

Part IV – Representations and Instructions

Section M

Evaluation Factors for Award

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

M.1 DOE-M-2001 Proposal Evaluation – General – Alternate III (Feb 2019) 1

M.2 Evaluation Factor – Key Personnel 2

M.3 DOE-M-2008, Evaluation Factor – Past Performance (Oct 2015) (Revised)..... 3

M.4 Evaluation Factor – Management Approach 5

M.5 Evaluation Factor – Cost and Fee/Profit..... 6

M.6 DOE-M-2011 Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors (Oct 2015) 6

M.7 DOE-M-2012 Basis for Award (Oct 2015) 7

This page intentionally left blank.

M.1 DOE-M-2001 Proposal Evaluation – General – Alternate III (Feb 2019)

(a) Conduct of acquisition.

- (1) This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Part 15 entitled, *Contracting by Negotiation*; Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR), Part 915 entitled, *Contracting by Negotiation*; and the provisions of this solicitation.
- (2) The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted by Offerors in response to this solicitation. Proposal evaluation is an assessment of the proposal and the Offeror's ability to perform the prospective Contract successfully. Proposals will be evaluated solely on the factors specified in the solicitation against the evaluation factors in this Section M to determine the Offeror's ability to perform the Contract.
- (3) The designated Source Selection Authority (SSA) will select an Offeror for Contract award whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. The SSA's decision will be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all evaluation factors in the solicitation. The SSA may reject all proposals received in response to this solicitation, if doing so is in the best interest of the Government.

(b) Deficiency in proposal.

- (1) A deficiency, as defined at FAR 15.001, *Definitions*, is 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. No award will be made to an Offeror whose proposal is determined to be deficient.
- (2) A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before completing the Government's evaluation if the proposal is deficient as to be unacceptable on its face. Deficiencies may include any exceptions or deviations to the terms of the solicitation. A proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address itself to the material requirements of the solicitation, or if it does not substantially and materially comply with the proposal preparation instructions of this solicitation. Cursory responses or responses which merely repeat or reformulate the Master Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Performance Work Statement (PWS) and/or Task Order PWS will not be considered responsive to the requirements of the solicitation. In the event that a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.

- (c) Responsibility. In accordance with FAR Subpart 9.1, *Responsible Prospective Contractors*, and DEAR Subpart 909.1, *Responsible Prospective Contractors*, the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) is required to make an affirmative determination of whether a prospective contractor is responsible. The PCO may, if necessary, conduct a pre-award survey of the prospective contractor as part of the considerations in determining responsibility. In the absence of information clearly indicating that the otherwise successful Offeror is responsible,

the PCO will make a determination of non-responsibility and no award will be made to that Offeror; unless, the apparent successful Offeror is a small business and the Small Business Administration issues a Certificate of Competency in accordance with FAR Subpart 19.6, *Certificates of Competency and Determinations of Responsibility*. The responsibility determination includes a finding that award of the Contract to the Offeror will not pose an undue risk to the common defense and security as a result of its access to classified information or special nuclear material in the performance of the Contract, as prescribed in Section L 12 (DEAR 952.204-73, *Facility Clearance*), which requires submission of specific information by the Offeror related to foreign interests.

- (d) Award without discussions. In accordance paragraph (f)(4) of the provision at FAR 52.215-1, *Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition*, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a Contract without conducting discussions with Offerors. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal shall contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if the PCO later determines them to be necessary and may limit the competitive range for purposes of efficiency.
- (e) Organizational conflicts of interest. The Offeror is required by the Section K provision, *Organizational Conflicts of Interest Disclosure*, to provide a statement of any past, present, or currently planned interests related to the performance of the work and a statement that an actual or potential conflict of interest or unfair competitive advantage does or does not exist in connection with the Contract resulting from the solicitation.

M.2 Evaluation Factor – Key Personnel

- (a) Key Personnel. DOE will evaluate the proposed required Program Manager and Operations Manager (required key personnel) and up to three additional non-required key personnel, along with the Offeror's rationale for selecting the proposed non-required key personnel positions and why the positions are essential to the successful performance of the entire Master IDIQ PWS. The Program Manager and Operations Manager are considered equal in importance. The Program Manager and Operations Manager individually are significantly more important than the non-required key personnel individually.

Failure of the Offeror to propose the required key personnel positions, or to confirm the availability of all proposed key personnel as being assigned to the Contract full-time and that their permanent duty station is located on the Hanford site or within the local area, will adversely affect the Government's evaluation of the proposal and may make the proposal ineligible for award. Additionally, failure of the Offeror to provide a letter of commitment for each key personnel will adversely affect the Government's evaluation of the proposal.

Note: The DOE will evaluate all proposed key personnel. However, a higher number of proposed key persons will not be inherently evaluated more favorably than a lesser number of proposed key persons, as the proposed key personnel will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria in this factor.

- (b) Resume. The individuals proposed as key personnel will be evaluated on the degree to which they are qualified and suitable for the proposed position in relation to the work for which

they are proposed to perform and areas of responsibility. The qualifications and suitability of the individual key personnel will be evaluated on the following:

- (1) Experience. The key personnel individually will be evaluated on their DOE, commercial, and/or other Government experience in performing work similar to the work to be performed in their proposed position, including leadership and other accomplishments, with emphasis on production operations type work.
 - (2) Education. The key personnel individually will be evaluated on their education, specialized training, certifications, and licenses that support the suitability for the proposed position.
 - (3) References. DOE may contact any or all of the references and other sources of information not provided by the Offeror, to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the resume and to further assess the qualifications and suitability of proposed key personnel.
- (c) Oral interviews – Key Personnel. DOE will evaluate each separate, individual oral interview. The Offeror’s Key Personnel will be evaluated for qualifications and suitability, including leadership capability for the proposed position as demonstrated during the oral interview.

Note: DOE experience is not necessarily evaluated with more similarity than non-DOE experience, based on the sole fact that it was work for DOE. The key personnel evaluation is based on the factors listed above.

M.3 DOE-M-2008, Evaluation Factor – Past Performance (Oct 2015) (Revised)

- (a) Offeror. The Offeror, to include all members of a teaming arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1) will be evaluated on the Government’s assessment of relevant and recent past performance information obtained for the Offeror performing work similar in scope, size, and complexity to the portion of the Master IDIQ PWS that each entity is proposed to perform. The information will be evaluated in order to assess the Offeror’s potential success in performing the work required by the Contract. Similar scope, size, and complexity are defined as follows based on the portion of work that each entity is proposed to perform: scope – type of work (e.g., work as identified in the Master IDIQ PWS, including similar work of a non-nuclear nature and/or similar non-DOE work such as operating facilities with significant chemical/industrial hazards comparable to typical commercial chemical industry facilities regulated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and in some cases using the Occupational Safety and Health Administration’s Process Safety Management framework); size – dollar value (approximate average annual value in relation to the proposed work; annual contract value of approximately \$400M for evaluation purposes); and complexity – performance challenges (e.g., operating a first of a kind facility; operating DOE nuclear Hazard Category 2 or facilities; overcoming barriers to maintaining operating production levels; overcoming issues related to maintenance and obsolescence; subcontractor management; management of large complex contracts in highly regulated industries; management of complex Contractor Human Resource Management (CHRM) requirements; and successful partnerships with the Government, Client, and Regulators). The higher the degree of relevance of the work, the greater the consideration that may be given.

DOE will evaluate recent past performance information for contracts that are currently being performed or have a period of performance end date within the last 4 years from the original solicitation issuance date. To the extent that performance evaluations are divisible, the Government will only evaluate performance that occurred within the four (4) year period preceding the original solicitation issuance date. More recent past performance information may be given greater consideration.

The Government will not apportion the assessment of past performance differently amongst the members of a Contractor's Teaming Arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1), on a past performance contract, as each entity is considered to be responsible for overall performance of the ongoing or prior contract. All partner companies on past performance contracts will be equally credited (positively and negatively) for past performance information. However, relevancy determinations on a past performance contract may differ depending upon what scope each entity is proposed to perform.

- (b) Teaming Subcontractors. The Offeror's proposed Teaming Subcontractors as defined in the Section L.10(a)(2) will be evaluated on the assessment of the past performance information obtained for the Teaming Subcontractor performing work similar in scope, size, and complexity to that proposed to be performed by that Teaming Subcontractor. The DOE will evaluate past performance information for contracts that are currently being performed or have been completed within the last 4 years from the original solicitation issuance date.
- (c) Newly formed entity and predecessor companies. The evaluation of past performance for the Offeror and any Teaming Subcontractor(s) may be based on the past performance of its parent organization(s), member organizations in a joint venture, limited liability company, or other similar or affiliated companies, provided the Offeror's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent, member, or affiliated company will be provided or relied upon in contract performance such that the parent, member, or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. Meaningful involvement means the parent, member, or affiliate will provide material supplies, equipment, personnel, or other tangible assets to contract performance; or that the common parent will utilize the expertise, best practices, lessons learned, or similar resources from the affiliate to affect the performance of the Offeror. Past performance information from predecessor companies that existed prior to any mergers or acquisitions may also be considered where the Offeror's proposal demonstrates such performance reasonably can be predictive of the Offeror's performance.
- (d) Work to be performed. DOE will evaluate the Offeror and all members of a teaming arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1) and any Teaming Subcontractors, in accordance with the work each entity is proposed to perform to cover the work scope described in the Master IDIQ PWS. The resulting rating will consider whether the Offeror's team as a whole (including Teaming Subcontractors) have demonstrated relevancy to all PWS requirements.
- (e) No record of past performance. If the Offeror or Teaming Subcontractor(s) do not have a record of relevant past performance or if information is not available, the Offeror or Teaming Subcontractor(s) will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably.
- (f) Performance information. The Government will only evaluate past performance information for work it considers relevant to the acquisition in terms of similar in scope, size, and

complexity, as defined above in paragraph (a), and within the timeframe specified, as defined above in paragraph (a). The Offeror may also be evaluated on safety statistics (OSHA, Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) and Total Recordable Case (TRC)) and DOE enforcement actions and/or worker safety and health, nuclear safety, and/or classified information security incidents or notifications posted to the DOE Office of Enterprise Assessments website (<https://energy.gov/ea/information-center/enforcement-infocenter>) and corrective actions taken to resolve those problems.

- (g) Terminated contracts, cure notices, and conditional payment of fee/profit/other incentive actions. The Government may consider contracts of the Offeror, to include all members of a teaming arrangement, as defined in FAR 9.601(1), and Teaming Subcontractors that:
(1) were terminated for default; (2) included a cure notice(s), in accordance with FAR Part 49, *Termination of Contracts*; and (3) included a conditional payment of fee/profit/other incentive action(s) as described in the DEAR, over the preceding four (4) years from the original solicitation issuance date, including the reasoning for the aforementioned actions.
- (h) Sources of past performance information. The Government may consider past performance information from sources other than those provided by the Offeror, such as commercial and government clients, government records, regulatory agencies, and government databases such as the Government's Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and award fee determinations. The Government may contact any or all of the references provided by the Offeror and will consider such information obtained in its evaluation.

Note: DOE contracts are not necessarily evaluated with more relevance than non-DOE contracts, based on the sole fact that it was work for the DOE. The evaluation of relevancy is based on the factors listed above. Scope, size, and complexity determinations will be made solely based on the relationship of past work to current requirements, without any preference or benefit given based on the entity for which the work was performed.

- (i) List of DOE contracts. The Government may consider the information provided per Section L, Attachment L-8, *List of DOE Contracts*; and evaluate past performance information on work determined to be relevant to the acquisition in terms of similar in scope, size, and complexity, as defined above in paragraph (a).

M.4 Evaluation Factor – Management Approach

- (a) Contract Transition Approach. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's approach to achieve the Contract Transition Task Order requirements, including Contractor Human Resource Management (CHRM) requirements in Section H, for the safe, effective, and efficient transfer of responsibility for execution of the Master IDIQ Contract with little or no disruption to ongoing operations.
- (b) Management Approach. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's management approach to: effectively negotiate, manage, implement and execute multiple simultaneously performed Task Orders for the Master IDIQ PWS; integrate tank farm and WTP operations; vision of optimal solutions for disposition of tank waste to achieve significant risk and financial

liability reduction; interface and collaborate with other site contractors; and partner with the DOE and the Regulators.

- (c) Small Business Participation. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's approach to meet or exceed the small business subcontracting requirement of 18 percent of the cumulative value of Task Orders, including subcontracting of meaningful work scope.

M.5 Evaluation Factor – Cost and Fee/Profit

The Cost and Fee/Profit Proposal will not be adjectivally rated or point scored, but will be considered in the overall evaluation of proposals in determining the best value to the Government.

The Cost and Fee/Profit Proposal will be evaluated for cost realism and price reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1 and price FAR 15.402(a). Cost realism analysis will be performed on the Offeror's proposed Transition Task Order costs. This analysis will be used to determine whether the proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed and reflect a clear understanding of the transition requirements. The transition cost proposal will be compared to the Volume II proposal for consistency and understanding of the requirements. Price reasonableness will be performed on both the proposed fully burdened labor rates (excluding fee) for the period February 1, 2023 through January 31, 2024 applied to the DOE provided Estimated Direct Productive Labor Hours and of the proposed key personnel costs. Key personnel compensation is capped at \$568,000 for each designated key person, as established by Section 702 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013.

For purposes of determining the best value, the evaluated price will be the total of the proposed fee/profit (all fee/profit proposed by Task Order type) for a 1-year period (not exceeding the identified fee limitations), proposed costs for Key Personnel (up to the compensation limits shown above), proposed costs for the FY 2023 fully burdened labor rates (excluding fee) applied to the DOE provided Estimated Direct Productive Labor Hours (Offeror's additional proposed direct labor categories included in L-6g shall not be used to compute the evaluated price for award purposes), and realistic costs for the Transition Task Order period. Mathematical errors shall be corrected to compute the evaluated price. An Offeror that proposes a fee amount exceeding the maximum prescribed available award fee, target fee, and/or fixed fee amounts as specified in Section L may be considered unacceptable for award.

M.6 DOE-M-2011 Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors (Oct 2015)

- (a) The relative importance of the evaluation factors for the Technical and Management Proposal (Volume II) are below.
- (1) Key Personnel;
 - (2) Past Performance; and
 - (3) Management Approach.

Key Personnel is more important than Past Performance and Management Approach. Past Performance and Management Approach are considered equal in importance.

- (b) The evaluation factors for the Technical and Management Proposal (Volume II), when combined, are significantly more important than the total evaluated price (Volume III). Each evaluation factor applicable to this solicitation is identified and described in this and other provisions of this Section M. The descriptive elements of each evaluation factor will be considered collectively in arriving at the evaluated rating of the Offeror's proposal for that evaluation factor. Areas within an evaluation factor are not sub-factors and will not be individually rated, but will be considered in the overall evaluation for that particular evaluation factor.

M.7 DOE-M-2012 Basis for Award (Oct 2015)

The Government intends to award one contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating each Offeror's proposal against the evaluation factors described above. The evaluation factors for the Technical and Management Proposal will be adjectivally rated. The Cost/Price evaluation factor will not be rated, however the evaluated price will be used in determining the "best value" to the Government. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior Technical and Management Proposal than making an award at the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one Offeror's Technical and Management Proposal over another. Thus, to the extent that Offerors' Technical and Management Proposals are evaluated as close or similar in merit, the evaluated price is more likely to be a determining factor in selection for award.

This page intentionally left blank.