on its content and will not assume that performance will include anything not specified in the proposal. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the procedures established herein. The Evaluation

Panel will assign to each evaluation criterion a final adjective consensus rating of exceptional, acceptable, good, acceptable, marginal, or unacceptable based on the following descriptions:

Exceptional	An exceptional proposal contains significant strengths and no weaknesses. The proposal exceeds the performance and technical capability requirements defined in the Statement Of Work (SOW). The proposal offers value-added methodologies for improving service that benefits the Government. The evaluator has no doubt that the offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed. The offeror acknowledges risks and develops an approach that proactively identifies and mitigates risks, and looks to reduce or eliminate future risks.
Good	A good proposal contains significant strengths and only a few minor weaknesses. The Offeror's proposal meets the performance and technical capability requirements as defined in the SOW. The evaluator has a high degree of confidence that the Offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed. The Offeror acknowledges technical or schedule risk and develops an approach capable of mitigating all apparent risks effectively.
Acceptable	An acceptable proposal contains strengths that outweigh any existing weaknesses. The Offeror's proposal meets the performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW. The evaluator is confident that the offeror can successfully achieve the requirements in the SOW if the technical approach proposed is followed.
Marginal	The proposal meets the bare minimum performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW, and also have significant weaknesses. The evaluator is not confident that the offeror can successfully complete the required tasking without significant Government oversight or participation. The proposal either fails to address risks or the proposed risk mitigation approach is not deemed to be sufficient to manage the risk.
Unacceptable	An unacceptable proposal that contains one or more significant weaknesses and deficiencies. Proposal fails to meet specified minimum performance and technical capability requirements defined in the SOW. The evaluator is confident that the Offeror will be unable to successfully complete the required tasking. The proposal does not adequately acknowledge or address risk, mitigate risk, or may actually introduce risk.

AWARD DETERMINATION

The contract(s) resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to that responsible offeror(s) who's offer-conforming to the solicitation is technically acceptable and whose technical/cost relationship is the most advantageous to the Government, cost and other factors considered. The offeror's proposal shall be in the format prescribed and shall contain a response to each of the areas identified which affects the

evaluation factors for award. The Government will determine best overall value on the basis of the factors described above.

Award will be made to that offeror(s) whose proposal is technically acceptable and whose technical/cost relationship is the best value to the government. The critical factor in making any cost/technical tradeoff is not the spread between the technical scores but rather the significance of that difference. The significance of the spread scores will be determined on the basis of what that difference might mean in terms of performance and what it would cost the Government to take advantage of it. Award may not necessarily be made for technical capability that would appear to exceed those needed for the successful performance of the work. The Government reserves the right to make cost/technical tradeoffs that are in the best interest and advantageous to the Government. The Government may reject any or all offers if such action is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

Award may be made without further discussions. Initial offers should be submitted with the most favorable terms, from a price and technical standpoint. The Government may, after evaluation of proposals, conduct oral or written discussions as appropriate, with the offerors whose proposals are within a competitive range.