

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS 2

M.2 BASIS FOR ISSUANCE OF TASK ORDER 2

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ... 2

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION..... 3

M.5 COST AND FEE 4

DRAFT

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

This Task Order competition is being conducted pursuant to Section H.14, EMCBC-H-1005 Ordering Procedures, of the Basic Contract and FAR Part 16. The instructions set forth in Section L are designed to provide guidance to the Contractor concerning the documentation that will be evaluated. The Contractor must furnish adequate and specific information in its response. Any exceptions, deviations, or conditional assumptions to the terms of this RTP, unless specifically requested in the RTP, may make the proposal unacceptable for award. If a Contractor proposes exceptions to the terms and condition of the Task Order, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Contractor that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the Task Order. A task proposal may be deemed non-responsive and eliminated from further consideration, if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable.

Prior to issuance of the Task Order, a determination shall be made whether any possible Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) exists with respect to the apparent successful contractor (including any teaming partners and major or critical subcontractors) or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, DOE will consider the representation required by Section K and other pertinent information available to DOE. An award may be made if there is no OCI or if any potential OCI can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.

M.2 BASIS FOR ISSUANCE OF TASK ORDER

The Government intends to award one Task Order to the Contractor whose proposal is evaluated as representing the best value to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each Contractor's proposal based upon the evaluation of the selection factors in M.4 and M.5.

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

- (a) The proposals will be evaluated using information submitted by the contractors on the two factors listed below. Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 are equal.
 - (1) Technical Approach
 - (2) Key Personnel and Organization
- (b) In determining the best value to the Government, Technical Evaluation Criteria when combined, are significantly more important than price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior technical proposal than making an award at the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium that it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one proposal over another. Thus, the closer or more similar in merit the Contractors' technical proposals are evaluated to be, the more likely the evaluated price may be the determining factor in selection for award.
- (c) Areas within an evaluation criterion are not sub-criteria and will not be individually rated, but will be considered in the overall evaluation for that particular evaluation criterion.

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Evaluation Criteria 1 and 2 constitute the evaluation criteria for the technical proposal. Corresponding proposal preparation instructions are in Section L. The technical proposal will be evaluated using adjectival ratings and will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

(a) Criterion 1 – Technical Approach

DOE will evaluate the depth, quality, completeness, effectiveness and reasonableness of the Contractor's technical approach for PWS activity C.1.2.1 Pre-Release Planning and Facility Transfer of the GDP from USEC including facility walkdowns efficiently; to achieve minimum S&M for PWS activities in the following areas: C.1.3 Facility Modification and Infrastructure Optimization including stabilization, deactivation, and a detailed approach and its implementation plan for utility and laboratory optimization (C.1.3.2.1 through C.1.3.2.5); C.1.4., Surveillance and Maintenance and Utility Operations including a graded S&M approach for each of the four categories of facilities; C.1.4.3 Cylinder Transfer, and for C.1.4.5 Waste Management Operations including treatment, handling, packaging, transportation, and disposal, C.1.5 Deactivation, Decontamination and Demolition, and C.1.7 Post-GDP Shutdown Environmental Services. Additionally, DOE will evaluate the Contractor's understanding to perform C.1.1 Task Order Implementation Period, C.1.2.2 Project Support, C.1.6.1 On-Site Waste Disposal Facility design. DOE will evaluate the Contractor's proposed change control process that will ensure the Performance Baseline remains aligned with the Task Order terms to include scope, cost, and schedule. DOE will evaluate the detailed schedule consistent with the cost worksheets and critical path schedule. DOE will evaluate the identification of the risks and impacts to the proposed approach; rationale for the identified risks and impacts; and the approach to eliminate, avoid, or mitigate these risks.

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's approach to planning and integrating all Section C requirements for the Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs). This will also include the effective utilization of the anticipated funds for each fiscal year.

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's process for identifying distinct subprojects that can be performance-based and performed on a fixed price basis by competitively selected subcontractors.

(b) Criterion 2 – Key Personnel and Organization

DOE will evaluate the suitability of the Key Personnel for the positions proposed. In evaluating the Key Personnel, the Program Manager will be considered more important than other proposed Key Personnel when combined.

Contractors are advised that the Government may contact any or all references and other sources including those not provided by the Contractor. The DOE reserves the right to use any information received as part of its evaluation of the Key Personnel. Contractors who do not submit a signed Letter of Commitment from each proposed Key Person may be ineligible for award without discussion. Failure to submit Letters of Commitment may result in the Contractor receiving a lower rating.

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's organization and its rationale for its proposed organizational structure to execute the PWS requirements. DOE will evaluate the Contractor's proposed organizational structure including roles, responsibilities, authorities, lines of communication, and interfaces with DOE and others, the types and number of

people, rationale for the organizational structure, and rationale and strategy for the use of subcontractors.

DOE will evaluate the oral interview for the Key Personnel for leadership, communication, project management skills, and problem-solving capabilities in response to the interview questions.

DOE will evaluate the extent of small business participation, including small disadvantaged business (SDB) participation in performing meaningful work (size and scope/complexity) that will contribute to the overall successful performance of the Task Order.

M.5 COST AND FEE

The Cost and Fee Proposal will not be adjectivally rated, but it will be considered in the overall evaluation of proposals in determining the best value to the government. The Most Probable Cost and Fee for CLINs 0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0006, and 0007A and the Total Proposed Price for CLINs 0007B-D, will be added together to compute the overall evaluated price for the Task Order and used in determining the best value to the government.

DOE will compare the evaluated price (total for CLINs 0001 through 0007) to the anticipated funding as set forth in Section L for both the total anticipated Task Order funding and the anticipated funding by fiscal year. Since the funding is subject to change based on actual appropriation and actual award date of the Task Order DOE may make an award to a Contractor whose evaluated price differs from the anticipated funding profile provided in Section L.

For CLINs 0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0006, and 0007A (Cost Plus Award Fee):

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's cost proposal for realism and reasonableness. The evaluation will result in the determination of a Most Probable Cost for each Contractor. The evaluation of cost realism includes an analysis of specific elements of each Contractor's proposed cost to determine whether the proposed estimated cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the methods of performance and materials described in the Contractor's technical proposal. The evaluation of cost reasonableness includes those considerations described in FAR subpart 31.2, including the reasonableness of the five highest compensated executive's salary and consistency with the anticipated funding profile in Section L. Based on its review, DOE will determine a most probable cost to the government.

The most probable cost will be calculated by adding the following evaluated cost together: Task Order Implementation Period, Task Order Project Management, Facility Deactivation and Infrastructure Optimization and Surveillance and Maintenance and Utility Operations, Cylinder Transfer, On-Site Waste Disposal Facility, and Post-GDP Shutdown Environmental Remediation Transition and Environmental Services Waste Operations. The Proposed Fee will consist of adding all of the award fees for each CLIN designated above.

The Contractor has the responsibility to fully document its cost proposal and provide clear traceability to the PWS. DOE may adjust evaluated price as part of its cost realism analysis if the contractor does not adequately provide this documentation and traceability.

For CLINs 0007B-D (Firm Fixed Price):

DOE will evaluate each Contractor's total proposed price for each CLIN identified above to assess reasonableness, price realism and completeness. The price reasonableness evaluation may include the following:

- Comparison of the Contractor's total proposed price to other Contractor's proposed price for each CLIN.
- Comparison of the Contractor's total proposed price to other Contractor's total proposed price for each CLIN.
- Comparison of the total proposed price with independent government cost estimates for each CLIN.

The price realism analysis will be utilized to determine if the proposed total price are realistic and consistent with the Technical and Management Proposal with regard to the nature, scope and duration of the work to be performed. The price realism analysis may include an analysis of the individual cost elements used to develop the total proposed price to determine if the total proposed price is significantly over or understated. Inconsistencies between the Cost/Price Proposal and other portions of the proposal could raise concerns regarding the Contractor's understanding of the requirements and ability to perform the work for the total proposed price.

An unreasonable, unrealistic or incomplete Cost/Price Proposal may be evidence of the Contractor's lack of, or poor understanding of, the requirements of the PWS and thus may adversely affect the rating of the Contractor's Technical and Management Proposal.

For all fixed priced CLINs (0007B-D) the proposed price for each identified CLIN will be added together to compute the total proposed price. In the event of a conflict between the total proposed price specified by the Contractor in Volume III and the proposed prices reflected in Section B, the price in Volume III will be used to determine the total proposed price. The Contractor has the responsibility to fully document its cost proposal and provide clear traceability to the PWS.