

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

As discussed previously evaluation of the offerors' proposals will be a two-phase process. The evaluation factors, and the evaluation approach for each phase is discussed below.

M.1 Phase I Evaluation. This evaluation forms the basis for the down select to identify offerors who will have the opportunity to participate in the Phase II, Field Demonstrations. In Phase I, proposals will be evaluated in the following manner: Factor I (Technical/Safety and Management) and Factor II (Past Performance) will be numerically scored. Factor III (Price Proposal - Volume II) will not be scored, but will be evaluated in accordance with M.1.3 below. Factors I and II are worth 400 points and 200 points, respectively.

M.1.1 Factor I -Technical/Safety and Management - 400 points. The sub-factors to be evaluated are listed below in their order of importance and with assigned points as follows:

1. Technical/Safety-250 points
 - a. Safety (60 pts.)
 - b. Expertise in multiple technologies/approaches for each critical process element (60 pts.)
 - c. Comprehensive understanding of the OE cleanup process and ability to technically integrate effort across a process and program, including digital data transfer and fusion (50 pts.)
 - d. Proposed Innovations (potential for improvement and widespread application at FMC) and technical ability /experience for innovation and continuous improvement including the use of value engineering (40 pts)
 - e. QA/QC (especially relating to proposed innovations)(40 pts.)
2. Management-150 points
 - a. Team composition (40 pts.)
 - b. Integration and planning (30 pts)
 - c. Cost/schedule/risk assessment, reporting and controls (25 pts.)
 - d. Key personnel (20 pts.)
 - e. Small business/Historically Black Colleges and Universities/ Minority Institutions commitment (15 pts.)
 - f. Management for innovation and continuous improvement (10 pts.)
 - g. Performance metrics and incentives (The relevance and attainability of the metrics and incentives that are contained in the Section C SOW and the initial actual task order, and any additional specific performance metrics and incentives recommended by the offeror)
(10 pts.)

M.1.2 Factor II - Past Performance - 200 points. To be relevant, past performance must have been accomplished by 1) the offeror, 2) a major subcontractor (a subcontractor proposed who will perform 10% or more of the effort under this contract), or 3) key personnel proposed. The past performance score will be determined based upon three considerations:
1) The "past performance information" (See FAR 42.1501) presented in the offeror's Oral Presentation and Interview,
2) The results of the questionnaires mailed to USAESCH by the offeror's past customers

3) Other sources (as part of this evaluation the Government reserves the right to gather Past Performance information on any or all offerors, from any credible source).

Results of the evaluation of these three areas will be melded into a single score for each of the sub-factors listed below.

- a. Safety (45 pts.)
- b. Quality of work(35 pts.)
- c. Customer satisfaction (35 pts.)
- d. Cost performance (25 pts)
- e. Terminated Contracts, Cure/Show Cause Letters, problems encountered, and offerors corrective actions taken. (25 pts.)
- f. Schedule performance (15 pts.)
- g. Innovation/continuous improvement (15 pts.)
- h. Extent to which the offeror as a past contractor carried out the policies of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9 (See RFP Section I.20 and I.21) on prior contracts (5 pts)

M.1.3 Factor III - Price Proposal (Volume II). Price will not be a scored criterion, but will be competitively evaluated as to reasonableness and realism. Offerors that are found to be unreasonably low/high may be considered unacceptable and may be rejected on that basis. The Contracting Officer will consider price realism in the evaluation of the fixed price and time and materials approaches. The fixed price proposal will be significantly more important than the time and materials proposal.

M.2 Phase II Evaluation. This is the last step of the evaluation process and proposals will be evaluated in the following manner: Factor IV - (Field Demonstration Data and Conclusions - Volume III) which will be numerically scored.

M.2.1 Factor IV - Field Demonstration Data and Conclusions (Volume III)(400 pts.) The sub-factors to be evaluated are listed below in their order of importance and with assigned points as follows:

1. Identification of ordnance items (number, depth, volume or mass) (110 pts)

2. Safety (100pts.) This sub-factor will be evaluated in accordance with M.2.2.

3. False positives (80 pts.)

4. Data processing methodology (overall approach, analytic tools, criteria) (60pts.)

5. Management and integration (50 pts.)

M.2.2 Safety Criteria for Field Demonstration.

EACH TEAM WALKS INTO THE FIELD DEMONSTRATION WITH 100 POINTS. THE NUMBER OF VIOLATIONS WILL BE TALLIED AND SUBTRACTED.

1. Major safety violations: DEDUCT 25 points for the first occurrence.

Any second offense in the major safety violation areas will result in termination of the field efforts and a score of 0 for the safety portion of the field demonstration

a. personnel moving into the out-of-bounds areas during their geophysical work.

b. touching, moving, kicking UXO or UXO-like items.

c. performing any intrusive activities, intrusive meaning digging, scuffing, or otherwise intentionally moving surface dirt or materials, such as, but not limited to; dead leaves or scrap to facilitate sensor proximity to the surface or to identify near-surface anomalies without PRIOR approval from USACE Safety personnel.

d. driving any stakes into the ground without PRIOR approval from USACE Safety personnel.

2. Minor safety violations: (DEDUCT 10 points for each occurrence)

a. running, horseplay in the test grid.

b. unsafe work practices, such as but not limited to; lifting, improper use of handtools, unsafe acts with bladed equipment, etc.).

c. failure to follow on-site directions by USACE Safety personnel.

NOTICE: NO WARNINGS WILL BE GIVEN

M.3 Award. After the completion of the Phase II evaluation the scores for the Technical/Safety and Management (Phase I), Past performance (Phase I) and Field Demonstration Data and Conclusions (Phase II) will be added to give a total score. All evaluation factors, other than cost or price are significantly more important than cost or price. A tradeoff process, as contemplated by FAR 15.101-1(a), is possible under this solicitation, i.e., it may be in the best interest of the government to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror, in accordance with the announced evaluation factors. Consistent with the evaluation criteria, the Government will award a contract which, in the judgement of the Contracting Officer, will result in the best value for the Government. Only one award shall result from this solicitation.

END OF SECTION M