From:	Furlong, Elizabeth R CIV USARMY ACC (US)
To:	Furlong, Elizabeth R CIV USARMY ACC (US)
Cc:	USARMY RIA ACC Mailbox EAGLE
Subject:	EAGLE RFP Revisions to Section L and M
Date:	Monday, December 29, 2014 3:17:32 PM
Attachments:	EAGLE RFP revisions to Section L and M.PDF

Attention All EAGLE BOA Holders:

The Army Contracting Command-Rock Island (ACC-RI) in conjunction with the Army Sustainment Command (ASC) has determined that language changes were needed to the EAGLE Section L and M solicitation narratives. The attached document shows the areas where changes were made (highlighted in yellow). If you would like to provide comments or have questions regarding these changes, please submit your concerns/questions to the EAGLE mailbox for response no later than 7 January 2015. A copy of this notice will be placed on the EAGLE Website in the very near future. Please note that these changes will appear in all solicitations issued after today's date.

Thanks,

LIZ FURLONG
Contract Specialist
Army Contracting Command - Rock Island
Email: Elizabeth.R.Furlong2.civ@mail.mil
Phone: (309) 782-1819

L.1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

L.1.1 These instructions are a guide for preparing a proposal. These instructions describe the type and extent of information required, and emphasizes the significant areas to be addressed in the proposal. Review the Performance Work Statement (PWS) contained in this Request for Proposal (RFP) for further insight into the areas that must be addressed within the proposal. Include detailed information sufficient to enable the Government evaluators to conduct a meaningful review and make a determination relative to the Offeror's understanding of the requirements in each of the evaluated areas. It is the Government's intent to award one combination **Firm Fixed Price (Transition-In CLIN only)/Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF)** Requirements contract with some non-fee bearing cost elements (e.g., Other Direct Costs) which are ancillary to the services provided.

L.1.2 In accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition (Jan 2004), the Government intends to award a contract without discussions. Offerors are cautioned to examine this RFP in its entirety and to ensure that proposals contain all necessary information, provide all required documentation, and are complete in all respects. The Government is not obligated to make another request for the required information nor does the Government assume the duty to search for data to cure problems it finds in proposals. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions in the evaluation process and to permit Offerors to revise proposals, if deemed necessary by the Contracting Officer. During the evaluation process, the Government may request clarifications as needed. Clarifications do not constitute discussions and an Offeror is not allowed to change its proposal in response to a request for clarification. In accordance with FAR 15.306(c)(2), the Contracting Officer may make a competitive range determination for purposes of efficiency, consisting of only those proposals that have a reasonable chance of award without a major rewrite. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be notified in writing.

L.1.3 The proposal shall be valid for 180 days from the required submission date.

L.1.4 Offers, modifications, revisions, or withdrawals of Offers received after the date established in this RFP for receipt of proposals will be handled in accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1.

L.1.5 An Offeror is defined as the prime BOA Holder submitting a proposal under this RFP.

L.1.6 For the purposes of this Task Order RFP, a teammate is defined as a Joint Venture partner and/or subcontractor(s) that are included in the Offeror's BOA Attachment 0002 - Team Arrangement at the closing date of the Task Order RFP.

L.1.7 Updates related to this Task Order RFP, to include the RFP, amendments, notices, and other information, will be made available on the EAGLE website at: http://www.acc.army.mil/contractingcenters/acc_ri/eagle/index.html. Offerors are advised to continuously monitor the EAGLE website for new information. Offerors are deemed to have knowledge of all documents that are posted to the EAGLE website.

L.2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION:

L.2.1 The proposal shall be prepared in a clear and legible manner. In addition, the Offeror shall write the proposal in English and the proposal must be specific and complete as described in these instructions. Offerors shall not specifically prepare samples or descriptive literature for submission with

the proposal. Adherence to the prescribed format is required. Failure to provide proposals in compliance with the instructions specified in this RFP shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award. An authorized official of the firm shall sign the Standard Form (SF) 33, all signed amendment coversheets, SF30, and all certifications requiring original signature. Electronic signatures are acceptable.

L.2.2 All information pertaining to a particular volume shall be confined to that volume. For example, no Cost/Price information shall be included in any volume other than the Cost/Price Proposal volume. The Government is not required to and will not search other volumes for a missing file.

L.2.3 No classified material shall appear anywhere within the proposal.

L.2.4 Offeror must be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) and have a Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) and Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code.

L.2.5 Digital MS Word files and MS Excel files shall be compatible with Microsoft (MS) Office 2007.

L.2.5(a) Please Note: Do not lock or password protect any file (e.g. *.doc, *.pps, *.xls, *.txt, *.msg).

L.2.6 Adobe PDF (Portable Document Format) Files. Scanned documents must be legible and shall have the ability to be viewed in Adobe Acrobat.

L.2.7 Compressed files (e.g. *.zip) will be accepted only through Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI). Compressed files (e.g. *.zip) will not be accepted via e-mail.

L.2.7(a) Executable files (e.g. *.bat, *.exe, *.jar, *.vb, *.wsf) will NOT be accepted in ASFI or via e-mail.

L.2.8 For the purposes of proposal preparation and evaluation only, the Offeror shall use **XX XXX 20XX** as the Notice to Proceed (NTP) date. Proposal information shall reflect that NTP date.

L.3 PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS:

L.3.1 Offeror shall submit its proposal through ASFI Bid Response System (BRS). The requirements and procedures for offer submission are found in the ASFI BRS Vendor Guide on the EAGLE website: http://www.acc.army.mil/contractingcenters/acc_ri/eagle/index.html.

L.3.2 The proposal submittal method used for this solicitation is the File Upload Process.

L.3.3 Up to ten files can be uploaded at one time. The combined size of the ten files cannot exceed 20 megabytes (MB). If needed, the Offeror can break attachments into smaller files or use the upload utility multiple times if files exceed the 20MB size limit.

L.3.4 Digital file names shall use the required naming convention for each specific proposal document identified below. Filenames must be 40 characters or less and must not contain single quotes, spaces and pound or percent signs. If an Offeror's file name is too long (more than 40 characters), they are permitted to abbreviate the Name of the Company field within the file name to facilitate proposal upload into ASFI BRS.

L.3.5 An Offeror submitting its proposal, as well as its teammates or subcontractors submitting cost/price information independently to the Government, should note for the Offeror's records the price quote number when submission is complete.

L.3.6 Once the Offeror's proposal is submitted, it cannot be systematically canceled or edited by the Offeror or the contracting office. To submit a revised proposal, the Offeror must do the following:

L.3.6(a) Submit the revised proposal in its entirety (in accordance with Section L) via ASFI BRS following the File Upload Process.

L.3.6(b) Send an e-mail to the EAGLE Mailbox at usarmy.RIA.acc.mbx.eagle@mail.mil clearly identifying the solicitation number and stating that a revised proposal was submitted and the previous submission is no longer valid. Please note the price quote number of the previous submission and new submission in this e-mail.

L.3.7 Do not assume submission will be instantaneous. File size and number of files to be uploaded will be factors to consider. Offerors should allow adequate time for submission completion.

L.3.8 To avoid rejection of an offer, the Offeror must make every effort to ensure its electronic submission is virus-free. Proposals, or portions thereof, submitted with the presence of a virus or which are otherwise unreadable will be treated as unreadable pursuant to FAR 15.207(c).

L.3.9 Instructions for Subcontractor Cost proposal submission can be found in **L.5.4.2.7.2.**

L.4 PROPOSAL STRUCTURE:

L.4.1 The Offeror shall submit a proposal in accordance with the guidelines below.

L.4.1.1 For all MS Word or MS Excel documents, each page shall include the complete Offeror's name, volume number, file name, date, and solicitation number in a header and/or footer.

L.4.1.2 Each Offeror shall submit one proposal that addresses all of the requirements of this RFP. To be considered for this requirement, the Offeror must submit a complete response to this RFP using the instructions provided in Section L. <u>If the Offeror's proposal fails to meet the terms and conditions of the RFP or takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of the RFP, it shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

L.4.1.3 The Offeror shall provide sufficient detail to substantiate the validity of all stated assertions. Proposals must not merely repeat the RFP requirements, but rather must provide convincing documentary evidence of how contract requirements will be met. Clarity and completeness are essential. Data not submitted with the proposal, but submitted previously, or presumed to be known (i.e., previous projects performed for the United States Government (USG)) will not be considered as part of the proposal, except for Past Performance (see paragraph **L.5.3.1**).

L.5 INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED:

L.5.1 General Documents**:** The Offeror shall include the following:

L.5.1.1 One executed signed copy of the RFP coversheet titled “Solicitation, Offer and Award” (SF33).

L.5.1.1(a) Naming Convention: Offeror’s_Name_Vol_1_SF33

L.5.1.1(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.1(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.1(d) Failure to provide the signed SF 33 and in compliance with **L.5.1.1(a) through L.5.1.1(c)** shall render the Offeror’s proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.1.2 EITHER all signed amendment coversheets titled “Amendment of Solicitation/ Modification of Contract “ (SF30) or one executed signed copy of the RFP coversheet with block fourteen (14) completed.

L.5.1.2(a) Naming Convention: Offeror’s_Name_Vol_1_SF30(Amends)

L.5.1.2(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.2(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.3 Section I clauses that require contractor completion.

L.5.1.3(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_IClauses

L.5.1.3(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.3(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.4 Section K clauses that require contractor certification.

L.5.1.4(a) Naming Convention: Offeror’s_Name_Vol_1_KClauses

L.5.1.4(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.4(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.5 Offeror Points Of Contact (POC): The Government does not intend to conduct discussions prior to awarding this requirement. However, any exchanges to include clarifications between the USG and the contractor will be conducted through the use of e-mail. Therefore, the Offeror is required to provide at least two (2) company individuals whose responsibilities will include reading and responding to Evaluation Notices (ENs) through e-mail. For example, the Offeror's Contract Manager, as an agent of the company might be the main agent responsible, but a second agent should be available in case of the main agent's unavailability. The agents' names, company titles, telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, and e-mail addresses should be provided. A Title Page is allowable to provide for the restriction or disclosure and use of data as specified in FAR Clause 52.215-1.

L.5.1.5(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_POCs

L.5.1.5(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.5(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.6 SECRET Facility Clearance: In order for an Offeror/teammate/ subcontractor/managing partner to request and sponsor an individual employee's SECRET Security Clearance to perform the functions identified in the **PWS Paragraph 1.3.12**, the Offeror/teammate/ subcontractor/managing partner shall possess a SECRET Facility Clearance prior to this RFP closing date. Therefore, the Offeror shall complete and submit Attachment 0015 - SECRET Facility Clearance. Attachment 0015 shall include a list of proposed teammates/ subcontractors/managing partner that shall require a SECRET Facility Clearance in accordance with PWS Paragraph 1.3.12. The Offeror shall also include the name of its company or managing partner of a partnership, joint venture, or limited liability company that possesses the SECRET Facility Clearance if the Offeror is a newly formed partnership, joint venture, or limited liability company. The Contracting Officer will verify the Offeror and the teammates/ subcontractors/ managing partner identified on Attachment 0015 possess a SECRET Facility Clearance via the Defense Security Services (DSS) Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD).

The CAGE code listed on Attachment 0015 shall be the CAGE code of the entity that possesses the Secret Facility Clearance. It is acceptable for the CAGE codes listed on Attachment 0010 and Attachment 0015 to differ, however both of the CAGE codes must be from the same legal entity. The Offeror shall note on its Attachment 0015 if it's CAGE code or its teammate's/ subcontractor's/ managing partner's CAGE code on Attachment 0010 differs from the CAGE code that holds the SECRET Facility Clearance. In this case, the Offeror shall identify its CAGE code or its teammate's/ subcontractor's/ managing partner's CAGE code that holds clearance. The Offeror shall also provide an explanation of the relationship between the CAGE code on Attachment 0010 and CAGE code identified on Attachment 0015. If the CAGE code on the Attachment 0015 and Attachment 0010 are different, and represent separate legal entities, the offeror's proposal will be found noncompliant. If the CAGE code for the Offeror, managing partner, teammate or subcontractor, stated on the Attachment 0015 does not possess a Secret Facility Clearance, the offeror will be found noncompliant. The offeror's proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

NOTE: If an Offeror/teammate/subcontractor/managing partner possesses an INTERIM SECRET Facility Clearance prior to the RFP Closing date, and that can be validated by the Defense Security Service (DSS), the INTERIM SECRET Facility Clearance is sufficient to meet the SECRET Facility Clearance requirement for proposal submission.

L.5.1.6(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_Att0015

L.5.1.6(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.6(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.6(d) <u>Failure to provide a completed SECRET Facility Clearance - Attachment 0015 and in compliance with **L.5.1.6(a) through L.5.1.6(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

L.5.1.7 Business Systems Information:

L.5.1.7.1 The Contracting Officer will review the Offeror's accounting system status for determining contractor responsibility in accordance with FAR 16.301-3; a cost-reimbursement type contract may be used only when the contractor's accounting system is adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract. An adequate system is a system that can separately accumulate costs under a Government contract and has the ability to generate the specific cost information required under the anticipated contract. An SF 1408 has been attached to this RFP (Attachment 0006) which contains the specific procedures that are considered part of an adequate system. Therefore, in order for an Offeror to receive an award under this RFP, the successful Offeror will be required to demonstrate that the design of its accounting system can accomplish the specific SF 1408 procedures; as a result, the Offeror is required to provide in its proposal:

- Official documentation, from either a successful Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) audit of the Offeror's accounting system; or

- A letter from the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) documenting its approval/adequacy of the Offeror's accounting system; or

- Rationale for why documentation cannot be presented at proposal submission and a proposed date for which required documentation will be available. Absent an adequate accounting system, an apparent awardee cannot be determined responsible under FAR 9.104-5 and will be ineligible for award. Per FAR 9.104-5(b), an apparent awardee who does not furnish the certification or such information as may be requested by the Contracting Officer shall be given an opportunity to remedy the deficiency. Therefore, if an Offeror is unable to provide the certification with its proposal as required, it will be given another opportunity to present the required certification prior to award in the event it is determined to be the apparent awardee.

L.5.1.7.1(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_AcctSys

L.5.1.7.1(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.7.1(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.7.2 The Offeror shall provide its current Government approval status of the following business systems: billing (internal controls), estimating, budget and financial control, purchasing, quality assurance, and property control systems. The Offeror shall provide official Government approval documentation for any systems that have Government approval. The approval status and approval documentation will not be evaluated and is for Government reference only. If approval of any of these business systems is not available, provide a statement of such and a brief rationale as to why these systems have not been approved.

L.5.1.7.2(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_BusSys

L.5.1.7.2(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.7.2(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.8 Teaming Matrix (Attachment 0010): The Offeror shall provide the full company name, CAGE code, role of participant, functional area(s) to be performed, total estimated dollar value for the total period of performance of 5 years, percent of participation, basis of selection (competitive/non-competitive) and the cost proposal submittal method. The Offeror shall populate every column using the instructed fill-ins on the Attachment 0010 for itself, proposed teammates and proposed subcontractors. Note: The total estimated dollar value provided on Attachment 0010 should be equal to the 'Subtotal – Proposed Contract Value' found on Attachment 0005 - Cost/Price Matrix.

- Teammate/Subcontractor Utilization: Offerors proposing the use of Teammate(s)/Subcontractor(s) shall do so in accordance with Section H, paragraphs 1-H (d and e) of this RFP. The Government will verify that the Offeror's proposal includes approved teammates by comparing the Offeror's Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix to the Offeror's BOA Attachment 0002 - Team Arrangement as of the closing date of the RFP.

L.5.1.8(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_Att0010

L.5.1.8(b) File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word

L.5.1.8(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.1.8(d) Failure to provide a fully completed Teaming Matrix - Attachment 0010 containing all of the required information (including populating every column), or failure to provide a Teaming Matrix - Attachment 0010 in compliance with **L.5.1.8(a) through L.5.1.8(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.1.9 **Offerors shall submit its Small Business Administration 8(a) Certification Letter as proof of being an 8(a) contractor.**

L.5.1.9(a) **Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_1_8(a)cert.**

L.5.1.9(b) **File Format: Adobe PDF or MS Word**

L.5.1.9(c) **Page Limit: none**

L.5.1.9(d) **Failure to provide the Small Business Administration 8(a) Certification Letter and in compliance with L.5.1.9(a) through L.5.1.9(c) shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.**

L.5.2 Technical Factor:

L.5.2.1 The Offeror shall demonstrate mission capability by detailing its proposed technical approach to meet the requirements specified in the PWS and this RFP by providing the following:

L.5.2.1(a) Staffing and Management Plan (SMP)

L.5.2.1(b) Mission Essential Contractor Services (MECS)

L.5.2.1(c) Organizational Diagram (OD)

L.5.2.1.1 Staffing and Management Plan (SMP):

L.5.2.1.1(a) The Offeror's SMP proposal shall adhere to the following:

L.5.2.1.1(a)(1) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_2_SMP

L.5.2.1.1(a)(2) File Format: Text Searchable Adobe PDF

L.5.2.1.1(a)(3) Page Limit: **X** Pages

L.5.2.1.1(a)(3)(i) Page limit excludes cover page, table of contents, and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms

L.5.2.1.1(a)(3)(ii) Pages larger than 8.5 inches x 11 inches will be counted as two pages

L.5.2.1.1(a)(3)(iii) The font size shall be no less than 10 point font and no more than 14 point font for all documents; however, for charts and diagrams, font size shall be no less than 8 point font and no more than 14 point font.

L.5.2.1.1(a)(4) Failure to provide the Staffing and Management Plan and in compliance with **L.5.2.1.1(a)(1) through L.5.2.1.1(a)(3)(iii)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.2.1.1(b) The Offeror's Staffing and Management Plan must detail an approach to deliver services required in the RFP and PWS, must be supported by the Offeror's Attachment 0002 Staffing/Labor Mix, and at a minimum, must address the following elements:

L.5.2.1.1(b)(1) Staffing and organization of the required effort by providing a realistic approach to creating its management structure from general staff oversight by first line supervisors through its company headquarters management. This approach must include adequate details of chain of command structure and methodology, internal controls for problem resolution.

L.5.2.1.1(b)(2) Staffing rationale and assumptions - Offeror's overarching methodology for determining its proposed skill set(s) / skill level(s) by Functional Area and assumptions supporting staffing decisions or explanations needed to clarify staffing decisions made in order to ensure proper execution of the effort.

L.5.2.1.1(b)(3) Flexible Staffing Approach - The Offeror's ability to effectively and efficiently: cross-utilize , temporarily reallocate, and rapidly increase and decrease its workforce. The Offeror must adequately identify how this approach will be executed during surges in effort and during periods of protracted reductions in workload without sacrificing quality of services provided. Additionally, the Offeror must adequately demonstrate its ability to effectively and efficiently cross utilize personnel when possible to better support short term requirement changes; provide better and timelier support; and reduce costs through more efficient staffing. Cross utilization must address an approach to ensuring safety, training, and certification requirements are met and must not impact or appear to impact quality of the effort.

L.5.2.1.1(b)(4) Transition-in Approach - Realistic and feasible time-phased approach to transitioning-in all of the PWS requirements with key milestones from Notice to Proceed (NTP) to successfully reaching a fully operational capability (FOC) which demonstrates, at a minimum (within the time indicated at M.1.1):

L.5.2.1.1(b)(4)(i) Approach to ensure open communication with incumbent contractor and the Government to include periodic meetings documenting progress.

L.5.2.1.1(b)(4)(ii) Approach to ensure compliance with Executive Order 13495 - Hiring of qualified incumbent workforce.

L.5.2.1.1(b)(4)(iii) Approach to ensure proper, timely requisition / issuance of (as required): Contractor Common Access Cards (CAC) / access badges and security clearances.

L.5.2.1.1(b)(4)(iv) Approach to assuming accountability of Government Furnished Property (GFP) 0/ Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) (including joint inventory with incumbent contractor) with all actions up to and including reconciliation completed prior to the end of transition-in.

L.5.2.1.1(c) Staffing/Labor Mix (Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix): The Offerors must provide its proposed staffing/labor mix in relation to the PWS requirements and the provided workload data (see applicable Technical Exhibits) for both the base period and option periods (fully operational capable 12-month periods (365 day periods)). The Offeror's proposed approach must present a staffing approach which demonstrates an understanding of this effort and provides its expected skill level, to include level of responsibility, to properly perform all of the PWS requirements.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(1) Offeror’s proposal shall adhere to the following:

L.5.2.1.1(c)(2) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_2_Att0002

L.5.2.1.1(c)(3) File Format: MS Excel

L.5.2.1.1(c)(3)(i) Not to exceed 175 rows and 78 columns of information per worksheet.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(3)(ii) The Offeror shall not add or remove any tabs (other than the example tab) to the Attachment 0002 Staffing/Labor Mix.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(4) Failure to provide the Staffing/Labor Mix Attachment 0002 in the Government provided format as of the closing date of the RFP, and in compliance with **L.5.2.1.1(c)(2) through L.5.2.1.1(c)(3)(ii)**, or to provide the following required information: proposed labor category descriptions; proper identification of SCA/CBA/Exempt; FLC1/FLC2; applicable SCA code(s); proposed hours per FTE including total FLC1 hours by functional area; proper identification of Functional Area; and Shop or PWS Requirement shall render the Offeror’s proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(5) Definitions relating to Staffing/Labor Mix:

L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(i) Full Time Equivalents (FTEs): Compensable hours are determined by the Offeror and are the work hours available to perform a function in one year less holiday and vacation hours. An employee who works all available compensable hours is one Full Time Equivalent. If an employee works less than the total compensable hours for one year, that is considered a fractional FTE. Fractional FTEs are determined by dividing the hours scheduled for that employee by the total available compensable hours.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) Functional Labor Category 1 (FLC1) FTEs: Contract or task order level employees that are specifically identified to directly accomplish the tasks/functions of the workload provided in **Exhibit X TE 5-M-S-T-001** (e.g. mechanic / shop supply clerk in support of the maintenance effort). Note: Leads may be proposed as solely FLC1, if applicable. Labor classification (i.e. SCA, CBA, Exempt) in accordance with the SCA and CBA directives is at the sole discretion of the Offeror.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(iii) Functional Labor Category 2 (FLC2) FTEs: Contract or task order level employees required for the completion of RFP requirements, but do not directly perform the tasks / functions of the workload provided in **Exhibit X TE 5-M-S-T-001**. FLC2 employees may be required by the RFP, regulation, or the Offeror's business practices, but are not directly supporting the workload (e.g. project manager, all managers, FLC2 portion of proposed supervisors, administrative assistant). Labor classification (i.e. SCA, CBA, Exempt) in accordance with the SCA and CBA directives is at the sole discretion of the Offeror. Additionally, all managers must be proposed as solely FLC2; supervisors may be split FLC1 and FLC2 with the FLC2 portion proposed commensurate with the level of supervisory duties assigned.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6) The following instructions pertain to the Staffing/Labor Mix - Attachment 0002:

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(i) The Offeror must identify all of its proposed FLCs along with proposed staffing levels in terms of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) on the Staffing/Labor Mix - Attachment 0002 (to include identifying key and specified non-key positions). Staffing must be based on all of the PWS requirements and the workload data (see applicable Technical Exhibits) for the identified base period and all option periods (four identical fully operational capable 12-month periods (365 day periods)). The Offeror's Attachment 0002 must identify Key and Specified Non-Key positions using "(Key)" and "(Non-Key)" following the Offeror's position description or description; see example tab in Exhibit X. The purpose of Staffing/Labor Mix - Attachment 0002 is to provide the Government with a complete picture of each Offeror's staffing and total proposed labor hours for each work center/shop for the base period and each option period.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(ii) The FTEs proposed for FLC1, when multiplied with the associated labor hours per year proposed, for the option periods ("FTE Count Option Periods 1-4" tab) shall be equal to or greater than the total minimum hours of **XX** for Maintenance, **XX** for Supply, and **XX** for Transportation as provided in the attached workload data, **Exhibit X TE 5-001 M-S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours.**

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(iii) The FTEs proposed for FLC2 shall not be included in the total minimum hours for Maintenance, Supply, and Transportation provided in the attached workload data, **Exhibit X TE 5-001 M-S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours** (i.e. FLC2 portion of proposed supervisors, if applicable)**.**

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(iv) The Government intends to use the MS Excel program to analyze the data provided; therefore, the Offeror is required to supply this data to the Government in the MS Excel file format (.xls or .xlsx) provided with this RFP.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(v) FTE numbers are to be consistent throughout the base period and all option periods. Do not assume any change in requirements. Additionally, the Offeror shall not add or delete any tabs to the Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix (other than the example tab). Workload data provided is for a 12-month period (365 day period). Fully Operational Capability staffing must support the provided workload data and all PWS requirements and must be demonstrated in the Offeror's Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix. The proposed labor hours must correlate to the period being staffed (i.e., all tabs shall have the same staffing with the appropriate annual hours (by employee type) for the base period (less transition-in) and option periods). <u>Adding or deleting tabs to Attachment 0002 (other than the example tab) shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vi) The Offeror must provide its proposed labor hours per year by employee type in the Hours Per Year column for Exempt, CBA1, CBA2 and SCA in the Offeror's Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vii) The Offeror must insert FLC1 or FLC2 for all proposed positions. Please note: The hours associated with FLC2 employees (including supervisors proposed solely as FLC1), in whole or part, will not count toward the total minimum hours specified, and employees incorrectly identified as FLC1 will not count toward the total minimum hours specified in **L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(ii).**

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(viii) Additionally, the Offeror must insert the SCA, Exempt, or CBA labor code (e.g. CBA1, CBA2) in the CBA/SCA/Exempt column for all proposed labor categories. The following is provided for example purposes only:

FLC1 = Direct Support of **TE 5-001-M-S-T**
SCA 01011 = SCA Labor Code
Accounting Clerk I = SCA Labor Category Description

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(ix) The Offeror must insert the proposed labor category description and it must match the labor category description found in either the CBA or SCA or be provided by the Offeror (if Exempt (e.g., manager, supervisor)). If SCA is identified, the Offeror must also provide the corresponding SCA labor code. In the event the labor code and labor category description do not match, the SCA labor code will take precedence over the labor category description. Additionally, the Offeror may insert the "Offeror Position Title" in order to better identify the functional nature of the position.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(x) The Offeror must insert the applicable functional area (i.e. PMO, Maintenance, Supply, or Transportation) in the Column(s) indicated as "Fill in Functional Area." This column is intended to match or align with the Functional Areas listed in the attached Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours (**Exhibit X**). The Offeror may add or delete columns as needed within the limitations provided in accordance with **L.5.2.1.1(c)(3)(i)**.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xi) The Offeror must insert the corresponding shop or PWS requirement in the cells labeled "Shop or PWS Requirement." The shop or PWS requirement provided must correspond to the

workload data and/or PWS requirements provided in the RFP; the Offeror may add/delete columns as needed within the limitations provided in accordance with **L.5.2.1.1(c)(3)(i)**.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii) The Offeror must insert number of FTEs (or less than full time equivalents expressed as FTEs) within the applicable FTE Count column. The Offeror's staffing must be rounded to the nearest hundredth decimal (i.e. two decimal places to the right of the whole number). Formatting the cells to display only two decimal places is not considered rounding; the values entered in each cell should only contain two decimal places. FTEs entered by the Offeror with greater than two decimal places will be rounded by the Government to the nearest hundredth decimal (two decimal places to the right of the whole number) using the Microsoft Excel formula "=ROUND(number,num_digits)" in accordance with generally accepted rounding methods, i.e. numbers 5 through 9 are rounded up to the next whole number; numbers 1 through 4 are rounded down to the next whole number.

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xiii) The Offeror must clearly identify all FTEs that are cross utilized FTEs, or, in other words, when a portion of an FTE (e.g. supervisor) is applicable to an FLC1 labor category and a portion of the same FTE is also applicable to an FLC2 labor category. These employees must be listed on the Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix in all applicable locations (e.g. part time worker (.40 FLC1) and part time supervisor (.60 FLC2)) with the appropriate percentage of hours applicable to each labor category expressed as a decimal (not to exceed two decimal places to the right of the whole number). (See 'Example Tab' contained in Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix.)

L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xiv) The Offeror must complete the section of the Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix marked 'Base Period Total Proposed FLC1 Hours' and 'Option Period Total Proposed FLC1 Hours' by correctly calculating its total proposed FLC1 hours for Maintenance, Supply and Transportation. Calculations must correctly multiply total proposed FLC1 FTEs by the Offeror provided Hours per Year applicable to the specific employee type. Calculations must be equal to or greater than the minimum required hours as stated in **Exhibit X.**

L.5.2.1.2 Mission Essential Contractor Services (MECS):

L.5.2.1.2(a) The Offeror's MECS proposal shall adhere to the following:

L.5.2.1.2(a)(1) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_2_MECS

L.5.2.1.2(a)(2) File Format: Adobe PDF

L.5.2.1.2(a)(3) Page Limit: 2 pages

L.5.2.1.2(a)(3)(i) Page limit excludes cover page, table of contents, and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms

L.5.2.1.2(a)(3)(ii) Pages larger than 8.5 inches x 11 inches will be counted as two pages

L.5.2.1.2(a)(3)(iii) The font size shall be no less than 10 point font and no more than 14 point font for all documents; however for charts and diagrams, font size shall be no less than 8 point font and no more than 14 point font.

L.5.2.1.2(a)(4) Failure to provide the Mission Essential Contractor Services and in compliance with **L.5.2.1.2(a)(1) through L.5.2.1.2(a)(3)(iii)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.2.1.2(b) Mission Essential Contractor Services (MECS) -The Offeror's MECS Plan shall demonstrate a realistic approach as to how it will continue to perform the essential contractor services listed in Attachment 0013 - Mission Essential Contractor Services by addressing each part of the DFARS 252.237-7024 (b)(2)(i through v) individually.

L.5.2.1.3 Organizational Diagram (OD):

L.5.2.1.3(a) The Offeror's Organizational Diagram proposal shall adhere to the following:

L.5.2.1.3(a)(1) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_2_OD

L.5.2.1.3(a)(2) File Format: Adobe PDF

L.5.2.1.3(a)(3) Page Limit: 4 pages

L.5.2.1.3(a)(3)(i) Page limit excludes cover page, table of contents, and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms

L.5.2.1.3(a)(3)(ii) Pages larger than 8.5 inches x 11 inches will be counted as two pages

L.5.2.1.3(a)(3)(iii) The font size shall be no less than 10 point font and no more than 14 point font for all documents; however for charts and diagrams, font size shall be no less than 8 point font and no more than 14 point font.

L.5.2.1.3(a)(4) Failure to provide the Organizational Diagram and in compliance with **L.5.2.1.3(a)(1) through L.5.2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.2.1.3(b) The Offeror's Organizational Diagram must demonstrate a comprehensive, realistic organizational overview based on the following:

L.5.2.1.3(b)(1) Identification of the tasks the proposed teammate(s) (if applicable) and/or proposed major subcontractor(s) (if applicable) will be performing.

L.5.2.1.3(b)(2) Identification of the command and control relationship among the prime contractor, proposed teammate(s) (if applicable) and proposed major subcontractor(s) (if applicable) to include identification of leadership positions (e.g., site leads, foremen, directors, deputies, managers, supervisors, and team leads) and who is responsible for performing successful oversight of each of the primary task areas identified in Section C-5 of the PWS. FTE Counts are not required on the Organizational Diagram. Proposed FTEs will only be evaluated on the Attachment 0002.

L.5.2.1.3(b)(3) Identification of an independent quality control section (i.e. local onsite quality control organization reporting directly to the corporate quality office).

L.5.3 Past Performance Factor:

L.5.3.1 The Government will consider the recent and relevant past performance references that were provided with the Offeror's BOA proposal, task order proposals to date, and the BOA annual review, as well as references obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. Offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation. The Government will not evaluate any new past performance references provided by the Offeror in its proposal with the exception of the information requested in **L.5.3.5.1 through L.5.3.5.4** below.

L.5.3.1.1 A major subcontractor is defined as a proposed subcontractor expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price (for the base period and all option periods). For purposes of this Task Order RFP, major subcontractors are not considered those teammates identified in the Offeror's BOA Attachment 0002 - Team Arrangement.

L.5.3.1.2 The Offeror shall provide a consent letter for each major subcontractor and teammate expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price using the Letter of Consent template provided in Attachment 0004. This letter allows the release of the major subcontractors' and teammates' present and past performance information to the Offeror. Failure to include written consent from each major subcontractor and teammate will result in the Government's inability to contact the Offeror to communicate the findings from its major subcontractor(s) and teammate(s) references. A Letter of Consent from the BOA Step Two process is not relevant to this Task Order RFP. A new Letter of Consent is required and shall adhere to the following:

L.5.3.1.2(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_3_Att0004

L.5.3.1.2(b) File Format: MS Word or Adobe PDF

L.5.3.1.2(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.3.1.2(d) <u>Failure to provide a completed Letter of Consent for each major subcontractor and teammate expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price and in compliance with **L.5.3.1.2(a) through L.5.3.1.2(c)** will render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

L.5.3.2 The Government is under no obligation to search for additional information in order to identify contracts/performance references.

L.5.3.3 Any additional narratives are not required in this factor and will not be evaluated if provided.

L.5.3.4 Recency and relevancy definitions can be found in **M.5.2.7 and M.5.2.8**, respectively

L.5.3.5 The Offeror shall complete Attachment 0003 - Performance Questionnaire. A separate questionnaire shall be provided for the Offeror, each proposed teammate expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price, and/or each proposed major subcontractor as identified on Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix.

L.5.3.5(a) If the Offeror, its proposed teammates expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price, and/or its major subcontractors have experienced any performance problems as described in **L.5.3.5.1 through L.5.3.5.4**, it shall mark "Yes" for the applicable paragraph(s) on Attachment 0003 - Performance Questionnaire.

L.5.3.5(b) If the Offeror, its proposed teammates expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price, and/or its major subcontractors have not experienced any performance problems as described in **L.5.3.5.1 through L.5.3.5.4**, it still shall mark "No" for the applicable paragraph(s) on Attachment 0003 - Performance Questionnaire.

L.5.3.5(c) The Offeror's proposal shall adhere to the following:

L.5.3.5(c)(1) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_3_Att0003

L.5.3.5(c)(2) File Format: MS Word or Adobe PDF

L.5.3.5(c)(3) Page Limit: none

L.5.3.5(c)(4) <u>Failure to provide a completed Performance Questionnaire - Attachment 0003 in compliance with L.5.3.5(c)(1) through L.5.3.5(c)(3) shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

L.5.3.5.1 The Offeror shall identify all recent and relevant contracts where it or its proposed teammates expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price experienced any performance problems that occurred between the date of the Offeror's original BOA RFP Step 2 proposal and the closing date of this RFP. For each contract identified, the Offeror shall provide copies of all Level III Corrective Action Reports (CARs), cure notices or show cause letters received regardless of whether or not the contract was provided as a contract reference in the Offeror's BOA proposal, the BOA annual review process, data calls or task order proposals to date. In addition, it shall include the contract number, a brief description of the issue, the corrective actions taken to avoid recurrence of the problem, the extent to which the corrective action has been successful, a mitigation plan of how to prevent similar future issues, and Customer points of contact who can confirm the success of the corrective measures. <u>Offerors are hereby put on notice that this is the single opportunity to adequately address any adverse past performance submitted by the Offeror in response to this RFP. The Government will not give the Offeror an opportunity to address adverse past performance information contained in this questionnaire during evaluations.</u>

L.5.3.5.2 In the event that the Offeror wishes to utilize a major subcontractor(s), the Offeror shall identify all recent and relevant contracts where its proposed major subcontractor(s) experienced any performance problems that occurred within three years prior to the closing date of this RFP. For each contract identified, the Offeror shall provide copies of all Level III CARs, cure notices or show cause letters received regardless of whether or not the contract was provided as a contract reference with the Offeror's BOA proposal, the BOA annual review process, data calls or task order proposals to date. In addition, it shall include the contract number, a brief description of the issue, the corrective actions taken to avoid recurrence of the problem, the extent to which the corrective action has been successful, a mitigation plan of how to prevent similar future issues, and Customer points of contact who can confirm the success of the corrective measures. <u>Offerors are hereby put on notice that this is the single opportunity to adequately address any adverse past performance submitted by the Offeror in response</u>

to this RFP. The Government will not give the Offeror an opportunity to address adverse past performance information contained in this questionnaire during evaluations.

L.5.3.5.3 The Offeror shall disclose the contract number of all recent and relevant contracts that were terminated for default or terminated for cause, in whole or in part, from the date of the Offeror's original BOA proposal to the closing date of this RFP, for itself and its proposed teammates expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price. The Offeror shall provide the contract number, type of termination, reason for the termination, and a Customer point of contact who can verify the information provided. Offerors are hereby put on notice that this is the single opportunity to adequately address any adverse past performance submitted by the Offeror in response to this RFP. The Government will not give the Offeror an opportunity to address adverse past performance information contained in this questionnaire during evaluations.

L.5.3.5.4 The Offeror shall disclose all recent and relevant contracts that were terminated for default or terminated for cause, in whole or in part, within three years prior to the closing date of this RFP, for its proposed major subcontractors. The Offeror shall provide the contract number, type of termination, reason for the termination, and a Customer point of contact who can verify the information provided. Offerors are hereby put on notice that this is the single opportunity to adequately address any adverse past performance submitted by the Offeror in response to this RFP. The Government will not give the Offeror an opportunity to address adverse past performance information contained in this questionnaire during evaluations.

L.5.4 Cost/Price Factor

L.5.4.1 Cost/Price General Instructions.

L.5.4.1.1 MS Excel documents provided in response to the Cost/Price Factor may contain macros. A macro is a series of commands and instructions that are grouped together as a signal command to accomplish a task automatically.

L.5.4.1.1(a) If the Offeror's proposal contains macros, the Offeror shall submit a narrative that explains instructions for operating the macro. If a teammate/subcontractor is submitting an independent cost proposal that contains macros, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also submit a narrative that explains instructions for operating the macro.

L.5.4.1.1(b) The Offeror's proposal and its teammate/subcontractor proposal(s) who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) shall adhere to the following:

L.5.4.1.1(b)(1) Naming Convention of Offeror: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_ MacroInst; or, Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors: Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_MacroInst

L.5.4.1.1(b)(2) File Format: MS Word

L.5.4.1.1(b)(3) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.1.1(b)(4) Failure of the Offeror or its proposed teammates/subcontractors who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) to provide the Macro Instructions and in compliance with **L.5.4.1.1(b)(1) through L.5.4.1.1.(b)(3)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-

compliant. The Offeror's proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.1.2 All costs and expenditure profiles shall be stated in U.S. dollars.

L.5.4.1.3 The costs/price proposed shall be based on the workload data and PWS requirements. Offerors are advised that the workload contained in the attachments provided with the solicitation is based on a best estimate of the Government's current requirements and, therefore, should be viewed as sample workload. Because the sample workload provided is an estimate and is used for evaluation purposes only, there may be fluctuations in the Government's requirements during the evaluation period which may lead to increases or decreases in the actual workload after award. However, Offerors are cautioned to base proposal submissions strictly on the workload contained in the attachments provided with the solicitation.

L.5.4.1.4 The cost/price proposed must be consistent with the Offeror's Technical Proposal. Consistency between the Offeror's Cost/Price and Technical Proposals reflects on the Offeror's ability to perform the effort required at the amount proposed. Any significant inconsistencies if unexplained, raises a fundamental question as to the Offeror's inherent understanding of the work required and its ability to perform the contract.

L.5.4.1.4.1 The Offeror's firm fixed-price transition-in proposal shall include all cost / price elements required for performance from notice to proceed until full operational capability is achieved. The Offeror's proposed cost/price must be commensurate with its proposed transition-in approach provided in its Technical Proposal. As this is a firm-fixed price portion of the overall effort, Offerors will not be able to adjust this price after award; therefore Offerors must perform this portion of the effort at the price proposed.

L.5.4.1.5 Areas of cost that may be considered (not a complete list nor are these elements mandated):

L.5.4.1.5.1 All required inventories, inspections, assessments.

L.5.4.1.5.2 All coordination, planning, travel, other meetings, events.

L.5.4.1.5.3 All human resources actions, planning, notifications, security clearance application/processing, employee identification requirements.

L.5.4.1.5.4 Any potential direct labor costs associated with performance prior to end of transition-in period.

L.5.4.1.5.5 Other key events, coordination, milestones, supplies, materials, processes, applications, services.

L.5.4.1.6 A proposal is presumed to represent the Offeror's best efforts in response to this RFP. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performance and the costs shall be explained in the proposal. For example, if a business policy decision was made to absorb a portion of the estimated costs, that approach shall be stated within the proposal (including any associated calculations). The burden of proof as to the cost credibility rests with the Offeror.

L.5.4.2 Cost/Price Proposal Specific Instructions.

L.5.4.2.1 The Offeror shall submit a table of contents outlining all of the documents (by document file name) comprising the Offeror's Cost/Price Volume. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent cost/price proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also submit a table of contents outlining all of the documents (by document file name) comprising the teammate's/subcontractor's Cost/Price Volume. Offerors (and teammate(s)/subcontractor(s)) shall adhere to the following table of contents format:

L.5.4.2.1(a) Naming Convention of Offeror: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_TOC; or, Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors: Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_TOC

L.5.4.2.1(b) File Format: MS Word or Adobe

L.5.4.2.1(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.1(d) Failure of the Offeror or its proposed teammates/subcontractors that will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) to provide the table of contents and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.1(a) through L.5.4.2.1(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The Offeror's proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.2.2 The Offeror shall provide an overall Cost/Price Matrix which summarizes the transition period, base period, all option periods, and overall proposed price for the contract. The Offeror shall complete the Cost/Price Matrix (Attachment 0005) for the base year and option years by populating the highlighted blue cells. All un-highlighted cells are formula driven. All highlighted cells need to be populated. For areas that the Offeror intends to propose no cost, Offerors shall populate those cells with a zero (0). Offerors shall adhere to the following:

L.5.4.2.2(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_Att0005

L.5.4.2.2(b) File Format: MS Excel

L.5.4.2.2(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.2(d) Failure to provide and to fully populate the highlighted blue cells within the Cost/Price Matrix - Attachment 0005 and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.2(a) through L.5.4.2.2(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.2.3 The Offeror shall provide all cost/pricing assumptions and associated rationale in a narrative format. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent cost proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide all of its cost/pricing assumptions and associated rationale in a narrative format. Offerors (and teammate(s)/subcontractor(s)) shall adhere to the following:

L.5.4.2.3(a) Naming Convention of Offeror: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_Assumptions; or, Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors: Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_Assumptions

L.5.4.2.3(b) File Format: MS Word or Adobe PDF

L.5.4.2.3(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.3(d) Failure of the Offeror or its proposed teammates/subcontractors who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) to provide the Assumptions and Rationale and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.3(a) through L.5.4.2.3(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.2.4 The Offeror shall provide the name and local DCAA office address in a narrative format.

L.5.4.2.4(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_DCAA

L.5.4.2.4(b) File Format: MS Word or Adobe PDF

L.5.4.2.4(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.5 The Offeror shall provide a consolidated table of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs)/Headcounts by primary task areas and labor category or classification for the prime and all subcontracted labor. The detailed staffing shall include both total hours and associated FTE in support of the direct labor being proposed. The Offeror shall provide references for the calculations of FTEs and associated pricing for those FTEs. This consolidation should support the information in Attachment 0002 of the Technical Proposal Volume. The Offeror shall provide this information for the base period and each option period for all cost type CLINS.

L.5.4.2.5(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_FTEtable

L.5.4.2.5(b) File Format: MS Excel, MS Word or Adobe PDF

L.5.4.2.5(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.5(d) Failure to provide the consolidated table of FTEs/Headcounts and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.5(a) through L.5.4.2.5(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.2.6 The CLINs for Other Direct Costs (ODCs) are Government provided surrogate numbers, which are inclusive for any Offeror's applicable indirect rate adders. ODCs are defined in Attachment 0001 PWS.

L.5.4.2.7 The Offeror and its proposed Teammates/Subcontractors (or affiliated divisions/subsidiaries, etc.) shall submit a Cost/Price Proposal in accordance with **L.5.4.2.7.2**. The information detailed in **L.5.4.2.7.2** is only required for the Offeror and its proposed Teammates/Subcontractors that were selected on a non-competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation). The Government will confirm a proposed Teammate/Subcontractor was selected on a competitive or non-competitive basis by referencing Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix.

L.5.4.2.7.1 If the Offeror selected a proposed teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) based on competition (i.e. two or more offers), proof of the following shall be submitted in order to adequately document the competition: the basis for the competitive selection and that the basis was in accordance with the Offeror's purchasing system; the contract type that was used; that the competition was specifically conducted to support this requirement; and, that the competition included an evaluation of cost/price data. If selection of other than low Offeror was made, the trade off decisions must be discussed. The Offeror shall include the letter request for proposal and all related attachments provided to the teammate/subcontractor, the proposal response from the teammate/subcontractor and the basis for selection, and the determination of price reasonableness (price analysis) and/or cost realism analysis. In addition, the Offeror shall submit a Cost/Price Proposal in accordance with **L.5.4.2.7.1(a) or L.5.4.2.7.1(b)**.

L.5.4.2.7.1(a) The Offeror and its proposed Teammates/Subcontractors, with proposal values exceeding $1,000,000 for the total five years of potential performance that were selected on a competitive basis (two or more offers) and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation), shall provide a detailed cost element proposal by CLIN submitted electronically in Microsoft Excel format, with working formulas/algorithms - prepared in accordance with FAR 15.408 - Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses Table 15-2, Instructions for Submitting Cost/Price Proposals When Certified Cost or Pricing Data Are Required. The Cost/Price Proposal shall be supported with verifiable facts, figures, and basis of estimates in accordance with instructions at FAR 15-2.
L.5.4.2.7.1(b) Proposed Teammates/Subcontractors that were selected on a competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) below $1,000,000 for the total five years of potential performance shall also provide a cost element proposal by CLIN submitted electronically in Microsoft Excel format, with working formulas/algorithms. At a minimum, they shall provide details of proposed direct labor rates, to include Service Contract Act (SCA) or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) labor rates, and the individual cost elements (fringe, overhead, indirect costs, profit/fee, etc.) the subcontractor used to calculate its total proposed amount.

L.5.4.2.7.1(c) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Sub/Team_Name_Vol_4_ CompSelect

L.5.4.2.7.1(d) File Format: MS Excel, MS Word, Adobe PDF

L.5.4.2.7.1(e) Page Limit: None

L.5.4.2.7.1(f) <u>Failure of the Offeror or its proposed teammates/subcontractors that were selected on a competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) to provide its Cost/Price Proposal and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.7.1(c) through L.5.4.2.7.1(e)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>
L.5.4.2.7.2 The Offeror and its proposed Teammates/Subcontractors (or affiliated divisions/subsidiaries, etc.) that were selected on a non-competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) shall submit a Cost/Price Proposal in accordance with **L.5.4.2.7.2(a) or L.5.4.2.7.2(b)**.

L.5.4.2.7.2(a) The Offeror and its proposed Teammates/Subcontractors, with proposal values exceeding $1,000,000 for the total five years of potential performance that were selected on a non-competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation), shall provide a detailed cost element proposal by CLIN submitted electronically in Microsoft Excel format,

with working formulas/algorithms - prepared in accordance with FAR 15.408 - Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses Table 15-2, Instructions for Submitting Cost/Price Proposals When Certified Cost or Pricing Data Are Required. The Cost/Price Proposal shall be supported with verifiable facts, figures, and basis of estimates in accordance with instructions at FAR 15-2.
L.5.4.2.7.2(b) Proposed Teammates/Subcontractors that were selected on a non-competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) below $1,000,000 for the total five years of potential performance shall also provide a cost element proposal by CLIN submitted electronically in Microsoft Excel format, with working formulas/algorithms. At a minimum they shall provide details of proposed direct labor rates, to include Service Contract Act (SCA) or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) labor rates, and the individual cost elements (fringe, overhead, indirect costs, profit/fee, etc.) the subcontractor used to calculate its total proposed amount.

L.5.4.2.7.2(c) Naming Convention of Offeror: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_CostProp; or, Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors: Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_CostProp

L.5.4.2.7.2(d) File Format: MS Excel

L.5.4.2.7.2(e) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.7.2(f) Failure of the Offeror or its proposed teammates/subcontractors that were selected on a non-competitive basis and who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) to provide its Cost/Price Proposal and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.7.2(c) through L.5.4.2.7.2(e)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.2.7.3 If a proposed teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) chooses to provide its cost/price information independently to the Government, it shall submit its proposal through ASFI BRS. ASFI BRS Instructions are found in **L.3** above. If a teammate/subcontractor submits a proposal for more than one Offeror, that teammate/subcontractor shall provide its cost/price information as a separate proposal submission for each Offeror. Therefore, a teammate/subcontractor that submits a proposal for multiple Offerors would receive a separate price quote number for every proposal submitted for each Offeror. If any of an Offeror's teammates/subcontractors who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) choosing to submit their cost/price proposals independently, fail to submit their proposals to the Government, it shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

L.5.4.2.7.3.1 The proposed teammate(s)/subcontractor(s) who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) shall include Attachment 0016, entitled "Teammate/Subcontractor Cost Information Submission" with its ASFI submission. Attachment 0016 shall include the teammate's or subcontractor's company name, CAGE code, task order solicitation number, the Offeror's name for which it is submitting this particular proposal, and the Offeror's corresponding BOA number.

L.5.4.2.7.3.1(a) Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors:
Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_Att0016

L.5.4.2.7.3.1(b) File Format: MS Word or Adobe PDF

L.5.4.2.7.3.1(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.7.3.1(d) Failure of any teammates/subcontractors who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation), submitting Cost/Price Proposals independently to the Government, to provide Teammate/Subcontractor Cost Information Submission - Attachment 0016 and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.7.3.1(a) through L.5.4.2.7.3.1(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

Note: This attachment shall only be submitted by the teammates/subcontractors.

L.5.4.2.7.4 The Offeror also must ensure that its proposed teammate(s)/subcontractor(s) submit their information by the proposal due date and time and all the calculations that pull forward to the Offeror's proposal are consistent with the teammate(s)/subcontractor(s) overall proposed price, along with identifying supporting data and explanations. The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the proposals of these other entities conform to the same criteria, including supporting data and explanations.

L.5.4.2.7.5 The Offeror shall provide the rate data as stated in the paragraphs below. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide the rate data as stated in the paragraphs below. The requested data is required for the Government to perform the mandatory cost realism analysis of proposed direct and indirect expenses.

L.5.4.2.7.5(a) Direct Labor Rates.

L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(1) The Offeror shall provide the basis of proposed direct labor rates. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide the basis of proposed direct labor rates. The data may include, but is not limited to, SCA wage determinations, collective bargaining agreements, current payroll records, and/or current wage surveys.

L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(2) Compliance with any applicable Service Contract Act (SCA) or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) is required. For evaluation and proposal submission purposes only, Offerors should assume a **XX XXX 20XX** Notice to Proceed date. Offerors (including teammates/subcontractors) shall use the CBA and SCA rates in effect on **XX XXX 20XX** through the final year of the current CBA and shall not include escalation. In the event a CBA rate(s) expires during the period of performance and a new CBA rate is not applicable, Offerors (including teammates/subcontractors) will continue to use the last applicable rate in force (without escalating) for the remainder of the period of performance.

L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(3) Supporting data shall also be provided for Direct Labor costs for personnel not covered by the SCA or a CBA (i.e., exempt positions). At a minimum, this support should consist of current payroll records and/or current wage surveys and will be provided as "screen shots" for each applicable labor category from the payroll records or from the wage survey data. The Offeror's proposal (including independent submissions from teammates and subcontractors) shall include an explanation of why each wage survey title was selected from the wage survey(s) and how that information was used to determine the rates included in the proposal. EXAMPLE: The proposed rate for a Supply Manager is

based on the median salary for a Warehouse Manager (selected wage survey title) with 5 years of service; annual rate $xx,xxx divided by 2080 = $xx.xx per hour. The Warehouse Manager title was selected from the utilized wage survey as the duties and qualifications for that position are considered to be most similar to the duties as required by the PWS.

For proposal preparation purposes only, for contract years 2016-2020 (calendar years), the Offeror shall escalate its annual proposed 2015 exempt rates utilizing the following percentages (which were derived from the weighted fiscal year Army Inflation Indices for Operations & Maintenance Army (OMA)): CY2016 - 1.93%; CY2017 - 2.00%; CY2018 - 2.00%; CY2019 - 2.00%; and CY2020 – 2.00%. If the Offeror proposes escalation of exempt rates utilizing different percentages than these provided, or proposes no escalation of exempt rates, the Offeror's exempt rates will be normalized (adjusted) by the Government consistent with the percentages provided above.

L.5.4.2.7.5(b) Indirect Expense Rates.

L.5.4.2.7.5(b)(1) Indirect rates allocate indirect costs such as overhead, general & administrative (G&A) expense, and fringe benefit costs. The Offeror shall provide the pool and base costs for all proposed indirect expense rates. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide the pool and base costs for all proposed indirect expense rates. All data shall be provided in a Microsoft Excel file with accompanying explanatory notes. Proposals also shall include an appropriately detailed description of how proposed indirect rates have been applied to proposed direct costs.

L.5.4.2.7.5(b)(2) Indirect Cost Rate = Indirect Cost Pool divided by Indirect Cost Allocation Base

L.5.4.2.7.5(b)(3) Pool - A descriptive summary of the costs proposed in each pool is required to be submitted in the Offeror's proposal. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide a descriptive summary of the costs proposed in each pool. An indirect cost pool is a logical grouping of indirect costs with a similar relationship to the cost objectives. For example, maintenance overhead pools include indirect costs that are associated with maintenance effort. Proposals also shall include an appropriately detailed description of how proposed indirect rates have been applied to proposed direct costs.

L.5.4.2.7.5(b)(4) Base - The Offeror shall describe the indirect cost allocation base. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also describe the indirect cost allocation base. The indirect cost allocation base for overhead rates is usually labor dollars; for G &A rates, the base is usually Total Cost Input or Value Added; and for fringe benefit rates the base is labor.

L.5.4.2.7.5(c) Budgetary Data.

L.5.4.2.7.5(c)(1) The Offeror shall provide budgetary rate data for 20**XX** through 20**XX** depending upon availability. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide budgetary rate data for 20**XX** through 20**XX** depending upon

availability. The data provided shall be the costs for the pools and bases used to calculate the proposed indirect cost rates. Appropriately detailed explanations shall be provided for the basis of 20**XX** through 20**XX** forecasted indirect rates. If budgetary data for 20**XX** has been used to estimate proposed 20**XX** through 20**XX** rates, provide that explanation. If any portion of the proposed 20**XX** through 20**XX** forecasted rates is a discreet estimate, an explanation and supporting data shall be provided. The budgetary data shall include the pool and base summary information as explained in **L.5.4.2.7.5(b) through L.5.4.2.7.5(b)(4)**. If the data is not available, the Offeror shall provide an explanation why the data cannot be provided.

L.5.4.2.7.5(c)(2) If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal and the data is not available, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide an explanation why the data cannot be provided.

L.5.4.2.7.5(d) Historical Cost Data (Historical Rates). The Offeror shall provide historical cost data for 20**XX**, 20**XX,** and 20**XX**. If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide historical actual cost data for 20**XX**, 20**XX**, and 20**XX**. The historical data shall be provided in the same format as proposed rates and include detailed actual pool and base costs. If the data is not available, the Offeror shall provide an explanation why the data cannot be provided. If a teammate/subcontractor is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal and the data is not available, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also provide an explanation why the data cannot be provided.

L.5.4.2.7.5(e) Naming Convention of Offeror: "Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_DRD_Applicable_Year(s)" and "Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_IRD_Applicable_Year(s)"; or, Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors:
"Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_DRD_Applicable_Year(s)" and
"Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_IRD_Applicable_Year(s)"

Note: Contractors shall include applicable year(s) in the title that are included in the file. For example, the end of the file name would be 2011-2018 (with the years representing the actual years of the data).

L.5.4.2.7.5(f) File Format: For information submitted in response to Paragraph **L.5.4.2.7.5(a)**, information may be submitted in MS Word, MS Excel, or Adobe PDF. Information submitted in response to paragraphs **L.5.4.2.7.5(b) through L.5.4.2.7.5(d)** shall be submitted in MS Excel. Additional narrative explanation in support of how indirect rates are developed may be submitted in MS Word or Adobe PDF format.

L.5.4.2.7.5(g) Page Limit: None

L.5.4.2.7.5(h) <u>Failure of the Offeror, or its proposed teammates/subcontractors who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation), to provide the required rate data and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.7.5(e) through L.5.4.2.7.5(g)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

L.5.4.2.7.6 The Offeror shall prepare and provide a document (MS Word table or Excel spreadsheet) that cross-walks all proposed labor categories subject to the SCA to the corresponding labor categories

and/or occupation codes in either the Section J Attachment 0007 - Department of Labor Wage Determination (DOL WD) or the Attachment 0008 - Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). At a minimum, there must be a column listing all of the proposed labor categories, followed by two or more columns listing the corresponding DOL WD or CBA labor categories/occupation codes; Offerors may also include columns that list the applicable rates for each category. If a teammate/subcontractor is submitting an independent Cost/Price Proposal, then that teammate/subcontractor shall also prepare and provide a document (MS Word table or Excel spreadsheet) that cross-walks all proposed labor categories subject to the SCA to the corresponding labor categories and/or occupation codes in either the Section J Attachment 0007 - Department of Labor Wage Determination (DOL WD) or the Attachment 0008 - Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

L.5.4.2.7.6(a) Naming Convention of Offeror: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_CW; or, Naming Convention of teammates/subcontractors: Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_CW

L.5.4.2.7.6(b) File Format: MS Word or Excel

L.5.4.2.7.6(c) Page Limit: none

L.5.4.2.7.6(d) Failure of the Offeror or its proposed teammates/subcontractors, submitting independent Cost/Price Proposals who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation), to provide the detailed information and in compliance with **L.5.4.2.7.6(a) through L.5.4.2.7.6(c)** shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

M.1 BASIS OF AWARD:

A proposal is presumed to represent the Offeror's best efforts to respond to the RFP. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performance and cost shall be explained in the proposal. For example, if the use of new and innovative techniques is intended, the impact on cost shall be explained. For example, if a business policy decision to absorb a portion of the estimated cost was made, that approach shall be stated within the proposal (including any associated calculations). The burden of proof as to the cost credibility rests with the Offeror.

M.1.1 The Government expects to award a single combination **Cost Plus Fixed Fee/Firm-Fixed Price** task order with a **XX** day transition-in period, one (1) 12 month base period and four one year evaluated option periods as a result of this RFP. **The Government will only evaluate proposals from Offerors that are certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA) for participation in the 8(a) program in accordance with FAR Part 19. Prior to award, the SBA will confirm the eligibility of the apparent successful Offeror to receive the contract award.** The Government will make an award to the responsible Offeror (in accordance with FAR 9.1) whose proposal complies with the RFP requirements and is determined to be the lowest total evaluated (fair and reasonable) priced proposal that is determined to be Technically Acceptable **with Substantial Confidence in past performance**. The responsibility determination shall include the following:

M.1.1.1 The Offeror is required to provide adequate documentation which proves its accounting system has been determined adequate by the Government to support receipt of a cost type contract. Failure to provide the required documentation shall impact the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination. Absent an adequate accounting system, an Offeror cannot be determined responsible under FAR 9.104-5 and will be ineligible for award.

M.1.1.2 The Government will determine responsibility by analyzing whether the apparent successful Offeror complies with the requirements of FAR 9.1. The Government may directly determine the responsibility of the apparent successful Offeror's teammate(s) and/or major subcontractor(s) with the requirements of FAR 9.104-4.

M.1.2 The Government intends to award one task order consisting of a base year period and 4 option year periods. However, the Government reserves the right to award no task order at all, depending on the quality of the proposals, prices submitted, and the availability of funds. An award under this RFP in no way obligates the Government to obligate additional dollars or additional option year periods.

M.2 The Government reserves the right to: limit the competitive range for the purposes of efficiency; award without discussions; and make no award should no offer prove to be acceptable based on the criteria set forth in this RFP.

M.2.1 Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposals (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Clarifications and communications conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions.

M.3 LISTING OF TOTAL PROPOSED PRICES AND STRICT COMPLIANCE REVIEW:

Listing of Total Proposed Prices. All timely offers will be listed according to the total proposed price (labeled as Total Proposed Price in Attachment 0005 Cost/Price Matrix) from lowest total proposed price to highest total proposed price. A cost/price analysis will not be completed prior to listing by total proposed price.

Strict Compliance Review. Proposals will be reviewed to determine if all compliance requirements set forth in Section L are satisfied. The Government will conduct the strict compliance review starting with the lowest total proposed priced offer to the highest total proposed priced offer, until at least five (5) or 20% of the proposals (whichever is greater) are determined to be compliant. Note that only the pool of five (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) of the proposals found to be compliant will move to Step 1 Technical Factor Evaluations. However, if the Government receives less than five (5) proposals, all proposals will be reviewed for compliance, and those proposals found to be compliant move to Step 1 Technical Factor Evaluations.

The Government will compare the Offeror's proposal to Section L in order to perform a compliance review. Any Offeror's proposal determined non-compliant per the terms noted in Section L or determined noncompliant per paragraphs a. through c. below, will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award. The compliance review will also include the following:

a. The Contracting Officer will verify that the CAGE code(s) for the Offeror and the teammates / subcontractors/ managing partner identified on Attachment 0015 - SECRET Facility Clearance possess a SECRET Facility Clearance via the DSS ISFD by the RFP closing date. It is acceptable for the CAGE codes listed on Attachment 0010 and Attachment 0015 to differ, however both of the CAGE codes must be from the same legal entity, and the CAGE code listed on the Attachment 0015 must possess the Secret Facility Clearance. If the CAGE code identified on the Attachment 0015 is different from the CAGE Code identified on Attachment 0010, and is identified as a separate legal entity, it cannot be used to fulfill the SECRET Facility Clearance requirement and the Offeror's proposal shall be rendered non-compliant. <u>If the CAGE code for the Offeror, managing partner, teammate or subcontractor, stated on the Attachment 0015 does not possess a Secret Facility Clearance, the offeror will be found noncompliant. Non-compliant proposals will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.</u>

b. The Contracting Officer will verify that the Offeror's proposal includes approved teammates by comparing the Offeror's Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix to the Offeror's BOA Attachment 0002 - Team Arrangement as of the closing date of this RFP. Proposed teammate(s) company name and CAGE code must match the BOA Attachment 0002 information. If an Offeror is required to propose itself and/or approved teammates in any of the three functional areas (Maintenance, Supply, or Transportation) and it lists a company that is not an approved teammate as of the closing date of this RFP, its proposal shall be rendered noncompliant. Non-compliant proposals will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

c. The Government will verify the Offeror's proposed Functional Labor Category 1 (FLC1) Employee hours on its Attachment 0002 – Staffing Labor Mix, "FTE Count Option Periods 1-4" tab, are equal to or greater than the total minimum FLC1 Employee hours indicated at **Exhibit X TE 5-001 M-S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours by Functional Area**. The minimum hours for this effort are: **XXX** for

Maintenance, **XXX** for Supply, and **XXX** for Transportation as provided in the attached workload data, **Exhibit X TE 1 M-S-T MINIMUM FUNCTIONAL LABOR CATEGORY 1 HOURS.** See L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii).

(1) By using Microsoft Excel, the Government will verify the Offeror's proposed option period total proposed FLC1 hours. In order to verify the Offeror's total proposed FLC1 hours by Functional Area, the Government will 1) IAW L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii), using the Microsoft Excel formula "=ROUND(number,num_digits)", round each FTE not entered by the Offeror to the nearest hundredth decimal (two decimal places to the right of the whole number) and 2) multiply the rounded number of proposed FLC1 FTEs for all FLC1 positions by the applicable offeror-provided number of hours per year by employee type.

(2) If the FLC1 hours contained in the Offeror's Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix, "FTE Count Option Periods 1-4" tab, are not equal to or greater than the minimum FLC1 hours for each Functional Area identified in Exhibit **X** TE 5-001 M-S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours (i.e., Maintenance, Transportation, Supply), the Offeror's proposal shall be rendered noncompliant and will not be evaluated nor further considered for award. The Offeror must satisfy the minimum hours requirement as stated in this RFP without exception.

(3) If the FLC1 hours calculated from the Offeror's Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix, "FTE Count Option Periods 1-4" tab, do equal or are greater than **XXX** for Maintenance, **XXX** for Supply, and **XXX** for Transportation as provided in the attached workload data, **Exhibit X TE 1 M-S-T MINIMUM FUNCTIONAL LABOR CATEGORY 1 HOURS**, the proposal will be eligible for further consideration and will be moved to STEP 1 of the evaluation process if all other compliance requirements in Section L and paragraphs a. and b. above are met.

d. Only Offerors whose proposals are determined to be compliant will move to Step 1 of the evaluation process.

M.4 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY:

M.4.1 **This is a competitive best value source selection in which competing Offerors will be evaluated against three evaluation factors: Technical, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. The Government will evaluate the Technical Factor on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Technical tradeoffs will not be made and no additional credit will be given for exceeding acceptability. The Past Performance Factor will be evaluated using a qualitative assessment by assigning confidence ratings. Cost/Price will be an evaluated factor; however it will not be rated. The Past Performance Factor is significantly more important than the Cost/Price Factor. All non-cost factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Cost/Price Factor. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror with the lowest evaluated (fair and reasonable) priced proposal that is determined Technically Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance. The Government will pursue the following evaluation approach in support of an award decision:**

This acquisition will utilize a Lowest Price Technically Acceptable Source Selection Approach as authorized by FAR 15.101-2, when best value is expected to result from the selection of the technically acceptable proposal with the lowest price. There are two evaluation factors, Technical and Cost/Price. The Government will evaluate the Technical Factor on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Technical tradeoffs will not be made and no additional credit will be given for exceeding acceptability. Cost/Price will be an evaluated factor; however it will not be rated. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror

with the lowest evaluated (fair and reasonable) priced proposal that is determined Technically Acceptable. The Government will pursue the following evaluation approach in support of an award decision:

STEP 1: Technical Factor Evaluations. The Technical Volumes will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis in accordance with the criteria detailed in "EVALUATION CRITERIA" in Section M.5 below. The Government will evaluate the Technical proposals against the technical evaluation criteria, from the lowest total proposed priced offer to the highest total proposed priced offer, until five (5) or 20% of the proposals (whichever is greater) are determined to be technically acceptable. If less than five (5) or 20% of the compliant proposals (whichever is greater) are determined to be technically acceptable, the Government will complete the strict compliance review of the next lowest total proposed priced proposal(s) for review in accordance with paragraph M.3 above. Note that only five (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) of the technically acceptable proposals will move to Step 2. However, if the Government receives less than five (5) proposals, all proposals will be evaluated and all proposals found technically acceptable will move to Step 2. If the Government receives no Technically Acceptable proposals, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions in accordance with M.4.4 as set forth below.

STEP 2: Past Performance and Cost/Price Factor Evaluations. All compliant proposals that are determined Technically Acceptable at Step 1 will be evaluated for Past Performance and Cost/Price in accordance with the criteria detailed in Section M.5 below.

a. The Past Performance Factor will be evaluated using a qualitative assessment by assigning confidence ratings.

b. The Cost/Price Factor will be evaluated for cost realism and cost/price reasonableness. It will not be assigned a rating.

c. All proposals which are determined to have Substantial Confidence in Past Performance, with a fair and reasonable evaluated price, will move to Step 3

d. If there are less than two (2) proposals with Substantial Confidence in past performance and the evaluated price is determined to be reasonable, the Government will complete the strict compliance review of the next lowest total proposed priced proposal(s) in accordance with paragraph M.3 and will proceed to Step 1 to evaluate technical acceptability until there are five (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) Technically Acceptable proposals to evaluate at Step 2. [Note: If there are no additional technical proposals left to evaluate at Step 1, the Government may proceed as indicated in M.4.4. below.]

STEP 3: As stated in M.1.1, the Government will make an award to the responsible Offeror (in accordance with FAR 9.1) whose proposal complies with the RFP requirements and is determined to be the lowest total evaluated (fair and reasonable) priced proposal that is determined to be Technically Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance. However, if all Offerors were assessed to have other than Substantial Confidence in past performance, the Government reserves the right to award to an Offeror with other than a Substantial Confidence rating in past performance. In that event, the Source Selection Authority will consider all factors and make a best value award decision.

M.4.2 All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by a team of Government personnel. Contents of written proposals and written responses to Evaluation Notices (if applicable) will be evaluated to determine the degree and extent to which the requirements set forth in the RFP are satisfied. No assumptions will be made by Government evaluators regarding areas not defined in the Offeror's written proposal.

M.4.3 Prior to award, the Government shall make an affirmative determination of responsibility for the apparent successful Offeror in accordance with FAR 9.1.

M.4.4 Discussions

M.4.4.1 The Government intends to award without discussions with respective Offerors. IF AND ONLY IF discussions are conducted at Step 1, the Government will make a competitive range determination, in accordance with FAR 15.306(c), based on the ratings of each Technical proposal against the Technical Factor evaluation criteria. No more than five (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) of the Offerors who have the lowest total proposed price compliant, highly rated Technical proposals will remain in the competitive range. Highly rated Technical proposals will include all proposals rated Technically Acceptable, and may also include Technically Unacceptable proposals that do not require a major revision and/or do not possess significant informational deficiencies. Technically Unacceptable proposals with the following deficiencies may be excluded from the competitive range at this step:

M.4.4.1(a) Failure to provide an adequate Staffing and Management Plan (SMP) (M.5.1.2)

M.4.4.1(b) Failure to properly identify or functionally align each of the primary tasks identified in C-5 of the PWS within the Organizational Diagram (M.5.1.4).

M.4.4.1(c) Any other issues that would require a major revision and/or indicate significant informational deficiencies of the requirement.

M.4.4.2 Definitions:

Deficiency: A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. (See FAR 15.001.)

M.4.4.3 IF AND ONLY IF discussions are conducted, then upon completion of the Technical Factor evaluations, the Government will make a subsequent competitive range determination, in accordance with FAR 15.306(c), based on the final ratings of each Technical proposal against the Technical Factor evaluation criteria. Only Offerors determined Technically Acceptable will remain in this subsequent competitive range and proceed to the Past Performance and Cost/Price evaluations identified in STEP 2 above.

M.5 EVALUATION CRITERIA:

M.5.1 Technical Factor:

The Government will evaluate the Technical Factor on an overall Acceptable/Unacceptable basis against all of the listed criteria identified in **L.5.2 and M.5.1**. An Unacceptable rating will be assigned when the

Offeror's proposal does not meet all of the listed criteria due to containing one or more deficiencies. In order to receive an overall Acceptable rating under the Technical Factor, an Acceptable rating must be received on all elements of the criteria. An Acceptable rating will be assigned when the Offeror has demonstrated an understanding of the PWS requirements and has provided an acceptable proposal based upon the evaluation of all the following elements:

M.5.1(a) Staffing and Management Plan

M.5.1(b) Mission Essential Contractor Services

M.5.1(c) Organizational Diagram

M.5.1.1 Technical Factor Rating: The Technical Factor ratings and definitions are as follows:

Acceptable: The proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the RFP.
Unacceptable: The proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the RFP.

An Offeror must receive an acceptable rating for the Technical Factor in order to be considered for award. Offers receiving an unacceptable rating for the Technical Factor will not be considered for award.

M.5.1.2 Staffing and Management Plan: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Staffing and Management Plan to determine if the Offeror's proposal adequately details an approach to deliver services required in the PWS and is adequately supported by the Offeror's Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix, for the following elements:

M.5.1.2(a) Offeror adequately demonstrates its ability to properly staff/organize the required effort by providing a realistic approach to creating its management structure from general staff oversight by first line supervisors through its company headquarters management. Offeror's proposal adequately details its chain of command structure and methodology, internal controls for problem resolution.

M.5.1.2(b) Offeror provides adequate rationale for its proposed skill set / skill level determination by Functional Area. Rationale adequately describes the Offeror's methodology for determining the skill level required in order to ensure proper execution of the effort.

M.5.1.2(c) Flexible Staffing Approach - The Offeror adequately demonstrates ability to effectively and efficiently: cross-utilize, temporarily reallocate, and rapidly increase and decrease its workforce. The Offeror adequately identifies how this approach will be executed during surges in effort and during periods of protracted reductions in workload without sacrificing quality of services provided. Additionally, the Offeror adequately demonstrates its ability to effectively and efficiently cross utilize personnel when possible to better support short term requirement changes; provide better and timelier support; and reduce costs through more efficient staffing. The Offeror's cross utilization adequately addresses an approach to ensuring safety, training, and certification requirements are met and does not impact or appear to impact quality of the effort.

M.5.1.2(d) Transition-in Approach - The Offeror adequately identifies a realistic and feasible time-phased approach of transitioning-in all of the PWS requirements with key milestones from Notice to Proceed (NTP) to successfully reaching a fully operational capability (FOC) which demonstrates, at a minimum (within the time indicated at M.1.1):

M.5.1.2(d)(1) Open communication with incumbent contractor and the Government to include periodic meetings documenting progress.

M.5.1.2(d)(2) Compliance with Executive Order 13495 - Hiring of qualified incumbent workforce.

M.5.1.2(d)(3) Proper, timely requisition / issuance of (as required): Contractor Common Access Cards (CAC) / access badges and security clearances.

M.5.1.2(d)(4) Assuming accountability of GFP / GFE (including joint inventory with incumbent contractor) with completion prior to end of transition-in. Completion requires all actions up to and including reconciliation to be completed.

M.5.1.2(e) Staffing/Labor Mix - The Government will evaluate the Offeror's entire staffing approach (FLC1 and FLC2) through its proposed labor categories (skill sets) with proposed staffing levels (number of employees) in Attachment 0002 - Staffing/Labor Mix to determine if the Offeror's staffing is feasible in relation to the PWS requirements and the provided workload data (see applicable Technical Exhibits) for both the base period and option periods (fully operational capable 12-month periods (365 day periods)). The Offeror's proposed approach must present a staffing approach which demonstrates an adequate understanding of this effort and provides its expected skill level, to include level of responsibility, to ensure successful performance of all the PWS requirements. Offerors must properly propose and identify Key and Specified Non-Key positions, as identified in Exhibit X on its Attachment 0002 as directed at L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(i). Additionally, the Offeror's proposed labor category skill level and expected level of responsibility is commensurate with the effort/assigned position.

M.5.1.3 Mission Essential Contractor Services (MECS) - The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Mission Essential Contractor Services Plan by determining if the Offeror's proposed plan adequately addresses a realistic approach on how it will continue to perform the essential contractor services listed in Attachment 0013 - Mission Essential Contractor Services. The proposed MECS Plan must address each part of the DFARS 252.237-7024 (b)(2)(i through v) individually.

M.5.1.4 Organizational Diagram - The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Organizational Diagram to determine if it demonstrates a comprehensive, realistic organizational overview based on the following:

M.5.1.4(a) Adequately identifies the tasks the proposed teammate(s) (if applicable) and/or proposed major subcontractor(s) (if applicable) will be performing.

M.5.1.4(b) Adequately identifies all of the command and control relationships among the prime contractor, proposed teammate(s) (if applicable) and/or proposed major subcontractor(s) (if applicable) to include identification of leadership positions (e.g., site leads, foremen, directors, deputies, managers, supervisors, and team leads) and who is responsible for performing successful oversight of each of the primary tasks areas identified in Section C-5 of the PWS. FTE Counts are not required on the Organizational Diagram. Proposed FTEs will only be evaluated on the Attachment 0002.

M.5.1.4(c) Adequately identifies the independence of the quality control organization (i.e. quality control organization reporting directly to the corporate quality office).

M.5.2 Past Performance Factor:

Past performance information is evaluated as a predictor of future contract performance. The Government will assess the degree of confidence it has in the expectation that the Offeror will successfully complete the requirements in accordance with the contract terms based on the Offeror's demonstrated record of recent and relevant performance.

M.5.2.1 The Government will assess the contract references provided in the Offeror's BOA proposal, the BOA annual review process, and task order proposals to date, and other information available from sources other than those identified by the Offeror, against the past performance evaluation criteria set forth below. The Government will include in its past performance evaluation any proposed teammate or subcontractor that is expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price for this effort. The Government will confirm a proposed teammate or subcontractor is expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price (to include base period and option periods) by referring to Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix.

M.5.2.2 An Offeror's past performance record will be assessed to determine its Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating. If an Offeror proposes the use of teammates (who are expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price for this effort), major subcontractors (who are expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price for this effort), or is a joint venture, the Offeror's past performance record will be assessed in its totality to determine the Offeror's past performance rating. The Government may take any of the following into consideration when determining an Offeror's past performance confidence rating:

M.5.2.2(a) The specific functional areas (Maintenance, Transportation, Supply) the Offeror, its teammate(s), or its major subcontractor(s) have performed as reflected by their respective past performance history, and the functional areas to be performed on the task order requirement by the Offeror, its teammate(s) or its major subcontractor(s).

M.5.2.2(b) The Offeror's, its teammate(s) or its major subcontractor(s) overall percentage of participation for this task order requirement.

M.5.2.2(c) The Offeror's and/or its teammate(s)/subcontractor(s)' performance details and ratings received in Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), as well as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) which includes both the Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and the Federal Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS). CPARS and PPQs will be utilized to assess a contractor's performance in the areas of Quality of Service, Schedule, and Cost Control.

M.5.2.3 In evaluating performance history, the Government may review the Offeror's current and prior performance record of complying with all aspects of its contractual agreement.

M.5.2.4 In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government may use information obtained from other sources, or may use information with regard to other contracts performed by the Offeror of which it has knowledge, whether or not those contracts are disclosed to the Government by the Offeror. It may also use any past performance that occurs after the RFP closing date and prior to award. The Government is not required to interview all points of contact identified by Offerors.

M.5.2.5 The Government may consider the recency, relevancy, source and context of the past performance information it evaluates, as well as general trends in performance, and demonstrated corrective actions. A significant achievement, problem, problem resolution or lack of relevant data in any element can become an important consideration in the assessment process. An adverse finding in any element or a lack of relevant data in regards to a performance issue may result in an overall lower confidence assessment rating.

M.5.2.6 The Government may also consider past performance information regarding predecessor companies, other corporate entities, or subcontracts, where such information is relevant to this acquisition.

M.5.2.7 Recency. Recency, as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the time that has elapsed since the past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant. For the purpose of this requirement recency is any contract under which any performance, delivery, or corrective action has occurred within the following time standards: three (3) years prior to this RFP closing date, even if the award date is outside this three (3) year window.

M.5.2.8 Relevancy. The relevancy of the past performance information will be evaluated as follows:

M.5.2.8(a) Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.

M.5.2.8(b) Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.

M.5.2.8(c) In order to determine if a reference is relevant, the reference must meet the scope, magnitude, and complexity requirements as detailed below.

M.5.2.8(c)(i) M.5.2.8(c)(i) In order to determine if a reference is similar in scope to the Ft. **XXXX** Task Order, the reference must have demonstrated experience in at least one of the following functional areas: maintenance, supply or transportation.

M.5.2.8(c)(ii) In order to determine if a reference is similar in magnitude and complexity to the Ft. **XXXX** Task Order, the Annual Average Dollar value must meet or exceed the minimum level of relevant experience identified below:

Maintenance: Offeror Reference - $6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $1.2M average annually
Supply: Offeror Reference - $6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $1.2M average annually
Transportation: Offeror Reference - $5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $1M average annually
Total $17M average annually

Maintenance: Offeror Reference - $1M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $200K average annually

Supply: Offeror Reference - $1.2M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $240K average annually
Transportation: Offeror Reference - $1M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $200K average annually
Total $3.2M average annually

Maintenance: Offeror Reference - $0.5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $100K average annually
Supply: Offeror Reference - $0.6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $120K average annually
Transportation: Offeror Reference - $0.5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – $100K average annually
Total $1.6M average annually

M.5.2.8(c)(iii) When reviewing contract references for magnitude and complexity, the evaluator will determine the functional areas contained in a contract reference. For example, **if all three functional areas apply to the Offeror's contract reference, the average annual dollar value must be at least $XXX for the reference to be determined similar in magnitude and complexity. If the Maintenance and Supply functional areas apply to the Offeror's contract reference, the average annual dollar value must be at least $XXX for the reference to be determined similar in magnitude and complexity.**

M.5.2.8(c)(iv) For Major Subcontractors and teammates performing 20% or more of the total contract value, the level of magnitude and complexity applicable to this evaluation is 20% of the above stated values.

M.5.2.9 Performance Confidence. Based on an assessment of all of the past performance information identified for the Offeror, the Government will determine an overall confidence rating for the Offeror. The overall confidence rating will be determined using the rating definitions below and will be based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record and the Government's expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. When determining the confidence assessment, consideration will be given to the depth and breadth of the Offeror's demonstrated recent/relevant experience.

M.5.2.9(a) <u>Substantial Confidence</u>: Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

M.5.2.9(b) <u>Satisfactory Confidence</u>: Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

M.5.2.9(c) <u>Limited Confidence</u>: Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

M.5.2.9(d) <u>No Confidence</u>: Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

M.5.2.9(e) <u>Unknown Confidence (Neutral)</u>: No recent/relevant performance record is available or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

M.5.3 Cost/Price Factor:

The total evaluated price will be the total of the Offeror's submitted cost/price proposal as detailed in Attachment 0005 - Cost/Price Matrix plus any Government identified probable cost adjustments as determined in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d) Cost Realism Analysis. Cost/Price proposals will not be assigned an adjectival rating. The Firm Fixed Price and Cost Proposals will be evaluated for cost realism and reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques.

M.5.3.1 Cost Realism Analysis. Cost Realism is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of the Offeror's proposed cost elements to determine the following: whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; whether the proposed cost elements reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and whether the proposed cost elements are consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Technical Proposal. Cost realism analysis shall be performed on cost reimbursement contracts to determine the probable cost of performance for each Offeror. The probable cost may differ from the proposed cost and should reflect the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is likely to result from the Offeror's proposal. In order to perform Cost Realism Analysis, the Government requires that the Offeror submits sufficient supporting detail relative to direct and indirect rates, subcontracts, material and equipment, if applicable, and Other Direct Costs.
M.5.3.1.1 Proposal Errors/Omissions. The Government is not under any obligation to correct proposal errors/omissions. Those proposals with errors/omissions, where the Government is unable to ascertain the Offeror’s intent without discussions, shall be removed from further consideration.

M.5.3.1.2 Capped Rates.

M.5.3.1.2.(a) Indirect Rates: If the Offeror’s or teammate(s)/subcontractor(s)’ proposals include indirect rates which are not fully supported by historical and/or budgetary data, those rates will be capped for evaluation purposes and contract execution.

M.5.3.1.2.(b) Fee Rates: The Offeror’s fee rate will be capped as proposed for contract execution.

M.5.3.1.3 Subcontractor Proposal Consistency. If a subcontractor’s detailed cost proposal differs from the pricing that the Offeror includes in its proposal, the subcontractor’s detailed cost proposal will take precedence and may result in an adjustment to the Offeror’s proposal.

M.5.3.2 Evaluation of Option to Extend Services. As part of the price evaluation, the Government will evaluate the Option to Extend Services under FAR Clause 52.217-8 by adding one-half of the Offeror's final option period price to the Offeror’s total price. Therefore, the Offeror's total evaluated price will include the prices for the base period, first option period, second option period, third option period, fourth option period, plus one-half of the fourth option period price.

M.5.3.3 The Government will review the Offeror’s document (required by **L.5.4.2.7.6**) that cross-walks all proposed labor categories subject to the SCA to the corresponding labor categories and/or occupation codes in either the Section J Attachment 0007 - Department of Labor Wage Determination (DOL WD) or the Attachment 0008 - Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) to ensure proposed labor rates are in accordance with the SCA.

M.5.3.4 Unbalanced Pricing. As part of the cost/price evaluation, proposals will be reviewed to identify any potential Unbalanced Pricing. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(g), Unbalanced Pricing, a proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

M.5.3.5 Sources. The methods of evaluation noted above may include the use of information from sources such as, but not limited to, the DCAA and the DCMA.