APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B
OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY EVALUATION

1. GENERAL

The purpose of this document is to establish a uniform evaluation procedure for offeror performance information based on contractually defined criteria. The Evaluation Team will evaluate each proposal individually using the qualitative/quantitative procedures which follow. Each proposal will be reviewed and rated by each of the evaluators. During this process, discrepancies between evaluations will be discussed and resolved within the team. Following the completion of the individual evaluations, a consensus evaluation will be derived. The results of this consensus evaluation will determine the Final Offeror Performance Rating to be utilized with the Final Technical Quality Rating to determine the overall adjectival rating for each proposal.

2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

a. Security. Each evaluator is responsible for maintaining security of offerors' proposals and Government evaluation documents. No material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. Proposals are not to be discussed outside of the evaluation room.

b. Procurement Integrity and Non-disclosure. Evaluators must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.

c. Written Comments. Written comments are required of each evaluator identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal on the rating worksheets. These comments are essential to the Contract Specialist (CS) in preparing the Source Selection Authority briefing, and debriefing of unsuccessful offerors.

d. Additional Information. Additional information may be needed to complete the evaluation process, or to assure that all proposals in the competitive range are conforming to the Request for Proposals (RFP). The Contracting Division will request the information or clarification be provided by the offeror in writing.

e. Prior to beginning the review or evaluation of any of the Offeror's proposals, the evaluators must familiarize themselves with the solicitation statement of work, proposal submission requirements (Section 00110) and the proposal evaluation criteria (Section 00120).

f. Evaluators shall review and evaluate all proposals independently. No discussions of proposals between the evaluators shall take place before the final consensus discussions.

g. Substitutions for evaluators will not be allowed once the evaluation process has begun. No consensus sessions may be held unless all evaluators are present as well as the non-rating board Chairperson.

3. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

a. Section 00110, Proposal Submission requirements identifies all the necessary submittal information to be included in the Contractor proposals. Proposals that reach the evaluation stage have passed an initial Contracting Division review to assure that they are complete and responsive. All proposals that are provided to the evaluation team must be evaluated and rated.

b. Past Performance Questionnaires. Each proposal shall include at least three completed questionnaires from previous offeror projects. If more than three questionnaires have been returned the evaluation team shall determine which three questionnaires are to be evaluated. If less than three questionnaires have been

returned for a particular proposal, that proposal shall receive an "NEUTRAL" rating for each of the questionnaires not received.

4. INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEETS

a. On the following pages individual worksheets are provided for use by the evaluators to review and rate the individual proposals. During the consensus evaluation, a single "consensus rating" worksheet shall be completed for each proposal and signed by all the evaluators. It is imperative that all comments and supporting rational for the rating assigned be included on this consensus sheet. Comments are required to support all ratings above or below "Satisfactory".

5. RATING METHODOLOGY

a. Proposals will be evaluated in each evaluation Factor based on the following rating scheme:

RATING	EXPLANATION
Neutral Performance Risk	An Offeror without a record of past performance or for whom information in past performance is not available. This offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.
Outstanding/Very Low Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Above Average/Low Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory/Moderate Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Normal contractor emphasis should preclude any problems.
Marginal/High Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unsatisfactory/Very High Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

b. Yes - No Items. Where the specific evaluation sheets indicate a YES – NO Rating these items shall be treated as informational items. They are included in the evaluation worksheets to assure a similar focus among the evaluators and to ensure that individual evaluators do not overlook proposal information provided.

6. EVALUATION FACTORS

a. As indicated in Section 00120, PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND CONTRACT AWARD, the following factors will be evaluated and rated for each proposal:

FACTOR 1: OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE: This factor is the most important factor in the evaluation of Offeror Performance Capability proposals.

FACTOR 2: OFFEROR PROJECT KEY PERSONNEL: This factor is slightly less important than Factor 1 but represents a significant level of importance in evaluating proposals.

FACTOR 3: TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE: This factor is equal in importance to Factor 2.

FACTOR 4: OFFEROR RELEVANT EXPERIENCE: This factor is less important than Factor 2.

FACTOR 5: OFFEROR MANAGEMENT PLANS AND SCHEDULES: This factor is equal in importance to Factor 4.

FINAL OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY RATING: This rating is determined by the offeror capability evaluation team as a consensus rating.

7. OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING

a. Following completion of the consensus rating, each proposal will be assigned a single overall adjectival rating. This final overall rating will be the rating which will be combined with the technical quality rating to arrive at an overall proposal rating adjective.

b. It is the responsibility of the evaluation team to provide and document sufficient strengths, weaknesses, and omissions to suitably support the assigned rating in each Factor as well as the overall rating. Documentation/comments are required for all ratings other than “SATISFACTORY”.

c. Following the completion of the consensus discussions and rating assignments, the individual rating worksheets from each of the evaluators will be collected by the Chairperson and destroyed. Each evaluator shall sign the final rating assignment sheet.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 1

OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate the success of the offeror based on the satisfaction of previous customers and clients as illustrated on the completed questionnaires. These completed questionnaires shall be used as a basis to begin the evaluation of this factor.

Has Government Received Three Completed Questionnaires for this Offeror ____ YES ___ NO

Do All the Questionnaires Received Reflect Projects Completed Within the Last 3 Years ____ YES ____NO

2. ACASS – CCASS Ratings: Contract Specialist shall provide ACASS and CCASS Ratings for the offeror and the princple subcontractor (design firm or construction firm) if the offeror is not a single entity. Evaluators shall list below the names of the firms reported on the resultant ratings.

Construction Rating (CCASS)

Firm Name: _____

Number of Ratings: Outstanding _____
Above Average _____
Satisfactory _____
Marginal _____
Unsatisfactory _____

Design Rating (ACASS)

Firm Name: _____

Number of Ratings: Outstanding _____
Above Average _____
Satisfactory _____
Marginal _____
Unsatisfactory _____

Select an appropriate overall rating for the CCASS and ACASS evaluation information available:

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

3. Relevant Evaluator Personal Knowledge: Has this evaluator had personal experiences with the offeror or the prime subcontractors? If so, describe below:

4. Quality of Products Produced: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the quality of the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Quality of the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

4a. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to final product quality.

4b. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to final product quality.

4c. Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

5. Timeliness of Products Produced: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain customer satisfaction with the timeliness of the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Timeliness of the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

5a. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to timeliness.

5b. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to timeliness.

5c. Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

6. Offeror Management Processes. Offeror Management Processes will be evaluated in terms of the Offerors Documentation, Cooperation with the Customer/Client Personnel, and the Management of Subcontractors.

6a. Offeror Documentation: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the documentation, reports, and other written materials completed by the offeror on the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror Documentation Skills of the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

6a.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Documentation and production of written materials.

6a.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Documentation and production of written materials.

6a.3 Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

6b. Offeror Cooperation with Customer/Client Personnel: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the offeror cooperation and interactions on the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror Cooperation on the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror the and proposed project team.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

6b.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Customer/Client Cooperation.

6b.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Customer/Client Cooperation.

6b.3 Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

6c. Offeror Management of Subcontractors: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the offeror Management of Subcontractors on the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror Subcontractor Management Skills on the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

6c.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

6c.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

6c.3 Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

Factor 1 Summary and Overall Rating

FACTOR 1 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Questionnaire Receipt	YES NO	
2.	ACASS/CCASS Rating		
3.	Personal Experience	N/A	No rating permitted here
4.	Quality Products Produced		
5.	Timeliness of Execution		
6a.	Offeror Documentation		
6b.	Offeror Cooperation		
6c.	Offeror Subcontractor Management		
OVERALL FACTOR 1-1 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 2

OFFEROR PROJECT KEY PERSONNEL

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Evaluators will use this item to document receipt of Proposal Information with respect to Key Personnel.

Does the Proposal Include Identifications of the Key Personnel? ____ YES ___ NO

2. Key Personnel: Review and evaluate the proposed Offeror personnel to be included on this project team. Have these individuals worked Design/Build projects together previously? Do the key construction staff (superintendent, CQC, Project Manager) have experience with "fast-track" design/build projects? Are the designers of record registered professional engineers? Are the designers suitably experienced in their field to provide them a suitable level of design expertise? Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror proposed project team below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

2a Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

2b Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

2c Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 3

OFFEROR TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Evaluators will use this item to document receipt of a technical approach narrative with the Proposal Information.

Does the Proposal Include a Technical Approach Narrative? ____ YES ___ NO

2. Evaluate the Offerors described understanding the two phase Design/Build process being used in this solicitation. Does the Offeror demonstrate a suitable understanding of the process to enable him/her to adequately address and anticipate the risks associated with Design/Build processes?

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

3. Evaluate the Offerors described understanding of “fast track” design construction procedures.

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

4. Evaluate the Offerors described understanding of the integration of key subcontractors into the Design/Build process. Does the Offeror illustrate a clearly defined role and responsibility for each of his/her key subcontractors?

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

5. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths the offeror demonstrated in the Technical Approach Narrative.

6. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses the offeror demonstrated in the Technical Approach Narrative.

7. Other: Include any other comments with respect to the Technical Approach Narrative.

Factor 3 Summary and Overall Rating

FACTOR 3 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Technical Approach Narrative Included in Proposal?	YES NO	
2.	Understanding of the Design/Build Process		
3.	Use of "Fast Track" Design/Build Process		
4.	Integration of Key Subcontractors		
5.	Strengths	N/A	No rating permitted
6.	Weaknesses	N/A	No rating permitted
7.	Other	N/A	No rating permitted
OVERALL FACTOR 1-3 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 4

OFFEROR RELATIVE EXPERIENCE

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Evaluators will use this item to document receipt of example project listings with the Proposal Information.

Does the Proposal Include an Example Project Listing with Suitable Explanation? ____ YES ___ NO

2. Evaluate the Offerors provided example projects. Are these projects similar in size (cost) and complexity with this solicitation requirements? Was the Offeror in responsible charge of the example projects? Was he/she a key subcontractor?

/__/ Outstanding /__/ Above Average /__ / Satisfactory /__ / Marginal /__ / Unsatisfactory

/__ / Neutral

NOTE: IF THE OFFEROR HAS NO RELEVANT EXPERIENCE LISTED OR THE EVALUATION PANEL DETERMINES THE EXAMPLE PROJECTS PROVIDED TO NOT REPRESENT RELEVANT EXPERIENCE, THE OFFEROR MUST BE RATED AS “SATISFACTORY”.

3. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths the offeror demonstrated in the example projects included in the proposal.

4. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses the offeror demonstrated in the example projects included in the proposal.

PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET

FACTOR 5

OFFEROR MANAGEMENT PLANS AND SCHEDULES

Offeror: _____

Evaluator:_____

1. General: Through this factor the evaluators will review and evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the design/build process as required in this solicitation. Each of the four subfactors are approximately equal in importance.

2. Subfactor Evaluations.

a. Quality Control Plan. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's quality control procedures planned for application to this project. The quality control plan and procedures must address design as well as construction phases of the project. The proposed quality control program must include and address the Corps three phase quality control system and acknowledge experience and familiarity with the Corps Quality Assurance program. If personnel identified by the Offeror have changed, the alternate personnel shall be reviewed to assure a similar level of quality.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / High Average /__ / Average /__ / Low Average

/__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's Quality Control Program. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's Quality Control Program. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

b. Schedule Information. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's proposed schedule information to determine the extent of "fast tracking" included. The schedule must reflect a single task oriented structure for both design and construction operations. Evaluators shall review and assess completeness, inclusion of required milestones, and realism. Proposed schedules which indicate project completion prior to the Government indicated maximum duration should receive favorable consideration.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / High Average /__ / Average /__ / Low Average

/__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's proposed Project Schedule. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's proposed Project Schedule. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

c. Closeout Plan. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's proposed closeout plan. Particular emphasis shall be placed on the preparation of Operations & Maintenance Manuals and the training of the base personnel on the installed systems and materials.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / High Average /__ / Average /__ / Low Average

/__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's proposed Closeout Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's proposed Closeout Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

d. Sub-Contracting Plan. Evaluators shall review and evaluate the Offeror's proposed subcontracting plan in terms of achieving the required special emphasis group participations and the completeness and rational for the plan proposed. Offerors who are not required to submit a subcontracting plan (ie Small Business concerns) will be assigned a rating equal to the highest evaluation of any subcontracting plan submitted in response to this solicitation.

Other Considerations: None.

/__ / Excellent /__ / Above Average /__ / High Average /__ / Average /__ / Low Average

/__ / Poor /__ / Unacceptable

- Proposal Strengths. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal strengths in the Offeror's proposed Sub-Contracting Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

- Proposal Weaknesses. Include narrative comments with respect to proposal weaknesses of the Offeror's proposed Sub-Contracting Plan. Comments are required for all ratings above "AVERAGE".

FACTOR 5 Summary Rating

FACTOR 5 SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Subfactor a Quality Control Plan		All subfactors are equal.
2.	subfactor b Schedule Information		All subfactors are equal.
3.	Subfactor c Closeout Plan		All subfactors are equal.
4.	Subfactor d Sub-Contracting Plan		All subfactors are equal.
FACTOR 5 RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – High Average – Average – Low Average – Poor - Unacceptable

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the subfactors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

Offeror:_____

Overall Offeror Performance Capability Rating

SUMMARY RATING CHART			
Item No.	**Description**	**Rating***	**Comments**
1.	Factor 1 Offeror Past Performance		The most important Factor.
2.	Factor 2 Offeror Project Key Personnel		This Factor is slightly less important than Factor 1
3.	Factor 3 Technical Approach Narrative		This Factor is equal to Factor 2
4.	Factor 4 Offeror Relevant Experience		This Factor is less important than Factor 2
5.	Factor 5 Offeror Management Plans and Schedules		This factor is equal in importance to Factor 4.
OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING**			

* Ratings may be either:
Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory

** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the four factors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators

Attach additional sheets to this rating summary to provide supporting rational for assignment of ratings.

_____
Board Member 1

_____
Board Member 2

_____
Board Member 3

_____
Board Member 4

_____
Board Chairperson

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY EVALUATION MATRIX

PROPOSAL SUMMARY SCORING MATRIX				
Offeror	Offeror Performance Capability Rating*	Proposal Technical Quality Rating**	Final Overall Proposal Rating**	Comments

* Ratings may be either:
Unknown – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory

** Ratings may be either:
Excellent – Above Average – Average – Poor - Unacceptable

Note:
Outstanding = Excellent
Average = Satisfactory
Marginal = Poor
Unsatisfactory = Unacceptable

_____
Board Member 1

_____
Board Member 2

_____
Board Member 3

_____
Board Member 4

_____
Board Chairperson