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 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF VOLUME III, COST AND FEE PROPOSAL 2

M.4 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ... 3

M.5 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 3

M.6 COST AND FEE AND PRICE EVALUATION 5

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 in accordance with H.14(e)(2) and (3) of the Basic IDIQ Contract 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 be 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 in accordance with FAR Part 9 and DEAR 909.

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 and each Contractor's recent and relevant past performance in accordance with the criteria in M.5 and evaluation of cost and fee and price as stated in M.6.

In determining the best value to the Government, Technical Evaluation Criteria when combined, are substantially more important than the evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a proposal with superior technical merit than making a selection at the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium which is calculated as a most probable cost for all CLINs that it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the higher technical merit.

M.3 TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF VOLUME III, COST AND FEE PROPOSAL

DOE will evaluate proposals in accordance with the M.5 Evaluation Criteria and M.6 Cost and Fee and Price. As part of this evaluation, DOE will also perform a technical analysis of the Cost and Fee Proposal, and consider this analysis in the evaluation of Volume II, Technical and Management Proposal, and as part of the evaluation of Volume III, Cost and Fee Proposal. As part of the technical analysis of the Cost and Fee Proposal, DOE will evaluate the reasonableness (cost reimburseable and firm-fixed price items) and realism (cost reimburseable items) of the proposed resources, traceability, errors and omissions, and other problem areas.

M.4 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

(a) The proposals will be evaluated using information submitted by the Contractor on the three factors listed below. Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 are equal and each is more important than Criterion 3.

(1) Technical Approach
(2) Key Personnel and Organization
(3) Recent and Relevant Past Performance

(b) 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.5 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation Criteria 1, 2 and 3 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 (Evaluated through Written Proposal Information)

DOE will evaluate the depth, quality, completeness, and effectiveness of the Contractor's technical approach to achieve the PWS objectives.

Additionally, DOE will evaluate the Contractor's general technical understanding of the following PWS elements to ensure comprehension of the work scope. DOE will evaluate the Contractor's comprehension of the scope of work to be performed and how such work will be integrated into the overall effort.

- C.1.2.1.1, Facility Walkdowns of Categories A-C & E;
- C.1.2.2.1, Project Planning, Integration & Interface;
- C.1.2.2.3.1, Integrated Safety Management Systems;
- C.1.2.2.3.6, Quality Assurance / Quality Control;
- C.1.2.2.4, Regulatory Compliance and Permits;
- C.1.2.2.5, Sampling and Data Management;
- C.1.2.2.8.1, Security Program;
- C.1.2.2.8.2, Nuclear Materials Control and Accountability;
- C.1.2.2.9, Records Management and Document Control;
- C.1.2.2.10, Program Management Support;
- C.1.2.2.11, Real and Personal Property Management;
- C.1.2.2.12, Computing and Telecommunications;
- C.1.2.2.13, Energy Efficiency;
- C.1.2.2.14, DOE Consolidated Audit Program (DOECAP);
- C.1.2.2.15, Asset Recovery and Recycling;
- C.1.2.2.16, Pension and Benefit Administration;
- C.1.2.3, Post-GDP Shutdown Environmental Remediation Transition; and
- C.1.6.1, On-Site Waste Disposal Facility Design

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's approach to planning, sequencing, integrating, and optimizing PWS requirements to drive down the costs of operating the site (including S&M) as quickly as possible and in a manner that effectively utilizes the anticipated funding profile for each fiscal year. DOE will evaluate the effectiveness of the Contractor's technical approach for a proposed change control process to ensure that the Task Order Initial Contract Performance Baseline (H.109) remains aligned with the Task Order terms to include scope, cost, and schedule. DOE will evaluate the consistency of the resource-loaded schedule with the cost worksheets and critical path schedule. DOE will evaluate the identification of the three project 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 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 (Evaluated through Written Proposal Information and Oral Presentations/Interviews)

DOE will evaluate the proposed Key Personnel for relevant experience (i.e., size, scope and complexity), education, capability, and leadership skills and the rationale for their organizational position. Additionally, DOE will evaluate the proposed Key Personnel's level of authority and access to corporate resources.

Contractors who do not submit a signed Letter of Commitment from each proposed Key Person may be ineligible for award without discussion. Failure to propose, at a minimum a Program Manager, will result in the Contractor's proposal being eliminated from further consideration for award.

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's proposed organizational structure including roles, responsibilities, authorities, lines of communication, and interfaces with DOE and others, rationale for the organizational structure, and rationale and strategy for the use of subcontractors. DOE will evaluate the Contractor's proposed organizational structure to support implementation of the technical approaches proposed and provide control and accountability for Task Order performance.

DOE will evaluate the oral presentations/interviews for the Key Personnel for leadership, communication, project management skills, and problem-solving capabilities in response to the presentation questions. DOE will evaluate how the Contractor identifies meaningful work activities that are suitable for competitive fixed price subcontracting opportunities and the proposed process for realization and implementation of those subcontracts.

DOE will evaluate the Contractor's approach to achieving its Small Business Subcontracting Plan, including the extent of small disadvantaged business (SDB) participation in performing meaningful work (size and scope/complexity).

(c) Criterion 3 – Recent and Relevant Past Performance

DOE will evaluate the recent and relevant past performance of the Contractor, joint venture partners, and proposed major or critical subcontractors. DOE may solicit past performance information from all available sources. DOE will evaluate all recent and relevant past performance to evaluate the degree to which the past performance demonstrates the Contractor's ability to successfully perform the PWS. In the case of a Contractor without a record of recent and relevant past performance, DOE will evaluate the Contractor neither favorably nor unfavorably.

M.6 COST AND FEE AND PRICE EVALUATION

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, 0005, 0006, and 0007 and the Total Proposed Price for subCLINs 0008A-C will be added together to compute the overall evaluated price for the Task Order and used in determining the best value to the government that effectively utilizes the anticipated funding profile for each year.

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 Section B 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.

For CLINs 0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, 0005, 0006, and 0007 (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 as prescribed in FAR 15.404-1(d). 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 executives' salaries as per DOE Acquisition Letter 2013-14 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 costs plus any adjustments made by the Technical Evaluation Team together: Task Order Implementation Period (CLIN 0001), Project Management (CLIN 0002), Facility Deactivation and Infrastructure Optimization and Surveillance and Maintenance and Utility Operations (CLIN 0003), Cylinder Transfers (CLIN 0004), Deactivation, Decontamination and Demolition (CLIN 0005), On-Site Waste Disposal Facility (CLIN 0006), and Post-GDP Shutdown Environmental Remediation Transition and Environmental Services Waste Operations (CLIN 0007). The total 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 the proposed costs as part of its cost realism analysis if the Contractor does not adequately provide this documentation and traceability.

An unreasonable, unrealistic, or incomplete Cost 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.

There should be no inconsistencies between the cost proposal and technical proposal. Should the Government determine that inconsistencies exist; such inconsistency may result in an adjustment to the Contractor's proposed costs and/or may result in a lower rating under Criterion 1 and/or 2.

For subCLINs 0008A, 0008B, and 0008C (Firm-Fixed Price):

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

- Comparison of the Contractor's proposed price for each subCLIN to other Contractor's proposed price for each subCLIN.
- Comparison of the proposed price for each subCLIN with independent government cost estimate for each subCLIN.

Price analysis will be utilized to determine if the proposed total price is reasonable and consistent with the Technical and Management Proposal with regard to the nature, scope and duration of the work to be performed.

The proposed price for each identified subCLIN will be added together to compute the total proposed price for CLIN 0008.

An unreasonable or incomplete 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.