

SOURCE SELECTION PLAN - ATTACHMENT 1
Raven Rock IRTC
Technical Evaluation Plan

I. Proposal Evaluation:

The purpose of this technical evaluation plan is to establish a uniform evaluation procedure based on defined evaluation factors included in the solicitation. Each member of the Technical Evaluation Board (TEB) shall independently review and evaluate each proposal. This evaluation includes technical, past performance, and price factors as described in the solicitation and this source selection plan.

Each TEB member will independently complete an assessment of each offeror's technical and past performance proposal information and assign an adjective rating to each evaluation criteria. The TEB, as a whole, will then discuss the individual ratings assigned. The adjective ratings will be compared for each of the evaluation criteria. In cases where board members have divergent adjective value ratings, a discussion of the merits of the offeror's proposal will seek to resolve the major differences.

II. Proposal Instructions to Offerors:

The offerors will be asked to submit bid prices for the value of the product offered and the costs of the services **and** complete a technical approach form. The instructions that follow are taken from the prospectus.

A. Price: Offerors must submit offers for the mandatory timber cutting units in terms of the unit price for each advertised product. The offer form states minimum acceptable offer rates and estimated quantities of timber. A price must also be submitted for the cost of the services.

Offerors must also enter a rate per unit and a total offer on the offer form for the mandatory and optional stewardship projects and may provide a separate price proposal that, as a minimum, contains a breakdown of the person hours, equipment, materials, overhead, profit and any other direct and indirect costs that substantiate the offeror's submitted prices.

1. **Completeness:** The proposal covers all requirements of the performance work statement/specifications, includes all pricing information required by the solicitation, and the Schedule of items is completed as required. The contractor must provide pricing for the Timber Sale and all service projects.
2. **Reasonableness:** Prices are reasonable in comparison to estimates, prior prices paid, competition and can be supported by suitable estimating techniques.
3. **Realism:** The government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced between the line items or sub-line items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated, as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. For example, if unique and innovative approaches are the basis for an unbalanced/inconsistently

priced proposal, the nature of these approaches and their impact on price must be completely documented. The burden of proof of realism rests solely with the offeror. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the government.

B. Technical Proposal: This section shall be clear, concise, and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation. The section should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather shall provide convincing rationale that effectively represents their technical capacity to perform the work described in the offering. The technical proposal will be used to make an evaluation and arrive at a determination as to whether the proposal will meet the requirements of the Government. It should include a detailed description of the techniques, procedures, and program for achieving the objectives of the specifications/statement of work, specifically addressing the following sub-factors:

1. Each offeror shall submit a list of contractor owned equipment (size and capacity) that will be used on this contract, the number of employees that usually are employed by the contractor, what tasks of the work will be performed by subcontractors, a list of subcontractors and their relative experience, and provisions for securing additional equipment and personnel. Additionally, the contractor will provide a proposed schedule of work on how they will accomplish the projects identified in this solicitation. The following should be included:
 - plan of operation for both timber harvest and stewardship project work, including a timeline;
 - quality control plan for both harvesting and service projects;
 - names and work experience of contract manager and on-the-ground supervisor;
 - equipment proposed to be used to accomplish the contract.
 - production capability to accomplish contract within timeline.

C. Capability and Past Performance: As part of the evaluation process, the Government will assess each offeror's past performance. The offeror shall present factual material dealing with contracts performed for other Government agencies, including the US Forest Service, or with private sector businesses for which the same or similar services were provided. Information requested includes successful execution of contracts. When problems were encountered briefly describe the problem areas and the steps taken to resolve or correct. For those contracts with less than positive performance, you are encouraged to provide a description of the problems and the efforts made to correct and to prevent future occurrences. Offerors are cautioned that the Government will use information provided by the offerors and information obtained from other sources in the development of the performance confidence assessments. The content should include a detailed description of the following sub-factors:

1. Key Personnel – Experience of personnel in similar work both in recency and relevancy
2. Subcontractors – Use of subcontractors and their quality of service/control
3. Past Contracts - Contract performance for projects of the same and size scope and timeliness of performance.

Offerors shall provide a list of all contracts similar in size and scope completed or on-going in the last 3 years on Attachment 2, Technical Proposal. Include the following information for each contract:

- Contracting agency/Business Name
- Contract Number
- Brief description of contract effort (service)(i.e. type of road, length of road, equipment used, tasks performed and trades used)
- Total Contract Value
- Period of Performance and indicate whether the contracts completed within the required performance time?
- Client's Name, Address, Telephone number, and point of contact

Offerors lacking recent and relevant present/past performance experience may submit information regarding key personnel who have recent and relevant experience. In this case, offerors shall provide the following information, as a minimum, to allow government evaluators to conduct a present/past performance evaluation for those key personnel cited by the offeror.

- Name of Key Personnel
- Complete Address
- Telephone Number
- Brief synopsis of relevant experience (a resume may be submitted)

The technical proposal (Attachment 2) is to be completed to address past performance proposal requirements. Additional information may be submitted to supplement this form as necessary. Offerors need to ensure all necessary past performance information is provided as noted above.

Any derogatory past performance information obtained will be presented to the affected offeror and that offeror will have an opportunity to respond with any mitigating facts. The final determination of past performance ratings shall rest with the contracting officer.

NOTE: "Relevant past performance" is defined as services the same or similar to those in the Statement of Work contained in this solicitation.

D. Utilization of Local Work Force: For the purpose of this Source Selection Plan, the local community is defined as the area relevant to the contract area, specifically the area of Heflin, AL. The offeror shall describe their ability to enhance local and small business employment. Identify how you intend to utilize local hires and subcontractors.

E. Geographical Proximity: Offeror shall provide driving distance in miles from contractor's and/or subcontractor's facility to Heflin, AL. Identify where you intend to deliver logs. Provide the name of the facility and its distance in miles from Heflin, AL town limits. A small business concern is a concern primarily engaged in the timber harvest or service work, which is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation, and together with its affiliates, does not employ more than 500 persons.

III. Factor Ratings:

Price

Prospective contractors must submit offers for the mandatory timber cutting units in terms of the unit price for each advertised product. The offer form states minimum acceptable offer rates and estimated quantities of timber.

Offerors must also enter a rate per unit and a total offer on the offer form for the mandatory and optional stewardship projects and may provide a separate price proposal that, as a minimum, contains a breakdown of the person hours, equipment, materials, overhead, profit and any other direct and indirect costs that substantiate the offeror's submitted prices.

Technical Approach

EXCEPTIONAL (E)

The proposal exceeds the requirements of the solicitation and provides an exceptional or outstanding approach that fully satisfies the Government's requirements. A complete understanding of the solicitation is demonstrated. Selection for award can be made without further exchange with the contractor.

ACCEPTABLE (A)

The proposal fully satisfies the requirements of the solicitation and demonstrates a good understanding of the solicitation. The offeror has adequately addressed all of the technical elements requested by the solicitation. Selection for an award could potentially be made without further exchange with the contractor.

MARGINAL (M)

The proposal does not fully meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses are identified which would indicate an insufficient understanding of the solicitation requirements. With minor revisions or clarifications, the proposal has a reasonable chance of becoming technically acceptable.

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

The proposal fails to satisfy requirements of the solicitation and the approach contains an unacceptable level of risk to the Government. Major deficiencies have been identified in the proposal which are either not correctable or would require major revision/rewrite to the proposal, without which the proposal doesn't have a reasonable chance of becoming technically acceptable.

Capability and Past Performance

EXCEPTIONAL (E)

Based on the offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

ACCEPTABLE (A)

Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

MARGINAL (M)

Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

NO RATING

No relevant past performance is available for evaluation. The offeror has asserted that it has no relevant past performance directly related or similar past performance experience. Proposal receives no merit or demerit for this factor.

Utilization of Local Work Force

EXCEPTIONAL (E)

The offeror will enhance local business development by using local hires and/or subcontractors to carry out all of the timber and service projects.

ACCEPTABLE (A)

The offeror will enhance local business development by using local hires and/or subcontractors to carry out more than one of the timber and service projects.

MARGINAL (M)

The offeror will enhance local business development by using local hires and/or subcontractors to carry out one of the timber and service projects.

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

The offeror will not enhance local business development by using local hires and/or subcontractors to carry out any of the timber and service projects.

Geographical Proximity

EXCEPTIONAL (E):

The contractor's headquarters or branch office is located within 40 miles of Heflin, AL; and/or the contractor has shown that a majority of the work will be accomplished using local contractors and hires.

ACCEPTABLE (A):

The contractor's headquarters or branch office is located within 41 to 100 miles of Heflin, AL and or the contractor has shown that half of the work will be accomplished using local contractors and hires.

MARGINAL (M):

The contractor's headquarters or branch office is located within 101 - 200 miles of Heflin, AL and or the contractor has shown that less than half of the work will be accomplished using local contractors and hires.

UNACCEPTABLE (U):

The contractor's headquarters or branch office is located over 200 miles from Heflin, AL and or the contractor has shown that a minority of the work will be accomplished using local contractors and hires.

Overall Proposal

Proposals will receive the following rating for the factors indicated. The information is taken from the solicitation. The following should be used as a guide in determining the rating of each factor and the overall evaluation of each technical proposal. **Note: If the offeror receives an unacceptable rating in any technical evaluation sub-factor, the technical proposal may receive an overall unacceptable rating.**

EXCEPTIONAL (E)

The proposal exceeds the requirements of the solicitation and provides an exceptional or outstanding approach that fully satisfies the Government's requirements. A complete understanding of the solicitation is demonstrated. Selection for award can be made without further exchange with the contractor.

ACCEPTABLE (A)

The proposal fully satisfies the requirements of the solicitation and demonstrates a good understanding of the solicitation. The offeror has adequately addressed all of the technical elements requested by the

solicitation. Selection for an award could potentially be made without further exchange with the contractor.

MARGINAL (M)

The proposal does not fully meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses are identified which would indicate an insufficient understanding of the solicitation requirements. With minor revisions or clarifications, the proposal has a reasonable chance of becoming technically acceptable.

UNACCEPTABLE (U)

The proposal fails to satisfy requirements of the solicitation and the approach contains an unacceptable level of risk to the Government. Major deficiencies have been identified in the proposal which are either not correctable or would require major revision/rewrite to the proposal, without which the proposal doesn't have a reasonable chance of becoming technically acceptable.

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary:

When the adjective ratings for each factor/sub-factor of each proposal have been finally assigned, the evaluation board members will jointly discuss each proposal separately and develop an evaluation board consensus adjective rating for each technical proposal (a single adjective rating for each proposal will be determined). The basis for each adjectival rating for each criterion assigned by individual evaluators will be furnished to the chairperson. The criteria established on the rating sheet will be used in developing the consensus adjective rating for each proposal. If a consensus rating cannot be reached, then the Chairperson of the evaluation board will decide which rating is most representative. The consensus rating will be one of several factors considered in the recommendation for award by the contracting officer

When consensus ratings for all proposals have been completed, the TEB will present a summary of their evaluation to the Contracting Officer. Their summary will include the overall rating for each technical proposal indicating the strengths, weaknesses, and any clarifications needed associated with each proposal. These weaknesses may be negotiated to correct proposal deficiencies, at the discretion of the Contracting Officer.

In cases where an offeror may not have the minimum acceptable rating for a specific evaluation criterion: The Contracting Officer will determine whether or not the proposal can be made acceptable. If it can be made acceptable with adjustment, then discussions will be needed to correct the proposal deficiencies. If the determination is that the proposal fails to comply with basic solicitation instructions, or is weak and lacking in clarity concerning ability to meet the basic requirements, it will be rejected from the competitive range, since it could not be made acceptable without major revisions.

V. Award without Discussions:

The Contracting Officer will only clarify the offerors' information; no discussions are contemplated. Offerors may be given the opportunity to clarify relevance or adverse past performance to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Clarifications are limited exchanges between the Government and offerors that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated. There will be no renegotiation of unit prices submitted.

VI. Competitive Range Determination:

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and reserves the right to award a contract without discussions with offerors. Offers should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms, from a price and technical standpoint, which the Contractor can submit to the Government. The source selection procedure will begin with an initial review of the proposals and continue through a technical evaluation conducted by the TEB. The TEB will rate the proposals based on the evaluation criteria identified above. The results of the TEB ratings will be presented to the Contracting Officer (CO). The CO will determine rankings of each offer and establish the competitive range. If it is determined that discussions are necessary, the TEB and the CO will initiate discussions (written and/or oral) with each offeror in the competitive range. At the conclusion of discussions, if any, held with those offerors within the competitive range, the CO shall review any clarifications or information received from the offerors in response to a request for Final Proposal Revisions, and adjust evaluation scores as appropriate, with assistance from the TEB, if needed. The CO shall prepare a Recommendation for Award based upon its evaluation of which proposal is considered to be most advantageous to the Government, cost and other factors considered. This recommendation and the supporting rationale shall be forwarded as necessary if Contracting Officer not serving as the SSA, via the Recommending Official, to the SSA. The CO's action on the Recommendation for Award will be clear and unequivocal and will be made part of the official contract record. Award will be made to that offeror whose proposal is determined to be most advantageous to the Government, cost and other factors considered.