



TI 801-02
October 02, 2000

US Army Corps
of Engineers

Technical Instructions

Family Housing

Volume 1: Project Management Manual

Headquarters
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Directorate of Military Programs
Engineering and Construction Division
Washington, DC 20314-1000

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTIONS

Family Housing

Any copyrighted material included in this document is identified at its point of use.
Use of copyrighted material apart from this document must have the permission of the copyright holder.

Approved for public release; distribution in unlimited

Record of Changes (e.g. changes are indicated \1\ .../1/)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>
------------	-------------	-----------------

These Technical Instructions supersede AEI Army Family Housing dated 1 November 1996, revisions to the statement of work dated 29 May 1997 and 10 September 1999, and incorporates EIRS Bulletins 97-02, Encl 3, Telephone Cable in Family Housing; 97-04, Encl 3, Family Housing Energy Conservation Improvements; and 99-01, Encl 1, Carbon Monoxide Alarms in New Family Housing.

FOREWORD

This Technical Instruction (TI) provide family housing project management guidance and design and construction criteria for the development of family housing projects. TI apply to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) commands and Major Army Commands (MACOM). This TI should be used when planning projects and preparing Requests for Proposals (RFP) for new, replacement, and major renovated construction of family housing for Army customers, other military services and for other customers as appropriate. This TI is effective immediately and is applicable to unprocured family housing and to proposed FY 00 and future family housing programs.

This TI reflects changes to the design criteria and process of procuring family housing. Contracting guidance contained herein should not be used as a substitute for thorough knowledge of current acquisition regulations. If a conflict arises between this guidance and the acquisition regulations, the acquisition regulations govern.

We will continue to work to improve family housing criteria and the process for procuring family housing. This TI is a living document and users are requested to address recommendations for changes and improvements, with their rationale for the proposed changes, through the Center of Standardization to HQUSACE, ATTN: CEMP-MA and CECW-EIV, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000.

This TI is distributed electronically through the TECHINFO Internet site <http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil.htm> and the Construction Criteria Base (CCB) system maintained by the National Institute of Building Sciences at Internet site <http://www.nibs.org/ccb/>. Locally reproduced copies should be checked against the current electronic version prior to use to assure that the latest instructions are used.

Files which can be edited to develop RFPs are available from the USACE Center of Standardization for Army Family Housing, U.S. Army Engineer District, Norfolk, ATTN: CENAO-EN -DE, telephone (757) 441-7693, Email: Peter.G.Reilly@usace.army.mil.

FOR THE DEPUTY COMMANDING GENERAL FOR MILITARY PROGRAMS:



STEPHEN E. BROWNING P.E.
Chief, Programs Management Division
Office of the Deputy Commanding General
for Military Programs



DWIGHT A. BERANEK, P.E.
Chief, Engineering and Construction Division
Office of the Deputy Commanding General
for Civil Works

PROJECT MANAGEMENT MANUAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>NUMBER OR APPENDIX PARAGRAPH TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.	INTRODUCTION TO FAMILY HOUSING AND THE DESIGN-BUILD PROCESS	
	1. PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION	1-1
	2. THE DESIGN-BUILD APPROACH IN ARMY FACILITY CONSTRUCTION	1-1
	3. HOUSING ACQUISITION PROGRAMS	1-2
	4. LEGAL BASIS	1-4
2.	USING AND EDITING THE TECHNICAL INSTRUCTIONS ARMY FAMILY HOUSING	
	1. VOLUME 1, USING THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT MANUAL	2-1
	2. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX A, TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL	2-1
	3. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX B, TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS	2-1
	4. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX C, OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY EVALUATION MANUAL	2-1
	5. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX D, US EPA ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM APPLICATIONS	2-1
	6. VOLUME 2, MODEL REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS	2-2
	7. VOLUME 2, EDITING THE ATTACHMENTS	2-2
	8. VOLUME 2, STATEMENT OF WORK, EDITING INSTRUCTIONS FOR NEW, REPLACEMENT, AND RENOVATED CONSTRUCTIONS.	2-5
3.	PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND SITE SELECTION	
	1. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	3-1
	2. FAMILY HOUSING SURVEY AND PROGRAMMING	3-1
	3. PROJECT DOCUMENTATION, REVIEW, AND CERTIFICATION	3-1
	4. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	3-2
	5. LAND ACQUISITION OPTIONS	3-2
	6. SITE SELECTION	3-2
	7. SITE VERIFICATION	3-4
	8. COST ESTIMATES	3-5
4.	CODE 1 ACTIVITIES	
	1. PROJECT INITIATION - CODE 1 DIRECTIVE	4-1
	2. SCOPE VERIFICATION	4-2
	3. PRE-DESIGN CONFERENCE	4-2
	4. SITE INVESTIGATION	4-2
	5. CODE 1 ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	4-3
5.	DEVELOPING A DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)	
	1. DESIGN INITIATION - CODE 2 DIRECTIVE	5-1
	2. PREPARING THE DRAFT RFP	5-1
	3. ACQUISITION REGULATIONS AND SOURCE SELECTION	5-1
	4. REVIEW AND COORDINATION	5-2
	5. DRAFT (PRE-FINAL) RFP COORDINATION MEETING	5-3
	6. CODE 2 ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	5-3
6.	ADVERTISING THE RFP	
	1. CODE 6 DESIGN DIRECTIVE	6-1
	2. ADVERTISING	6-1
	3. SOURCE SELECTION	6-1
	4. CODE 6 ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	6-1

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>NUMBER OR APPENDIX PARAGRAPH TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
7.	PROPOSAL PREPARATION PERIOD	
	1. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE	7-1
	2. QUESTIONS DURING THE PROPOSAL PERIOD	7-2
	3. PLANNING FOR THE RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS	7-2
	4. ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	7-4
8.	RECEIVING AND EVALUATING PROPOSALS	
	1. LEGAL AND CONTRACTING REVIEW	8-1
	2. ENGINEERING DIVISION TECHNICAL REVIEW	8-1
	3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION	8-2
	4. EVALUATING OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY	8-3
	5. DRAFT SOURCE SELECTION MEMORANDUM	8-3
	6. ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	8-4
9.	DISCUSSIONS AND AWARD	
	1. AWARD BASED ON INITIAL OFFER	9-1
	2. AWARD BASED ON DISCUSSIONS	9-1
	3. SOURCE SELECTION	9-2
	4. COORDINATING THE FINAL SOURCE SELECTION MEMORANDUM	9-3
	5. PREPARING FOR AWARD	9-3
	6. AWARD	9-4
	7. ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	9-7
10.	POST AWARD ACTIVITIES	
	1. DEBRIEFING THE UNSUCCESSFUL OFFERORS	10-1
	2. PRE-DESIGN FOR CONSTRUCTION CONFERENCE	10-1
	3. COMPLETION OF DESIGN	10-2
	4. CONSTRUCTION	10-3
	5. RECORD KEEPING	10-3
	6. POST AWARD ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST	10-3
APP A	TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL	
	1. OVERVIEW OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION	A-1
	2. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES	A-1
	3. SCORING	A-2
	4. TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL	A-3
APP B	TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS	B-1
APP C	OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MANUAL	
	1. OVERVIEW OF OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY EVALUATION	C-1
	2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES	C-1
	3. EVALUATION MANUAL AND SCORING WORKSHEETS	C-1
APP D	OFFEROR PROJECT TEAM AND PERFORMANCE PLANS EVALUATION MANUAL	
	1. OVERVIEW OF OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY EVALUATION	D-1
	2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES	D-1
	3. EVALUATION MANUAL AND SCORING WORKSHEETS	D-1

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>NUMBER OR APPENDIX PARAGRAPH TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
APP E	US EPA ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM APPLICATIONS	
	1. OVERVIEW OF THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM	E-1
	2. THE FOCUSES OF THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM	E-1
	3. WORKING WITH THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM DURING SOLICITATION DEVELOPMENT	E-2
	4. ASSURING COMPLIANCE WITH ENERGY STAR CONSIDERATIONS DURING PROPOSAL EVALUATIONS	E-2
	5. CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS - PERFORMANCE BY THE CONTRACTOR	E-3
	6. ENERGY STAR CHECKLISTS - STEP-BY-STEP COMPLIANCE	E-4
	7. INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE CHECKLISTS	E-4

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO FAMILY HOUSING AND THE DESIGN-BUILD PROCESS

1. PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION.

a. Purpose. These Technical Instructions (TI) for family housing consolidate into one document uniform criteria for the planning, design, evaluation, and construction of Army family housing. They also contain guidance on the use of negotiated, design-build procedures for procurement. They provide U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Project Architects/Project Engineers (PA/PE), Project Managers (PM) and Major Army Command (MACOM) planners with a single source document to guide the process of planning, developing, and executing Army family housing projects utilizing the competitive negotiations source selection process to select a design-build Contractor.

b. Organization. This document is organized in two volumes. The first volume, this document, is the Project Management Manual which describes the process of planning, developing, and executing a design-build family housing project. Materials supporting the source selection process are provided in the appendices. The second volume is a generic model Request for Proposals (RFP) to be used in developing RFP for family housing projects. The generic model follows the standard contract format for construction prescribed by EFARS 14.201-1(a)(1), (reference 1-1). The generic model STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) in Volume II, contains the design criteria for Army family housing to be implemented for Army projects. This model, when edited for a specific site and project composition, will form the basis for an RFP for family housing acquisition. Detailed instructions for using the Project Management Manual, for editing the Project Management Manual appendices, and for editing the sections of the model RFP are provided in Chapter 2 of this volume. Please note that contracting guidance contained in this TI is provided as an outline and should not be used as a substitute for thorough knowledge of current acquisition regulations. If a conflict arises between this guidance and the acquisition regulations, the acquisition regulations shall govern.

2. THE DESIGN-BUILD APPROACH IN ARMY FACILITY CONSTRUCTION.

a. Background. Since the early 1980s, the Congress has urged the military services to explore alternative construction methods. An area of particular interest is procurement by nontraditional approaches such as design-build, which includes both design and construction under a single contract. In most cases, this procurement process has significant advantages over the traditional, two contract, design-bid-build method for family housing. Primary advantages of design-build include the following:

(1) The proposer is allowed freedom to optimize design and construction methods in meeting design program requirements.

(2) The Government can achieve a shorter overall time frame for design and construction than with conventional design-bid-build techniques.

(3) Having a single Contractor for design and construction reduces disputes over the meaning of construction documents.

(4) Negotiated procurement encourages the Government and Contractor to work together to optimize design objectives, construction cost, and construction time frame.

b. Definition. Design-build contracting means combining both design and construction of a facility in a single contract. By comparison, in traditional design-bid-build contracting, design and construction are

sequential and contracted for separately. There are a variety of design-build contracting methods; a one-step "turnkey" selection procedure under 10 USC 2862 (reference 1-2) is one of the types.

c. Procedures. The design-build process uses an RFP to solicit for design and construction of a project by a single contractual entity. This entity may be a design-build firm, a joint venture between an architect-engineer (A-E) and a construction firm, or a construction management firm joint venture with an A-E and a construction firm. A design-build RFP states the project functional requirements, design and engineering criteria, technical performance specifications, proposal submission requirements, and proposal evaluation factors. Potential contractors develop their proposals for the Government to evaluate competitively, with the contract award based on a combination of technical merit and price. Therefore, the contract is not awarded on the basis of only initial construction cost, but also technical quality, offeror qualification, management expertise, life-cycle costs, aesthetics, and other factors important to a specific project as identified in the RFP. This process is referred to as a "Best Value" procurement.

3. HOUSING ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

This TI addresses requirements for MCA and O&M Family Housing projects. The overall management of Army housing programs is governed by AR 210-50 (reference 1-3). In addition to operation and maintenance of housing, this AR also addresses construction, leasing, and support documentation required for justification of housing requirements. This AR should be consulted when developing the programming requirements for family housing acquisition. Although the military construction program is the primary vehicle for acquiring new housing, and replacing and performing major upgrades of existing housing, a brief description of family housing acquisition programs is provided below:

a. Military Construction Program. Construction may be accomplished either by conventional or design-build methods. Conventional construction involves the use of in-house design staff or contract Architect-Engineer (A-E) services for the planning and design of a construction project. For Invitation for Bids (IFB) projects plans and specifications are developed, reviewed, and approved, bids are solicited, and a firm fixed price contract is awarded for the new construction. The design-build method solicits proposals from contractors which incorporate the requirements stated in an RFP. Based on a review of the proposals submitted, an award is made and the Contractor then undertakes the execution of the project. Construction projects at overseas locations will utilize, to the greatest extent possible, "factory built," "manufactured housing," or "concrete housing" in accordance with 10 USC 2821 (reference 1-4). Overseas housing, including materials, equipment, appliances, and systems will be procured in the United States, unless prohibited by country-to-country agreements.

b. Purchase of Existing Housing. When a construction program is authorized by the Congress, existing private housing (for projects of 35 units or more) may be acquired in lieu of construction if the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) determines it is in the best interest of the Government to do so. Acquisition is also accomplished through the military construction program.

c. Build to Lease Program (801). 10 USC 2835 (reference 1-5) allows the military services to lease housing using private sector funding. Section 801 housing may be constructed on private land. Housing may be rehabilitated or new construction built for the purpose of lease to the Government as military family housing. The lease term is for 20 years, after which time the private developer is free from any obligation to the Government. Lease cost to the Government is capped on a project-by-project basis.

d. Rental Guarantee Program (802). 10 USC 2836 (reference 1-6) allows the military services to enter into an agreement with a private developer to assure occupancy of rental housing constructed or rehabilitated as residential housing. Housing may be constructed on private land, constructed by a State or local housing authority on private land, constructed on land owned by a State or local government, or constructed on a military installation. OSD policy dictates that improvements must be sited on Government land. The rental guarantee term is for 25 years and may be renewed, if the project is on a military installation. The private developer would be provided a guarantee for up to 97 percent occupancy at a rental rate within the affordability range of military families. All design and construction costs are to be borne by the private developer.

e. Host Nation Housing. Various host nations provide facilities to support the United States military presence in that country. When the host nation provides military family housing, it will be constructed to the standards expressed in the SOW to the maximum extent practical.

(1) Adjustments may be made to accommodate local conditions (i.e., local density practice, car parking, utility systems requirements) so long as they do not exceed the standards for normal United States military construction. To the extent practical, program management and design reviews will be accomplished at the local level in order to avoid delays to the host country's schedules. Architectural design will be sensitive to local aesthetic tastes.

(2) Local building codes and standards may be used, except that United States life safety and fire protection standards will not be waived or otherwise compromised. Security fencing and lighting standards will be commensurate with the need. When the lawful or "normal construction practice" of the host country will not allow provision of certain amenities, such as air conditioning, supplemental funds may be programmed for timely completion of the additional work. Particular attention should be given to the local practice of long-term facility maintenance, which may differ from United States standards. Provisions will be made for the selection of materials and finishes that can be easily maintained.

f. Land Lease of Non-Excess Property. Another "innovative" mechanism to acquire housing is through the land act lease of non-excess property under 10 USC 2667 (reference 1-7). It provides that the secretary of a military department may lease land up to five years (longer, if justified in the public interest). In exchange for the negotiated land lease, the Government may require the private developer to construct military family housing to be individually rented at affordable rates. In addition, the fair market value of the lease interest may be provided by the private developer through either cash or "in-kind" considerations (generally interpreted as a reduction in monthly rentals to the military family).

g. Army Residential Communities Initiative. Public Law 104-106, as codified in 10 U.S.C. 2871 et seq. are provisions collectively known as the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. This law provides the Services with alternative authorities for construction and improvement of military housing (family and unaccompanied personnel). Under these authorities, the Services can leverage appropriated housing construction funds and government-owned assets to attract private capital in an effort to improve the quality of life for our soldiers and their families. This legislation provides a way to maximize use of limited appropriated funds, land, and existing facilities to encourage private sector investment.

(1) Under the Residential Communities Initiative (RCI), the Army will establish long-term business relationships with private sector developers for the purpose of improving military family housing communities. The Army will provide the developer a long-term interest in both land and family housing assets. These developers will become the master community developers for the Army community. The primary source of financial return for the developers will be the revenue stream generated from military personnel housing allowances paid as rent.

(2) Using the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process, the Army plans to select a "development partner" for several pilot projects. The RFQ process emphasizes the experience of the developer, their development concept for an installation, their financial and organizational capabilities, past performance, expected financial return, and their ability and plan to utilize small business concerns. Once a developer is selected for a particular installation, the Army will partner with this firm to jointly forge a Community Development and Management Plan (CDMP), which will be the blueprint for developing the residential community at that installation.

4. LEGAL BASIS

a. 10 USC 2826 (reference 1-8) establishes net area limitations for military family housing. Statutory floor area limitations for living units are shown in Volume 2, Statement of Work, TABLE 5-1.

- b. Subsubsection 2826(c) (reference 1-8) permits increases in the floor area limitations if such increases will permit award of a design-build contract or permit purchase, lease or conversion of housing units. Section 2826(c) thus implicitly authorizes design-build for military family housing.
- c. Regardless of whether conventional design-bid or design-build methods are used, subsection 2826(b) (reference 1-8) permits net floor areas to be increased by a maximum of 10 percent for officers holding special command positions as designated by the Secretary of Defense, commanding officers of military installations, and senior noncommissioned officers of military installations. The floor area increases under subsections 2826(b) and (c) (reference 1-8) are limited to a total of 10 percent.
- d. Public Law 102-190, Section 2808 (reference 1-9) permits increases in floor area limitations for family housing units in locations where harsh climatological conditions severely restrict outdoor activity for a significant part of each year.
- e. Manufactured housing, as defined by 42 USC 5402(b) (reference 1-10), is a manufactured house that is "a structure, transportable in one or more sections which in the traveling mode is 8-body ft [2440 mm] or more in width, or 12.2 m [40 ft] or more in body length or, when erected on the site, is 320 or more ft² [24 m²], and which is built on a permanent foundation when connected to the required utilities, and includes the plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems contained therein."
- f. Public Law 100-615 (reference 1-11) and Federal Regulations 10 CFR 435, Subpart C (reference 1-12), require Federal buildings to be designed and constructed to reduce energy consumption in a life-cycle, cost-effective manner using renewable energy sources when cost effective. RFPs will contain prescriptive and trade-off approaches that produce energy efficient designs and construction. The Statement of Work provided in this TI contains language and requirements which comply with the EPA Energy Star Homes Program. New housing built in accordance with these requirements shall be labeled as "Energy Star" homes, selected contractors are not required to be registered Energy Star Homes builders. These approaches should be geared to prevailing local practices for energy efficient housing.
- g. 42 USC 4901-4918 (reference 1-13) and 49 USC 1431 (reference 1-14) require Federal agencies and State and local governments to develop measures to control the harmful effects of noise on people. In response to this act, the Department of Defense (DoD) established DODINST 4165.57 (reference 1-15). Implementation of these requirements is covered in TM 5-803-7 (reference 1-17). In general, military family housing sites, including mobile home parks, should be restricted to Noise Zone 1 having a rating of 0-55 Day-Night Average Level (DNL). In no case should the DNL exceed 65. These standards also apply to housing sites near heavily traveled highways.
- h. 10 USC 2862 (reference 1-2) authorizes the use of the design-build process for military construction projects. The Army family housing program pre-dates the enactment of section 2862, and the procedures established in this TI satisfy the requirements for approval contained in section 2862. Procedures for developing design-build projects for facility types other than family housing are contained in ER 1180-1-9 (reference 1-18); CEMP-EA Memorandum, 25 August 1995, Delegation of Design Build Approval Authority; Design-Build Instructions (DBI) For Military Construction (reference 1-19), and Technical Requirements for Design-Build TI 800-03 (reference 1-16).

REFERENCES

- 1-1 FAR 15, "Contracting by Negotiation" and EFARS 14.201-1(a)(1), Uniform Contract Format
- 1-2 Title 10 USC 2862, "Turnkey Selection Procedures". Amends Public Laws: 102-190, Section 2802(b); 101-189, Section 2806; and 100-180, Section 2301
- 1-3 AR 210-50, "Installations, Housing Management," 26 Feb 1999
- 1-4 Title 10 USC 2821, "Requirement for Authorization of Appropriations for Construction and Acquisition of Military Family Housing," 3 January 1987
- 1-5 10 USC 2835, "Long Term Leasing of Military Family Housing to be Constructed," December 5, 1991
- 1-6 10 USC 2836, "Military Housing Rental Guarantee Program," December 5, 1991

- 1-7 10 USC 2667, "Leases: Non-excess Property," January 3, 1989
- 1-8 10 USC, 2826, "Limitations on Space by Pay Grade," October 1, 1982
- 1-9 Public Law 102-190, Section 2808, "Increase in the Amount of Space for Military Family Housing Under Certain Circumstances," December 5, 1991.
- 1-10 42 USC 5402(b), "Definitions, Manufactured Home," 3 January 1989
- 1-11 Public Law 100-615, "Federal Energy Management Improvement Act of 1988," October 11, 1988
- 1-12 10 CFR 435, Subpart C, "Mandatory Performance Standards for New Federal Residential Buildings," January 1, 1992
- 1-13 42 USC 4901-4918, "Noise Control," January 14, 1983
- 1-14 49 USC 1431, "Control and Abatement of Aircraft Noise and Sonic Boom," 3 January 1989
- 1-15 DODINST 4165.57, "Air Installation Compatible Use Zones," November 8, 1977
- 1-16 TI 800-03, "Technical Requirements for Design-Build," 1 July 1998
- 1-17 TM 5-803-7, "Airfield and Heliport Planning Criteria," 12 May 1981
- 1-18 ER 1180-1-9, "Design-Build Contracting", 31 July 1999
- 1-19 "Design Build Instructions (DBI) For Military Construction", 29 October 1994

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

- DB Design-Build
- PM Project Manager
- PA/PE Project Architect/Project Engineer (Technical Point)
- CS Contract Specialist
- TM Army Technical Manual
- ER Army Engineer Regulation
- PDT Project Delivery Team

CHAPTER 2

EDITING THE TECHNICAL INSTRUCTIONS, ARMY FAMILY HOUSING

1. VOLUME 1, USING THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT MANUAL.

The Project Management Manual provides a step by step discussion of the process of procuring Army Family Housing utilizing the one-step turnkey process. Each chapter describes a phase of the work, and chapters are placed in project sequence. Checklists of activities are included at the end of most chapters. Project design teams are encouraged to review and complete these checklists with respect to the specific work assignments and methodologies of their specific Districts, the Activity Lead identification is only an example of a possible process. The appendices which follow the Project Management Manual are provided to facilitate the source selection process. This chapter discusses the ways of using the Project Management Manual, its appendices, and the Model Request for Proposals (Volume 2 of this TI).

2. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX A, TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL.

The Technical Evaluation Manual is designed to be given to the team that evaluates the technical quality of offerors' proposals and assigns quality points to reflect the relative value to the Government. The Technical Evaluation Manual is coordinated with Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00120, PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA. This section of the RFP tells prospective offerors the relative value of the elements elaborated in the STATEMENT OF WORK. Coordination of RFP Section 00120; the STATEMENT OF WORK; the TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL; and the TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS must be accomplished for each project RFP developed. Although minor modification of these four areas is acceptable to reflect unusual user requirements and site conditions, modifications in general are discouraged.

3. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX B, TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS.

The technical evaluation worksheets are designed for use by the evaluation team to record quality points and comments. These sheets are a record of the quality evaluation and are necessary to support the source selection process. Worksheets are matched to Volume 2 Section 00120, APPENDIX A, TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL. Modification to worksheets must be coordinated with Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00120; the STATEMENT OF WORK; and the TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL..

4. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX C, OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY EVALUATION MANUAL.

The Offeror's Performance Capability Evaluation Manual establishes standards of acceptability and desirability with regard to various features of the offeror's responsibility and capability. Requirements for demonstration of offeror's capability are stated in the Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00110. This section requires completion of SOW, Attachment 4, Proposal Data Sheet. The performance capability evaluation is also referred to as Factor 5 in RFP Section 00120, PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA. The Offeror's performance capability will be evaluated in accordance with the guidelines factors in Appendix C. Appendix C contains both the evaluation manual and worksheets. Modifications to Appendix C must be coordinated with the other areas discussed in this paragraph.

5. VOLUME 1, APPENDIX D, US EPA ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM APPLICATIONS

The information contained in this Appendix is a general overview of the EPA's Energy Star Homes Program and provides a checklist to be completed for each unit type during construction. The Energy Star Program requirements have been incorporated into the basic Statement of Work contained in Volume II of this TI.

6. VOLUME 2, MODEL REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP), EDITING NUMBERED CONTRACT SECTIONS.

Volume 2 of this TI has been put together in the required contracting format for an RFP. Contract clauses cited are for informational purposes and must be updated each time an RFP is prepared in addition to the coordination requirements discussed in this chapter. Contracting guidance in this TI is not to be used as a substitute for thorough knowledge of the current acquisition regulations. If a conflict arises between the guidance in this TI and the acquisition regulations, the acquisition regulations govern. A listing of the contract sections and their titles is shown below:

SECTION	TITLE
00010	SOLICITATION, OFFER AND AWARD (STANDARD FORM 1442) AND PRICING SCHEDULE
00100	INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS/OFFERORS, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD
00110	PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS
00120	PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
00600	REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF BIDDERS/OFFERORS
00700	CONTRACT CLAUSES
00800	SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

7. VOLUME 2, STATEMENT OF WORK, EDITING INSTRUCTIONS FOR NEW, REPLACEMENT, AND RENOVATED CONSTRUCTION.

a. Applicability. The STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) is a narrative description of the requirements for an Army family housing unit and the associated site development. In addition, the SOW contains some prescriptive requirements below which no family housing unit is acceptable. The SOW should be used as a criteria document to develop projects for procurement by RFP. The criteria in the SOW should also be used to develop design drawings for procuring family housing by Invitation for Bid (IFB). The SOW is organized in the following order and the subparagraphs which follow contain information for use when modifying the SOW.

SOW PARA. NO.	TITLE
1	DESIGN OBJECTIVES
2	CRITERIA REFERENCES
3	SITE PLANNING

SOW PARA. NO.	TITLE
4	SITE ENGINEERING
5	UNIT DESIGN - ARCHITECTURE
6	UNIT DESIGN - STRUCTURAL
7	UNIT DESIGN - THERMAL PERFORMANCE
8	UNIT DESIGN - PLUMBING
9	UNIT DESIGN - ELECTRICAL
10	UNIT DESIGN - HEATING, VENTILATING AND AIR CONDITIONING
11	ENERGY CONSERVATION
12	CONTRACTOR PREPARED SPECIFICATIONS
13	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

b. New and Replacement Construction. The model STATEMENT OF WORK is the standard for development of new and replacement family housing. Local options for editing are shown in brackets. USACE design activities should edit the STATEMENT OF WORK to reflect site specific conditions. Upgrades of the stated criteria in response to installation requests must have been itemized and funding identified on the programming documents.

(1) Where an installation expresses a particular design for a finish or material, that information can be included in the Statement of Work and identified as a possible material quality increase for additional consideration during the technical evaluation. Following that identification, a statement must be included that this identification is not authorization to exceed the maximum construction funds available for this project as indicated in Section 00010 of the solicitation.

(2) Tornado Shelters/Protection. If a proposed project is to be constructed in a tornado prone area, the installation may identify such requirements during the development of the project in the 1391 process and seek specific funding and approval from ACSIM to support the inclusion of such requirements into the project. Identification of this need must be made at the programming stage of the project. As a general consideration, the project site must be categorized as being at "High Risk" when evaluated with respect to "Wind Zone" and "Tornado Activity" in accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Mitigation Directorate publication FEMA 320 (Oct 1998).

(3) Force Protection and Anti-Terrorism Considerations. Beginning in FY-03 all new construction and whole neighborhood improvement projects will require construction in accordance with applicable DoD standards. For prior year projects, Design Districts shall investigate applicable requirements and include in the solicitation statement of work. The current criteria is an "Interim Department of Defense Antiterrorism/Force Protection Construction Standards". The revised standards are currently in draft form and are being finalized.

c. Using the STATEMENT OF WORK for Renovation.

(1) Design Objectives and Criteria References. The intent of these paragraphs is to provide the Army with family housing which closely approximates housing available in the commercial market in the United States. The technical criteria contained in the STATEMENT OF WORK rely on industry standards as references whenever possible to provide a house comparable to private construction. Objectives and criteria references are the same for new, replacement, and renovated construction.

(2) Site Planning. The objectives of site planning are the same for new, replacement, and renovated construction. The goal is to provide each family a visually identifiable unit with a defined front yard, rear yard, and a garage adjacent to the unit whenever possible. Site densities may be adjusted to accommodate existing construction and street patterns. Overseas sites are normally built to higher density than those in the continental United States. Although retention of existing street patterns may be desirable, street patterns which facilitate through traffic within family housing neighborhoods should be reworked. Provide identifiable neighborhoods as discussed in Paragraph 3 of the STATEMENT OF WORK.

(3) Site Engineering. When site utilities are replaced or upgraded as part of a major renovation project, they should comply with the criteria as stated. New construction performed in connection with renovation will follow the criteria stated. Renovated construction should also consider requirements for soil treatment, termite control, decay treatment, asbestos, lead based paint and radon mitigation.

(4) Unit Design - Architecture. The goal of Paragraph 5 of the STATEMENT OF WORK as it applies to renovation is to provide a family housing unit of equal livability. Critical elements of the plan to be considered are the provision of primary living spaces on the primary floor including: living/dining room, kitchen, family room, half bath, washer and dryer space, bulk storage, and adjacent garage. Bedrooms with adequate storage and bathrooms meeting the STATEMENT OF WORK requirements may be provided on the primary floor or a secondary floor.

(a) Accessible Units. Accessibility requirements for handicapped individuals apply equally to new, replacement, and renovated construction. Whenever a feature of existing housing is renovated or upgraded it becomes subject to whatever accessibility requirements apply.

(b) Net Area. Although net area requirements apply to new, replacement, and renovated housing, Congress has approved small increases in net areas of renovated housing when they are requested and explained on the programming documents. Increases have been granted in cases where the provision of a family room, utility room, and half bath on the primary floor cannot be accommodated without exceeding the allowable net area. The cost of renovation, however, must be weighed against the cost of replacement and the lesser cost chosen, unless historic preservation issues are involved.

(c) Functionality, Dimensions and Areas. In renovation, functionality goals are of primary importance, such as not using rooms for circulation paths. Minor deviations in minimum dimensions are acceptable to accommodate existing walls. Minimum area requirements should be met or exceeded.

(d) Fire Protection and Sound Attenuation. Upgrading units to comply with construction standards for fire protection and sound attenuation is required. Units should comply with Paragraphs 5.d and 5.e. of the STATEMENT OF WORK.

(e) Finishes. When upgrading units comply with Paragraphs 5.i. through 5.s. Preserve existing good quality finishes, repairing whenever possible. Give careful consideration to retaining good quality finishes such as brick facing, slate and tile roofing, hardwood floors, ceramic tile, doors, windows, millwork, and cabinetry.

(5) Unit Design - Structural. Comply with the criteria as stated.

(6) Unit Design - Thermal Performance. Base thermal performance decisions on life cycle cost analysis.

(7) Unit Design - Plumbing. Comply with Paragraph 8., however, consider retaining existing plumbing fixtures which can be refinished.

(8) Unit Design - Electrical. Comply with Paragraph 9., however, consider retaining good quality or distinctive lighting fixtures.

(9) Unit Design - Heating, Ventilating and Air Conditioning (HVAC). Comply with Paragraph 10. In renovation, pay special attention to energy conservation features. Equivalent and innovative approaches to meeting these criteria are encouraged.

d. Using the STATEMENT OF WORK for Historic Housing. Historic family housing quarters should be maintained in a way which preserves their historic significance, integrity, and military history. Significant materials, spaces, and features are as follows:

(1) Planning and Programming. To preserve historic character, significant interior and exterior features must be identified and documented prior to programming a project for renovation of historic family housing. Concerned parties including the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), installation planning and maintenance staff, design architects and engineers, and housing occupants should agree on the scope, intent, and preservation objectives of a proposed project. When agreement cannot be achieved with the SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation may be called upon to achieve resolution. Preserving historic character takes precedence over full compliance with the family housing criteria in the STATEMENT OF WORK.

(2) Accessible Units. Historic housing units should be made accessible to handicapped individuals where this is possible without destroying the historic character of the building. Minimum accessibility requirements include site and parking access, access to primary living spaces, and access to one bedroom and one bathroom. When this requirement cannot be met for historic housing, equivalent units must be provided by new or replacement housing until the total installation requirement is met.

(3) Net Area. See Paragraph 7.c.(4)(b) above.

(4) Functionality, Dimensions, and Areas. See Paragraph 7.c.(4)(c) above.

(5) Fire Protection. Fire protection requirements will be met to provide protection to the occupants, the building, and its historic features. Protection will be accomplished by means which are unobtrusive and do not degrade the historic features of the building.

(6) Features and Finishes. Preservation of historic features, finishes, and spaces is of primary importance. Repair using matching materials is the best approach. Historic features may include landscaping, site features, building materials, and features of the building plumbing, mechanical and electrical systems (e.g., plumbing fixtures, fireplaces, grilles, radiators, stoves, lighting fixtures).

(7) Historic Structures. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings is the primary source of information on the treatment of historic structures. Chapter 16 of Technical Instructions, Design Criteria, (TI 800-01) provides sources and additional information on historic preservation laws, regulations, definitions, design issues, and available treatment resources.

8. VOLUME 2, EDITING THE ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF WORK.

The ATTACHMENTS reflect project specific requirements and should be edited to suit the situation. See the following table for a summary of ATTACHMENTS and special instructions:

ATTACHMENTS		
NO.	TITLE	NOTES
1	TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	USACE Design activity to provide
2	OUTLINE SPECIFICATIONS	See Section 0110 for requirements
3	FORMAT FOR REQUIRED AREA CALCULATIONS	See Section 0110 for requirements
4	PROPOSAL DATA SHEET	Not always required. See Section 0110.
5	PROPOSAL DRAWING FORMAT	USACE Design Activity title block, format, symbols, etc.
6	SITE AND LOCALITY MAPS	USACE Design Activity to provide.
7	PROJECT AND SAFETY SIGNS	USACE Design Activity to provide, samples included with in Volume II.
8	GEOTECHNICAL REPORT	USACE Design Activity to provide.
9	EXCERPTS FROM THE INSTALLATION DESIGN GUIDE.	USACE Design Activity to provide.
10	FIRE FLOW DATA	USACE Design Activity to provide.
11	LIST OF DRAWINGS	USACE Design Activity to provide.
12	ASBESTOS AND LEAD PAINT SURVEY RESULTS	USACE Design Activity to provide. This attachment will only be used for projects which include demolition requirements.

CHAPTER 3

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND SITE SELECTION

1. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT.

Programming is the responsibility of the military installation, Major Army Command (MACOM), and the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is responsible for execution. This chapter addresses the process of project development from the perspective of USACE validation of the project developed by the installation, and validated by the MACOM and ACSIM. USACE activities may provide programming assistance on a reimbursable basis and are encouraged to offer this service to the Installations they support. Programming should conform to the requirements of AR 210-50 (reference 3-1), and AR 415-15 (reference 3-2).

2. FAMILY HOUSING SURVEY AND PROGRAMMING.

The Department of the Army relies on the local community as the primary source of suitable housing for military families. When the local community is not capable of meeting housing needs, acquisition of family housing will be programmed. The family housing requirements survey is the first phase in the planning process. Properly executed, it will be the basis for determining the family housing requirements and supporting acquisition programs. When the requirements survey is approved by ACSIM it triggers the balance of the advance planning activity. In planning, the following should be considered:

- a. **Project Scope and Cost Limits.** The scope of each family housing construction project will provide for land planning, site preparation, design, construction, equipment, and support facilities such as roads, streets, walks, utility systems, landscaping, parking, and recreation areas. The maximum project cost, including appliances, contingency, supervision and administration, and the number of dwelling units for each project are fixed when Congress approves the programming documents.
- b. **Programming.** Close attention must be given to preliminary planning actions. The Department of Defense (DoD) relies on the program documents which result from preliminary planning accomplished by the military installations to support the program presented to Congress. After legislative enactment, project scope revisions due to inadequate preliminary planning are embarrassing and can result in project cancellation.

3. PROJECT DOCUMENTATION, REVIEW, AND CERTIFICATION.

The programming document, DD Form 1391, is the product of the investigations described in this chapter. The DD Form 1391 should accurately reflect the project scope in terms of the number of dwelling units, unit types, number of bedrooms per unit, unit development criteria, site development requirements, and the anticipated costs to accomplish the project.

- a. In accordance with AR 415-15, Paragraph 3-5, (reference 3-2), the USACE Major Subordinate Command (MSC) will review the project documentation submitted by the MACOM for compliance with technical standards, criteria, and cost engineering requirements. This chapter outlines specific requirements which must be checked. This review will include a site visit. MSC may delegate DD Form 1391 review to its family housing design district.
- b. Once the review has been completed and revisions made, the MSC will forward to the MACOM a statement that the project scope complies with Army standards, criteria, and cost engineering requirements, that deviations indicated are justified, and that sufficient information is available to commence the RFP process. In addition, this statement will list those issues that must be resolved before budget submission to prevent project delay or loss.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.

In accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 USC 4321-4361 (reference 3-3) environmental effects will be considered in the planning of projects and proposals including those for family housing. A preliminary environmental assessment should be made, by the installation, at the earliest stages of project development. A written environmental assessment will be proposed for all family housing projects and made a part of the planning record. For those projects having a significant impact on the environment, or anticipated to be controversial, an environmental impact statement will be prepared and processed in accordance with DoD Directive 6050.1 (reference 3-4) and AR 200-2 (reference 3-5).

5. LAND ACQUISITION OPTIONS.

Sites on the installation are generally the optimum selection. DoD owned on-post or off-post sites should be utilized for family housing projects if possible. When neither of these options are feasible, the exchange of land with local entities should be investigated prior to requesting authority to procure land with appropriated funds. Procurement of land from other Government agencies or non-Government sources is the least desirable option. Prior to purchasing a site for military family housing projects or designing projects for Government-owned land, a thorough site analysis should be performed. The site analysis should consider the factors discussed above and in TM 5-803-14 (reference 3-6). If land acquisition is required, a map showing the proposed location, parcel boundaries, estimated acreage, estimated acquisition cost, and other pertinent information is necessary.

6. SITE SELECTION.

Selection of candidate sites should be based on a site analysis. The site analysis provides documentation of the site opportunities and constraints for family housing that will ensure the site meets the program requirements. The site analysis should be used to develop a family housing area development plan that will reflect a compatible and functional area development that emphasizes optimal use of the site elements with the least disruption to the existing natural environment.

a. Installation Real Property Master Plan Documents. The recommendations of the installation Real Property Master Plan and Installation Design Guide which concern the candidate site and/or family housing in general should be documented.

(1) Installation Real Property Master Plan. Installation Real Property Master Plans include family housing area requirements. Master plans provide comprehensive documentation of existing conditions of the natural, man-made and human resources of the installation as a whole. It guides the future land use development and provides for the orderly growth of the installation. Master planning is accomplished in accordance with AR 210-20 (reference 3-7) and TM 5-803-1 (reference 3-8).

(2) Installation Design Guide. The Installation Design Guide provides guidelines for creating a visually consistent, harmonious, and attractive installation. The recommendations of the design guide should be considered in the family housing layout and unit design. The Installation Design Guide is developed in accordance with TM 5-803-5 (reference 3-9).

a. Site Analysis. Provide a documented analysis of on-site and off-site existing conditions and evaluate the impacts these conditions have on the program requirements. Complete documentation of the analysis and evaluation are important as a thorough site analysis is fundamental to a responsible family housing area development plan and site design. The site survey map is the base map for the site analysis. The analysis and evaluation include the following in accordance with guidance discussed in TM 5-803-14 (reference 3-6):

(1) Off-Site Conditions.

(a) Land Use. Consideration should be given to the distance to schools, churches, stores, and fire protection facilities.

(b) Transportation Systems. A site traffic impact analysis should determine the proper location and design of site access. The analysis should consider the trip generation and design-hour volumes, trip distribution and traffic assignment, existing and projected volumes, capacity analysis, traffic accident analysis, and traffic improvement plan. Off-post sites should be located within 30 miles [48.3 km] or one hour commute, one-way, during rush hours, whichever is less, by private transportation. In projects where significant numbers of new dwelling units will impact community highway systems, funding for access roads improvements may be available through the Defense Access Roads Program. If this situation exists, the Military Traffic Management Command should be contacted for additional information.

(c) Utilities. Because of the high cost of constructing utility mains, proximity to existing utilities such as water, electricity, gas, storm and sanitary sewer, and provision for gravity flow in storm and sanitary sewers should be discussed. The impact of the proposed project on the existing utility systems and the proximity to existing utilities should be evaluated. The cost of providing appropriate utility support for the proposed project will be addressed.

(d) Environmental Conditions and Hazards. Clearance from sewage treatment plant. Minimum - conservation safety distances from ordnance activities.

(e) Historical or archaeological resources.

(f) Safety Hazards. Proximity to airfields and other sources of hazards.

(g) Physical Security.

(h) Sources of Air, Noise, or Light Pollution. Proximity to airfields, highways, and other sources of noise.

(i) Visual Conditions.

(2) On-Site Conditions.

(a) Geology. A site requiring extensive excavation in bed rock should be avoided. A geotechnical investigation should be conducted for each project. The result should be based on a subsurface exploration plan designed to incorporate a unique set of project specific factors.

(b) Topography. Sites requiring excessive cut and fill should be avoided.

(c) Density. Land area for density calculations excludes slopes greater than 10 percent, major highways, flood plains and flood areas, lakes and water courses. Designated major recreation areas greater than 1.2 ha [3 acres] may be excluded from the density calculation. Density guidelines are provided in the STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW), TABLES 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3. Minimum site planning requirements are stated in Paragraph 3 of the STATEMENT OF WORK.

1/ Low-density siting is appropriate when existing Government land is readily available for residential use.

2/ Medium-density siting is appropriate when Government land is in short supply or private sector land can be purchased for reasonable prices (less than 15 percent of the unit cost) or local land use practice dictates this density.

3/ High-density siting is required when Government land is in extremely short supply or unavailable, land purchase is costly (greater than 15 percent of the unit cost), the surrounding zoning is urban, and local land use practice dictates this density.

- (d) Hydrology. Site requiring an elaborate drainage system should be avoided.
- (e) Soils.
- (f) Climate.
- (g) Microclimate. Potential for passive solar orientation.
- (h) Vegetation.
- (i) Wildlife Habitat.
- (j) Environmental Conditions and Hazards. An investigation should be conducted to determine if the site contains radon that will impact on the safe use of the site for family housing. Determine that the site is free of Hazardous and Toxic Waste (HTW) to include the following:
 - 1/ Soil contamination.
 - 2/ Underground storage tanks (UST).
 - 3/ Solid waste disposal.
 - 4/ Leaking fuel lines.
 - 5/ Ground water contamination.
 - 6/ Ordnance impact waste.
 - 7/ Former oil and hazardous spill sites, gas leakage, etc.
- (k) Historic or archaeological resources. An archeological investigation should be conducted for sites being considered to ensure that the sites do not include anything that will prohibit their use as a housing site
- (l) Visual Conditions.
- (m) Wetlands Protection.
- (3) Site Opportunities and Constraints. Provide the evaluation as a written and graphic summary of site opportunities and constraints for family housing. The documentation should show the boundaries and acreage, the number and types of units to be situated on the land, any waivers, conditions or restrictions, and the points of connection to the required utility systems. Footprints of the units or street patterns within the housing site boundaries is not required.

7. SITE VERIFICATION.

Based upon the site opportunities and constraints and evaluation of the program requirements, verify that the site meets the family housing program requirements. The selection of a housing site will be in accordance with specific guidance issued for each project in the Code 1 Design Directive. The USACE activity (design agency) should verify the following planning areas of the selected site:

- a. Suitability of the existing utility infrastructure to support the new development.
- b. Consideration of the mitigation of negative effects on the environment from the proposed development.

c. Adequacy of the selected site to suit the proposed development in terms of unit density, recreation areas, and occupant amenities.

8. COST ESTIMATES.

Cost estimates for the site procurement and/or required improvements to the site to support the new development will reflect the impact of the findings from the above investigations. This information must also be forwarded to the MACOM for input to the programming documents.

REFERENCES

- 3-1 AR 210-50, "Installations, Housing Management," 26 Feb 1999
- 3-2 AR 415-15, "Army Military Construction Program Development and Execution," 4 Sept 1998
- 3-3 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), January 1, 1970, 42 USC 4321-4361
- 3-4 DoD Directive 6050.1, "Environmental Effects in the United States of DoD Actions," July 30, 1979
- 3-5 AR 200-2, "Environmental Effects of Army Actions," 23 December 1988
- 3-6 TM-5-803-14, "Site Planning and Design," 14 October 1994
- 3-7 AR 210-20, "Master Planning of Army Installations," 30 July 1993
- 3-8 TM-5-803-1, "Installations Master Planning," 13 June 1986
- 3-9 TM-5-803-5, "Installation Design," 1 March 1981

CHAPTER 4 CODE 1 ACTIVITIES

1. PROJECT INITIATION - CODE 1 DIRECTIVE.

a. Directive. Design-build projects are initiated by directive from HQUSACE (CEMP-MA). The Design Code 1 shown on the directive is the authorization for selection of an architect-engineer (A-E), accomplishment of site investigation work including topographic surveys, subsurface and utilities investigations, and other work to the extent defined by special instructions of individual directives.

b. Scope and Project Definition Conferences. The general scope and composition, in terms of numbers of dwelling units, unit types, and number of bedrooms for each unit type will be specified in the design directive and the project DD Form 1391. The initial directive also generally requires a pre-design or pre-RFP preparation conference to be held at the installation.

c. Project Management. The USACE Project Manager (PM), in consultation with the PDT, should establish an overall project schedule as soon as possible after receipt of the Code 1 Directive. Normally, this should be completed within the first 30 days and entered into Project Reporting and Management Information System (PROMIS). Financial management data should be entered in the Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS). The PM is responsible for complying with the requirements of ER 5-1-11 (reference 4-1). The duties and responsibilities described in the following chapters belong collectively to the PM and the members of the project delivery team.

d. In-house Versus A-E. The decision whether the RFP documents are to be developed in-house or by A-E is critical to scheduling. All technical criteria, the statement of work, and any attachments and drawings and other technical information are developed by the respective technical specialists from the USACE Design District. The preparation of RFP sections normally referred to as the 'contract' (Section 00010-00800) are prepared by the PDT Contract Specialist with the exception of Section 00110, PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS and Section 00120, PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA. Additionally the technical team is responsible for the preparation of THE STATEMENT OF WORK, ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF WORK, and all DRAWINGS. In-house preparation is the preferred method. The decision on whether to use In-house personnel or an A-E depends on the availability of in-house technical staff and workload. Advantages of preparing the RFP documents in-house include:

(1) The level of knowledge and understanding of the competitive negotiations and the proper preparation for the source selection process is directly related to staff involvement in the development of the RFP documents.

(2) Technical personnel become involved and familiar with the project from the start.

(3) Expertise in design-build procurement is developed and maintained.

(4) Considerably more cost and staff time may be required for the use of an A/E contractor, providing direction, information, and review of an A-E developed RFP document package.

(5) In-house staff should have the needed familiarity with standards, criteria, and installation requirements. Consultant A/E firms are not generally familiar with RFP preparation and performance oriented criteria.

(6) The team that prepared the RFP stays with the project, participates in the proposal technical reviews, may participate in the evaluation of proposals, reviews of design submissions after contract award, and provides technical support to the construction field office.

e. Project Delivery Team. The project delivery team is lead by the PM. The team members include the disciplines and interested parties needed to successfully execute the project. Composition of the team may change as the project progresses. At this stage of the project, the project delivery team should include at least the following members:

- (1) Customer Representative or Customer Project Manager
- (2) Project Manager
- (3) Contracting.
- (4) Legal.
- (5) PA/PE supplemented by technical specialists as necessary. (Early childhood specialist with experience designing children's play areas for infants and toddlers may be desirable on some projects).
- (6) Environmental specialist.
- (7) Construction representatives.

2. SCOPE VERIFICATION.

a. Scope of Work. The PM should ensure that a complete scope of work is available to the project team developing the RFP document. The first opportunity to accomplish this is through a thorough review of the project DD Form 1391, including the back-up data.

b. Programming. A comparison of the project DD Form 1391 to the topics addressed in Chapter 3 of these Technical Instructions (TI) will provide an outline of things that should have been addressed in the programming of the project.

c. Clarification. Clarification should be requested from the installation, Major Army Command (MACOM), USACE Major Subordinate Command (MSC), and HQUSACE if conflicts exist or if data are omitted from the documentation.

3. PROJECT DEFINITION CONFERENCE.

This initial pre-design conference is normally held at the installation, and is a directed activity by HQUSACE. The PM schedules the conference with representatives of the user, MACOM, and USACE. This conference is very important because it establishes the procedures for all subsequent activities. The PM is responsible for explaining to the user the Design-Build process and his or her role as the leader of the Project Delivery Team. Unless the user has recently participated in a family housing project, he or she may be unaware of the restraints imposed by criteria. This lack of knowledge will cause confusion and frustration, and is best addressed at the start of the project. The conference is also the PM's opportunity to ask questions and to satisfy himself or herself that the project scope and constraints are accurately reflected in the project DD Form 1391.

4. SITE INVESTIGATION.

Each RFP should include the Site Analysis and Development Plan which contains the following information:

a. Drawings. Site Survey drawing(s) at 1:500 [approximately 1" = 40'] showing site boundaries; existing utilities with their sizes; access roads; topographic survey with contours at a maximum spacing of 500 mm [or 2-foot] intervals (Design Districts are encouraged to utilize contours at 250 mm [or 1 foot] intervals where appropriate for the selected site); existing structures; endangered wildlife; wetlands boundaries; specific trees or groups of trees to be retained; areas set aside for schools, parks or playgrounds; and location of soil borings. Installation Real Property Master Plan drawing(s) showing the immediate area of the master plan, project site, surrounding area, primary circulation patterns through the site, mandatory collector streets (when required), and any other data necessary for site development should be at a smaller scale.

b. Site Analysis.

(1) Fixed-site boundaries should be indicated that provide the acreage of buildable land that will result in a land-use density within the range prescribed by current criteria. The acreage of buildable land should include provisions for building setback lines and construction limits.

(2) Topography and soil boring data will be of such quality and quantity as to permit proposers to prepare their proposals without the need for additional extensive site investigations.

(3) Mandatory site planning considerations, such as access to the future site and utility stub-outs and sizing should be determined and indicated as requirements in the STATEMENT OF WORK.

(4) Utilities and Energy Studies. Utilities, fuel selection, and energy conservation studies should also be completed under the Code 1 Design Directive.

(5) Documented site opportunities and constraints for family housing.

5. CODE 1 ACTIVITIES MATRIX.

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

CODE 1 ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	PM	PA /PE	CS
a. Verify design start-up funds were provided with the Code 1 Directive. (If not, request funds as soon as possible)		X		
b. Verify the selected site is on the approved Real Property Master Plan. (If not, ask Installation if a request for a Real Property Master Plan revision has been initiated.)	X	X		
c. Provide Real Property Master Plans of the Installation indicating the locations of the existing utilities and roads on and adjacent to the proposed project site.	X			
d. Check to see if a topographic survey and soils investigation have been performed.		X	X	
e. Determine if a topographic survey and/or soils investigation will be completed by in-house staff or contract A/E. Initiate necessary A/E actions.		X	X	
f. Determine if energy conservation, passive/active solar studies have been completed by the Installation or need to be accomplished.		X	X	
g. Provide any existing fuel and utilities studies applicable to the project site.	X			
h. Obtain confirmation that an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as applicable, has been prepared and approved.		X		
i. Request site category code from the Installation to determine if hazardous materials are present and need to be abated in accordance with AR 200-1 (Reference 4-2)	X	X		
j. Review the project scope and the Programmed Amount (PA). Site development costs can normally be expected to be 25 to 40% of the cost of the houses to the 1500-mm [5-ft] line.	X	X	X	
k. Establish the complete project delivery team.	X	X	X	

CODE 1 ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	PM	PA /PE	CS
l. Develop the project schedule and enter in PROMIS		X		
m. Schedule Project Definition Conference. Notify participants in writing of the meeting date, time, and place.		X		
n. Prepare and Staff Acquisition Plan		X	X	X

REFERENCES

- 4-1 ER 5-1-11, "Programs and Project Management", 27 Feb 1998
 4-2 AR 200-1, "Environmental Protection and Enhancement," 21 Feb 1997

CHAPTER 5

DEVELOPING A DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

1. DESIGN INITIATION - CODE 2 DIRECTIVE.

a. Code 2 Directive. The Code 2 Design Directive is the authorization to prepare the RFP. The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for initiating the request for a Code 2 Design Directive after completion of Code 1 activities. The Code 2 Directive contains special instructions which must be carefully read. These instructions may include requirements for passive solar design, factory-built housing, or other requirements of significant impact on the project.

b. Cost Adjustments. Although the dwelling unit net area cost may be dictated by budget guidance, USACE design activities have the opportunity to revise the cost estimate based on the increased knowledge of the scope and the attributes of the site selected. USACE design activities are required to submit a revised cost estimate, indicating revisions to scope, unique requirements, and/or special site requirements. This submittal shall be made on ENGR Form 3086, and shall be submitted to HQUSACE (CEMP-EE), not later than 1 August of the program year, and must be submitted prior to the request for Code 6 Design Directive. AR 415-15 (reference 5-1) provides additional information.

2. PREPARING THE DRAFT RFP.

a. Project Criteria. The RFP provides criteria for design and construction of the dwelling units, site improvements, and utilities. It also sets forth the requirements for submitting proposals, for evaluation of proposals, stipulates design development, and submission requirements after contract award. The RFP also includes contract clauses, wage rates, special clauses, and Contractor Quality Control (CQC) requirements. Drawings are also a part of the RFP showing the project site, boundaries and topography, existing utilities and roadways, and the desired connection points for utilities.

b. Model RFP. Volume 2 of these Technical Instructions contains a model RFP. The USACE Design District must edit the STATEMENT OF WORK to ensure that the project scope and site specific data are accurately reflected in the RFP. Project requirements and restrictions should be incorporated into the draft document prior to submission for review. Other RFP sections should be reviewed and updated to reflect current contracting requirements. Particular attention should be paid to Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00110 and Section 00120. Legal and contractual aspects of the procurement require close coordination with the technical requirements of the RFP.

c. Evaluation Criteria. With the development of the RFP, the evaluation criteria must begin development in this same period. Once completed, the evaluation criteria becomes part of the source selection plan and determines the relative importance and rankings of the various technical and offeror performance aspects of the proposals.

d. Cost Estimate. With the receipt of the Code 2 and the preparation of the draft RFP the Cost Engineering Activity of the Design District should begin work on preparing and completing the construction cost estimate. This cost estimate needs to include provisions for the design costs which will be included in the proposals from contractors. The final cost estimate should be completed and forwarded to Contracting Division prior to advertisement of the RFP.

3. ACQUISITION REGULATIONS AND SOURCE SELECTION.

Those involved in the preparation of the RFP must be familiar with the process of contracting by negotiation as detailed in FAR 15 (reference 5-2). When preparing the RFP, the goal should be to negotiate a successful source selection with a minimum of administrative complexity. A clearly developed RFP and source selection plan will minimize protests associated with competitively negotiated contracts.

Protests result from both errors and omissions in the RFP package, as well as flaws in the Government's source selection process. The following issues must be considered when preparing the RFP:

a. FAR 15.209 (reference 5-3) require the Contracting Officer to state whether the Government intends to award with or without discussions. Serious consideration must be given to the proper alternate selected for use in FAR 15.504 (reference 5-4).

(1) Alternate I states that proposals will be evaluated with, and award made after discussions with the offerors. Alternate I encourages discussions. This alternative describes the situation which occurs most frequently, and may occur even when the basic clause is specified.

(2) The basic clause states that proposals will be evaluated and award made, without discussions with offerors. This alternate also reserves the right of the Government to conduct discussions if it is later determined to be necessary by the Contracting Officer. Experience with previous solicitations indicates that award based on initial offer, without discussions, is rarely advantageous to the Government.

b. Evaluation Factors. The RFP must state the evaluation factors and any significant sub-factors, that will be considered in making the source selection and their relative importance. FAR 15.304 (reference 5-5) states that all evaluation factors, which will have a significant impact on the source selection decision, must be included in the solicitation. AFARS 15.605(a) (reference 5-6) states that a mere recitation of the top level criteria is insufficient. Offerors must be told of the minimum requirements that apply to a particular evaluation factor or sub-factor, and their relative weight in the evaluation process. FAR 15.408 (reference 5-3) states that the solicitation must clearly state the relative order of importance of all evaluation factors and any significant sub-factors. Evaluation factors and sub-factors may, but need not be described using numerical weights. A descriptive phrase may be included, such as, "sub-factors listed in descending order of importance" or "sub-factors are of equal importance." See Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00120, for an acceptable model.

c. Importance of Cost. Each negotiated contract solicitation must describe the relative order of importance of cost to the technical evaluation criteria. Offerors must be told whether cost is more or less important than the technical evaluation factors. If the relative order of importance is not stated, cost and technical factors must be treated equally. See Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00100, for an acceptable model.

4. REVIEW AND COORDINATION.

a. Distribution. Upon completion of the draft RFP, copies should be distributed for review to the Major Army Command (MACOM), installation, and USACE in-house staff including design, counsel, construction, and contracting. This process should ensure that project requirements have been accommodated and that the RFP is current in all aspects. Submission requirements for reviewing agencies will be established by the PA/PE. Twenty-one calendar days should be adequate for review of the draft RFP and receipt of comments.

b. Value Engineering of the RFP criteria, in a team effort with the user, is also encouraged prior to finalization.

c. The USACE design activity will finalize and submit a concept design level cost estimate (ENG Form 3086) based on the draft RFP, including site specific support costs, to HQUSACE (CEMP-EE) by 1 August of the design year. The USACE design activity will assure compliance with the approved project DD Form 1391 and highlight any scope or cost changes on the ENG Form 3086

5. DRAFT (PRE-FINAL) RFP COORDINATION MEETING.

a. Review Comments and Meeting. The PA/PE is responsible for assembling the review comments. Following receipt of comments, an RFP coordination meeting should be held at the installation where the

housing is to be built. Each reviewing agency should be provided advance notification of the meeting place, time, and date to afford maximum participation and involvement.

b. Procedure. The PA/PE should have available, at the meeting, sufficient copies of the review comments for distribution to the attendees. The PA/PE will act as chairman of the meeting and will prepare and distribute minutes of the meeting indicating the agreed upon disposition of each review comment.

6. CODE 2 ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST.

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

CODE 2 ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA/ PE	CS
a. Distribute copies of the model RFP to In-House USACE personnel for initial review and editing.			X	
b. Distribute copies of the project DD Form 1391 to In-House USACE personnel defining the scope of work.		X		
c. After initial editing of the draft RFP, distribute to appropriate reviewing agencies including the MSC, MACOM, the Installation, and the USACE construction activity (when design and construction are split)			X	
d. Request comments from all reviewing agencies for incorporation into the final RFP.			X	
e. Schedule an RFP coordination meeting to discuss incorporation of review comments into the RFP.			X	
f. Distribute pre-final review comments to In-House USACE personnel for incorporation into the final RFP.			X	
g. Submit ENGR Form 3086 to HQUSACE (CEMP-EC), not later than 1 August of the design year.		X	X	
h. Start Source Selection Plan.		X	X	
i. Request Code 6 authority from HQUSACE (CEMP-EA)		X		
j. Complete cost estimate and forward to Contracting Division			X	

REFERENCES

- 5-1 AR 415-15, "Army Military Construction Program Development and Execution," 9/4/1998
- 5-2 FAR Part 15, "Contracting By Negotiation"
- 5-3 FAR 15.209, "Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses"
- 5-4 FAR 15.504, "Award to Successful Offeror"
- 5-5 FAR 15.304, "Evaluation Factors and Significant Subfactors"
- 5-6 AFARS 15.605(a), "Evaluation Factors, Evaluation Criteria"

CHAPTER 6 ADVERTISING THE RFP

1. CODE 6 DESIGN DIRECTIVE.

The Code 6 Design Directive is the authorization to complete and advertise the RFP. The Code 6 Design Directive will also include a breakdown of funds for design and construction available to award a contract. This information must be added to the final RFP prior to advertisement. The Code 6 Design Directive may include special instructions and should be carefully reviewed.

2. ADVERTISING.

a. After all required information is obtained and approvals received, advertise the project on a SF 1417, Pre-solicitation Notice, and synopsise in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD). The widest possible distribution of the Pre-solicitation Notice to contractors with a potential interest in submitting proposals is desired. With large projects, competition can be expected on a nationwide basis.

b. The synopsis must be in the CBD 15 days prior to issuance of the solicitation. Allow approximately 21 days from the transmittal of the synopsis to the CBD to issuance of the solicitation to allow the CBD to publish the synopsis.

c. Issue the solicitation package to prospective offerors.

d. Normally, an 8-week proposal period is adequate for preparation of technical proposals.

3. SOURCE SELECTION.

The selection process can be complex, and if not followed precisely, can lead to re-procurement or cancellation of the contract due to incorrect procedures or protests. Familiarization with FAR 15 (reference 6-1) will assist those involved in the selection process in avoiding potential problem areas. A source selection plan must be prepared and be approved by the Source Selection Authority prior to issuance of the solicitation.

4. CODE 6 ACTIVITIES.

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

CODE 6 ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA /PE	CS
a. Verify that the date, time, and location of the Pre-Proposal Conference have been coordinated with the Installation and included in the RFP.			X	X
b. Verify that all RFP review comments have been incorporated or otherwise resolved to the reviewer's satisfaction.			X	X
c. Prepare Bidability, Constructability, Operability, and Environmental (BCOE) Certification and forward for signature.		X		
d. Review basis of award stated in the RFP to ensure it is clear.		X	X	
e. Review the explanation of the evaluation process in the RFP to ensure that it is clearly defined.		X	X	

CODE 6 ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA /PE	CS
f. Verify that site drawings are complete and ready to publish.			X	
g. Check that the special requirements from the Installation have been incorporated into the final RFP.			X	
h. Verify that the RFP had a final Contracting and Legal review		X		
i. Verify that the wage rates are current and appropriate for residential construction.			X	X
j. Prepare Source Selection Guidelines for review and approval.			X	X
k. Verify that the amount of funds available for construction are identified in the RFP.			X	
l. Verify that Source Selection Plan is completed.		X		

REFERENCES

6-1 FAR Part 15, "Contracting By Negotiation"

CHAPTER 7 PROPOSAL PREPARATION PERIOD

1. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE.

a. Purpose. Offerors normally engaged in the housing construction industry may not be knowledgeable about competitive negotiation as a source selection acquisition method used by the Government. As a result, the pre-proposal conference is very important. The conference, however, must be conducted with skill and caution. The purpose of the conference is to explain and clarify the Request for Proposals (RFP) and its contracting procedures.

b. Time, Place, and Preparation. The conference should be held within the first quarter of the proposed time for preparation of proposals. The conference should be held at the installation where the housing is to be built, if possible. Representatives from the installation should be invited to the pre-proposal conference. A tour of the site is desirable. Government provided transportation, such as a bus, is needed to transport the attendees to and from the project site from the conference site.

c. Conference Minutes and Transcript. Accurate minutes of the conference proceedings are essential. Some USACE activities obtain the services of a court recorder who will prepare a transcript of the proceedings. It is important that the pre-proposal conference attendees be told at the beginning of the conference that the transcript of the conference will be distributed, to all potential offerors. Verbal answers may not be totally accurate or may be misleading and USACE staff are cautioned to avoid providing verbal responses to questions posed during the pre-proposal conference. The recommended method is to state to all participants that the transcript of the meeting is intended to provide the Government with a complete record of all questions and issues raised such that specific answers can be provided in writing. The amendment issued following the conference should include any changes to the RFP, all proposer questions and answers to date, and shall constitute the official position of the Government. Attendees should understand that oral comments do not amend the solicitation, and only a written amendment alters the solicitation.

d. Major Points. Most of the pre-proposal conference time should be devoted to an explanation of the provisions of the RFP. The technical, contractual, and administrative portions of the RFP should each be explained in detail. Special attention should be directed to the following points:

(1) The technical proposal and the cost proposal must be submitted on the same date, and must be kept separate.

(2) The Government reserves the right to negotiate with the offerors, or to make an award without negotiation. If negotiations are entered into with one offeror, then negotiations (written or oral) will be conducted with all offerors in the competitive range.

(3) Award to the low dollar proposal is not mandatory. Offerors must be told in the RFP whether cost is more or less important than the technical evaluation factors.

(4) A review of the proposal submission requirements should be conducted, so that potential offerors understand what material is required to be submitted in response to the RFP.

(5) The Government will review all portions of the proposal package to determine compliance with the RFP criteria and to evaluate technical quality.

e. Questions. Most questions asked by attendees at a pre-proposal conference originate from the lack of understanding of the RFP. Offerors should be encouraged to submit written questions prior to the pre-proposal conference. Questions submitted in writing during the conference should also be accepted. If

verbal responses are provided at the Pre-Proposal Conference, questions should be answered by directing the attention of the attendees to a specific paragraph of the RFP that answers the question and reading the pertinent points from that paragraph. Questions from attendees should be recorded with the name of the person and the company represented included.

f. Government Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Conference. As a minimum, the Contract Specialist, the Project Manager, and the PA/PE should attend the pre-proposal conference. If available, the technical specialists who prepared the various technical portions of the statement of work may add value to the conference and should be encouraged to attend if funding permits.

g. Attendance Roster and Minutes. A roster of attendees should be compiled for the conference. Minutes of the conference should be taken and distributed with an amendment to all RFP holders.

2. QUESTIONS DURING PROPOSAL PERIOD.

a. Point of Contact. The RFP will designate the Contract Specialist as the single point of contact for offerors who have questions regarding the RFP. The solicitation shall include the name, address, phone number, FAX number, and e-mail address of the CS. The CS will, insofar as possible, answer questions by reference to the RFP itself, and will carefully avoid making any statement that could be construed as interpreting or modifying the terms of the RFP. A written record of all questions and answers must be maintained and kept in the official contract file.

b. Errors and Misunderstandings. If questions arising during the proposal period indicate an error in the RFP, or any point upon which serious misunderstanding by offerors could occur, a formal amendment should be issued to all holders of proposal packages, clarifying the points in question.

c. Amendments. Every effort should be made to prepare the RFP in such a manner to minimize the number of amendments necessary. The content of each amendment should be reviewed to ensure clarity of intent.

d. Performance Criteria. Offerors are each designing, at their own expense, a proposal which satisfies their interpretation of the RFP. Guidance should be oriented toward performance criteria as contrasted with specific criteria used in conventional procurements.

e. Responses to Written Questions. All written questions submitted to the USACE Design activity should be cataloged and responded to in writing and those questions and answers furnished to all plan holders. It is imperative that all potential proposers receive the same information, at the same time.

f. Timing of Amendments. Given the short proposal periods and the potential impacts of late or substantial amendments, the issuance of amendments to the solicitation should be done as quickly as possible to avoid potential delays to the proposal receipt date. As a general rule, the amendment following the pre-proposal conference should be issued within 7 calendar days following the pre-proposal conference and should address all known issues and corrections at that point. Amendments issued after this point must be carefully considered with respect to potential schedule and cost impacts.

3. PLANNING FOR THE RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS AND EVALUATION.

a. Receipt of Proposals. The date and time for receipt of proposals and prices will be established in the RFP. The PDT should use this date as a milestone from which to set the tentative dates for the evaluation.

b. Contracting Officer Approval. The source selection guidelines must be written, reviewed by counsel, and approved by the Contracting Officer prior to issuance of the final RFP.

c. Technical Review. When the date for receipt of proposals is finalized, the PDT should identify and begin selecting review teams, and block out time for contracting and technical reviews. Prompt handling

of proposals is necessary to assure that the review is complete and written technical comments prepared for use by the evaluation team.

d. Evaluation of Proposals. Chapter 8 addresses the specifics of the evaluation process; however, planning for the evaluation should start at this time.

(1) Location. Evaluation of proposals may be held in proximity to the USACE activity or to the project site. If the USACE activity has appropriate facilities, the evaluation can be held on its premises. The PM should also explore the possibility of using other Government facilities which may be available for the evaluation. The use of a non-appropriated fund (NAF) club, which charges for its use, may be an alternative when the project site is selected for the evaluation.

(2) Hotel. The majority of evaluators will be in temporary duty status and will need hotel reservations. Leasing a conference room in the hotel where the evaluators stay is often the best situation. Depending on the number of people staying at the hotel, the hotel may be asked to provide the conference room at no additional cost to the Government. The PA/PE is encouraged to make inquiries with local hotels to obtain the best accommodation package to serve the evaluation team.

(3) Conference Room. The conference room should be comfortable and well lighted, but foremost it must provide a secure location for evaluating and storing proposals. Adequate layout tables, approximately 900 mm by 1500 mm [3-ft by 5-ft] should be provided for each evaluator. Tables should also be provided for the PA/PE and CS, and for the distribution and storage of evaluation materials. The evaluation activity requires a minimum of 4.5 m² [48 ft²] for each person attending the evaluation. The evaluation team may wish to work longer than an eight hour day, and the conference room should be available on a twenty-four hour basis. Coordination with the Contracting Division is required to obtain the conference room.

e. Source Selection Requirements. The Source Selection Authority formally establishes an evaluation group structure appropriate to the requirements of the particular solicitation. Working with the Contracting Division, the PM should develop a list of recommended personnel to participate in the evaluation. Each participating agency will be contacted and asked to provide the names of individuals designated to represent their agency. Composition of the evaluation team shall consist of individuals with experience in family housing design and construction. The evaluation team shall consist of at least four, and not more than six individuals and shall include one or more technical experts from another District with family housing experience. The Center of Standardization maintains a roster of available technical specialists which can be used to staff evaluation teams if suitable staff are not available or if specific technical support/guidance is deemed necessary by the project delivery team.

(1) As soon as the names of the evaluation team members are finalized, the PA/PE will have their names added to the list of RFP package holders, and will provide a copy of the RFP and amendments to them prior to the evaluation.

(2) Travel, per diem, and salary costs for evaluation team member's participation are funded from project design costs. Military Interdepartmental Purchase Requests (MIPR) should be forwarded to the participating evaluation team members in sufficient time to permit processing of travel orders.

4. ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

PROPOSAL PERIOD ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	PM	PA / PE	CS
a. Prepare written responses to potential offeror's letters and questions. Contracting should ensure that this information is distributed to all potential offerors.			X	X
b. Follow-up on coordination for the pre-proposal conference including time, place, date, and transportation for site visit.	X		X	X
c. Prepare attendance sheet for the pre-proposal conference.			X	
d. Identify Government personnel who will be attending the pre-proposal conference.		X	X	
e. Define the roles of all individuals attending the pre-proposal conference.		X		X
f. Prepare pre-proposal minutes and responses to questions.			X	X
g. Prepare amendment to RFP to incorporate any required changes and corrections to the solicitation documents.			X	X
h. Issue amendment to prospective offerors				X
i. Alert Contracting and Engineering Division with respect to proposal receipt date and expected technical support required.			X	X
j. Contact evaluation team members and establish commitments for participation. Include meeting dates, time, and place. Provide information concerning local hotels to out of town evaluators.			X	
k. Provide MIPR to fund evaluation team member support.		X		
l. Reserve hotel space and meeting space to support the evaluation efforts.			X	X
m. Provide evaluators with RFP and amendments.			X	
n. Issue copies of the RFP and amendments to In-House USACE personnel who will support the proposal review effort.			X	

CHAPTER 8 RECEIVING AND EVALUATING PROPOSALS

1. LEGAL AND CONTRACTING REVIEW.

a. General Conformity. Proposals should be opened by the Contracting Division. Proposals must not be opened publicly. The Contracting Division will also review proposals to ensure that the required cost, technical, and management data for each proposal are provided in accordance with Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00110, PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS. If the solicitation was prepared requiring proposal identification numbers, the Contracting Division will review each proposal for numbering in accordance with the issued Request for Proposals (RFP) number. Identifying marks left on the material by the offeror will be carefully removed and the correct number added to any item not properly identified. This should be done to ensure that no item can be separated from the proposal during the evaluation process and confused with material from another proposal.

b. Cost Proposal. The Contracting Division will perform cost and price analysis, and a complete review of the Cost Proposal. The review of the Cost Proposal will normally lead to negotiations with offerors in the competitive range. Questions resulting from cost and price analysis and from technical analysis will both be addressed in the negotiations.

(1) Cost and pricing data will usually be submitted with proposals. This information is administratively "for official use only" and will be delivered only to the Contracting Officer.

(2) The Contracting Division will also review representations and certifications, sub-contracting plans, proposal guarantees, SF 1442, the schedule of prices, etc. Proposals will be reviewed to ensure that proposal guarantees are adequate and valid for the full period for which proposals are to be effective, in accordance with the RFP.

c. Offeror Performance Capability. This category consists of the management plan and other information pertaining to the offeror's qualifications, including company personnel and company performance design and construction experience. After a review by the Contracting Division, the management proposal will be evaluated by Government staff with appropriate training and expertise in the field of construction management. See Appendix C for a sample format for evaluation.

d. Technical Review. Technical proposals will be forwarded to the Engineering for minimum technical review. This review is provided to screen proposals for overall technical compliance and to provide comments for the Evaluation Team with respect to the technical aspects of the proposals.

e. Non-Disclosure. All reviewers are required to sign a certificate which includes procurement integrity, nondisclosure, standards of conduct, and conflict of interest provisions before they receive proposals for review. In addition to reviewers, any and all personnel who see the proposals must sign the required certificates.

2. ENGINEERING DIVISION TECHNICAL REVIEW.

Upon receipt of proposals, from the Contracting Division, the PA/PE is responsible for ensuring that a complete proposal package is available for each technical reviewer. The technical review team of the USACE activity will consist of personnel with housing experience and an understanding of the constraints imposed by Congress and the Department of Defense (DoD) on the housing program. Technical reviewers will develop comments indicating how each offer meets, exceeds, or falls short of the requirements for each paragraph of the STATEMENT OF WORK. The PA/PE will assemble written comments generated by the technical reviewers and make copies available to the evaluation team members.

3. TECHNICAL EVALUATION.

a. Confidentiality and Security. In a competitive negotiations, matters pertaining to the proposals must be treated with confidentiality prior to award. Security of all proposal material must be maintained at all times to avoid the possibility of compromising the competitive negotiation process. The number of proposals received, the names of the offerors, and all other information are source selection information in accordance with FAR 3.104. (reference 8-1).

b. Evaluation Room. The PA/PE should schedule access to the evaluation room and ensure complete setup prior to the arrival of the evaluation team members. A properly prepared evaluation room reflects the USACE activity's professionalism and establishes an efficient working environment for the team. The PA/PE should ensure that the following are available to evaluators:

(1) Copies of the technical review comments.

(2) Copies of the RFP with all amendments.

(3) Supplies including: pencils, erasers, writing pads, file folders, simple calculators, staplers and staples, architectural and engineering scales, paper clips, masking and transparent tape, and a pencil sharpener

c. Technical Transfusions. The Contracting Officer and other Government personnel involved in proposal evaluations must not engage in taking an offeror's good ideas or technical information for the purpose of transferring that information to competing proposers. FAR 15.306 (reference 8-2) explicitly prohibits this type of technical transfusion in the source selection process.

d. Conduct. Each evaluation team member will assign quality points to each proposal in accordance with the TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL. See Appendix A for a model. Evaluation will be based strictly on the requirements stated in the STATEMENT OF WORK and Section 00120 PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA as shown in Volume 2 of this TI. Decisions and recommendations of the evaluation team will be by consensus of the voting members.

e. Consensus. AFARS 15.608(a)(2)(iii) (reference 8-3). Individual evaluator or unit scores will not be averaged or otherwise manipulated mathematically to produce a single raw score for any technical evaluation factors or sub-factors. Scores will be established as the result of a consensus of the evaluators. Where divergent evaluations exist, and none of the evaluators have misinterpreted or misunderstood any aspects of the proposal(s), consideration should be given to providing the Source Selection Authority (SSA) with written majority and minority opinions. The SSA is not bound by the recommendations of the evaluation team.

f. Contract Specialist (CS) Responsibilities. The CS can act as evaluation team chairman and discussion moderator, but will be impartial toward all proposals. (The PM or PA/PE could also act as the evaluation team chairman based on the processes within the Design District.) The CS will brief the team on the negotiated procurement process and evaluation procedures. The following procedures should be presented each time the team is convened:

(1) Security and integrity. Each member of the evaluation team is responsible for maintaining security of proposals and all Government evaluation documents. As such, no material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. Proposals should not be discussed outside the evaluation room.

(2) Procurement integrity and non-disclosure. Members of the evaluation team must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.

(3) Attendance sheets. Attendance sign-in sheets should be maintained to provide accountability, ensure consistency in member participation, and reinforce the creditability to the evaluation process.

(4) Access to the evaluation room. Evaluation team members may work beyond a normal 8-hour day. Since material is not permitted to be removed from the evaluation room, the team should be able to obtain access to the evaluation room in the evening and early in the morning.

(5) Zero scores. A score of zero on the consensus evaluation worksheet is an indication that the item or feature being scored does not meet a stated minimum requirement of the RFP. A score of zero can only be awarded by consensus of the voting members and must be supported by written documentation, with reference to the specific RFP requirement.

(6) Assigned scores. The scores for housing unit types and net floor areas will be calculated by the PA/PE using the formula in the TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL; see Appendix A. Scores will be announced to the evaluation team prior to totaling the individual score sheets. Each evaluation team member will enter the scores in appropriate blanks on their worksheets.

(7) Written comments. Written comments are required of each evaluation team member identifying the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal. These comments are essential to the PA/PE and CS in preparing the brief for the Source Selection Advisory Council (Authority), completing negotiations, and in the debriefing of offerors. Comments are to be objective and should not transfer ideas and design concepts from one proposal to another; see Paragraph 3.c. above. Full documentation is vital for the support of the Government's technical evaluation and scoring. It may be beneficial to include an administrative assistant to take notes during the consensus discussions so that all of the key comments identified can be cataloged. Consensus evaluation team comments are also necessary for defending the Government's selection in the event that a protest is filed.

i. Composition of the Technical Evaluation Team. The evaluation team is composed of not less than four and not more than six voting members representing the using activity, the USACE design activity, the USACE construction activity, and one or more technical experts from another District with family housing experience. The Center of Standardization maintains a roster of available technical specialists which can be used to staff evaluation teams if suitable staff are not available or if specific technical support/guidance is deemed necessary by the project delivery team.

h. Additional Information. Additional information may not be provided by an offeror during the technical evaluation. If additional information is necessary to complete the evaluation process, then the requirements should be communicated to the Contracting Division. The Contracting Division will request needed information in writing from the offeror during discussions.

4. EVALUATING OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY.

An offeror's management and performance capability may be determined by evaluating design, construction and management personnel qualifications, experience, financial capability, and organizational structure for the project. FAR 15.304 (reference 8-4) specifically permits evaluating such relevant factors. The management review should be a separate evaluation by individuals not involved in the technical or quality evaluations and should involve Government representatives experienced in construction management. Complete documentation of strengths and weaknesses of each proposal for each factor and subfactor is extremely important. A performance capability format is provided at Appendix C.

5. DRAFT SOURCE SELECTION MEMORANDUM

Evaluation scores, independent Government estimate, proposal prices, and any items requiring additional information or clarification will be used by the Contracting Division to prepare the draft Source Selection Memorandum (DSSM). The DSSM will address all offers in the competitive range, considering both

technical scores and price. Review and approval of the DSSM is required before negotiations with the offerors can begin.

a. Evaluation Scores. After technical evaluation of proposals has been completed, the PA/PE will compile the final consensus point scores awarded each proposal including all documentation of the strengths and weaknesses and forward them to the Contracting Division. Items identified by the evaluators which require clarification by the offerors should be directed to the Contracting Division for resolution. The Contracting Division will also open, close, and document all negotiations/discussions with the offerors. All these items become part of the report to the SSEB and the DSSM.

b. Government Estimate. The independent Government estimate should be used by Contracting Division in developing the DSSM.

c. Competitive Range. Per FAR 15.306 (reference 8-2), the competitive range will be determined on the basis of cost or price and other factors that were stated in the solicitation, and based on the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria, the Contracting Officer shall establish a competitive range comprised of all the most highly rated proposals.

6. ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

PROPOSAL RECEIPT AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA /PE	CS
a. Prepare technical review worksheets for minimum technical check.			X	
b. Meet with In-House USACE technical staff to set time frame for review and operating procedures.			X	
c. Assure sufficient copies of the solicitation are available for the technical reviewers.			X	
d. Track the schedule, receipt, and review of proposals by Contracting Division		X		
e. Receive proposals from Contracting Division and make available to the technical reviewers.			X	
f. Receive, compile, and reproduce copies of the Minimum Technical Evaluation Comments for use by the evaluators.			X	
g. Physically set up the evaluation space including adequate administrative supplies.			X	
h. Discuss the project with the evaluation team. Review the operating rules. Outline the necessity for the written identification of strengths and weaknesses of each proposal.			X	X
i. Convene the offerors performance capability evaluation.				X
j. Secure the total technical and offeror performance points from the evaluations.			X	X
k. Ensure proposals are returned and accounted for.			X	X
l. Obtain written comments from each evaluator before they are dismissed.			X	X
m. Assemble all comments for each proposal, from each evaluator, regarding strengths and weaknesses. For any items to be determined to be 'non-conforming' particular comments must address the proposal and the specific solicitation requirement which has not been met.			X	X

PROPOSAL RECEIPT AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA /PE	CS
n. Forward initial report to Contracting Division for it's use in preparing the DSSM. Include the following: individual worksheets, consensus worksheets, point scores, classification items, narrative comments, a list of potential discussion items and questions, and a list of any items requiring clarification.			X	X
o. Return proposal materials to Contracting Division for access control.			X	X

REFERENCES

- 8-1 FAR 3.104, "Procurement Integrity"
- 8-2 FAR 15.306, "Exchanges with Offerors after Receipt of Proposals"
- 8-3 AFARS 15.608(a)(2)(iii), "Proposal Evaluation, Technical Evaluation"
- 8-4 FAR 15.304, "Evaluation Factors and Significant Subfactors"

CHAPTER 9 DISCUSSIONS AND AWARD

1. AWARD BASED ON INITIAL OFFER.

Chapter 5, Paragraph 3.a. of this TI indicates that award based on discussion with offerors is preferred, and generally Alternate I should be selected, see FAR 15.209 (reference 9-1). However, if the basic clause is selected, award may now be made based on the initial offer. If award based on initial offer is possible, the Contracting Division should proceed immediately with the preparation of the Source Selection Memorandum for immediate award after approval. Award based on an initial offer may be advantageous to the Government if:

- a. It represents the best value to the Government under the Request for Proposals (RFP) evaluation criteria.
- b. It does not differ from the RFP requirements in any material way, that is, no substantive flaws exist in the technical or cost proposals.
- c. The price is reasonable.
- c. FAR clause 52.215-1 (reference 9-2) in its basic form (no alternatives) was included in the solicitation.

2. AWARD BASED ON DISCUSSIONS.

When Alternate I is selected, and frequently when the basic clause is selected, award is not possible based on initial offers. Questions and clarification items normally surface during the evaluation process which require discussions (negotiations) with the offerors in the competitive range.

a. Discussions. Discussions with offerors should be conducted by the Contracting Division in a timely and orderly manner so that a contract award can be made in the minimum time. Multiple rounds of discussions should be avoided. Some USACE activities permit face-to-face discussions, while others require all discussions be conducted in writing. The recommended method is to delineate the discussion items to each offeror in writing. Responses must be in writing, response is required for all discussion items, and should replace or expand upon elements in the initial proposal. Discussion items normally fall into the following three categories:

- (1) Those items in which the proposal appears to fail to meet RFP criteria.
- (2) Those items which require clarification due to contradictions, errors, or omissions in the proposal.
- (3) Those items which, due to physical or material conditions, may cause an unsafe or hazardous condition.

b. Corrected Documents. The corrected documents will be the basis for re-evaluating the point scores developed during the technical evaluation.

(1) In-house technical reviewers and in-house members of the evaluation team will determine the need for adjustments to points for the corrected items. If revisions are minimal, re-evaluation may not be required.

(2) Re-adjust technical points of each proposal based on the results of discussions. For minor changes, telephone coordination with participating members of the evaluation team may be adequate. Brief them

on the changes made by offerors and the recommendations of the in-house technical reviewers and evaluation team members. Revise score sheets to achieve consensus of all evaluation team members.

c. **Competitive Range.** See Chapter 8 of this TI Paragraph 5.c, and FAR 15.306 (reference 9-3) for a definition of the competitive range. When discussions are initiated with any offeror, they must be conducted with all offerors in the competitive range. If requirements are revised for one offeror, they must be revised for all offerors. This is done by amending the solicitation which may be done throughout the negotiation phase, see FAR 15.206 (reference 9-4).

d. **Wage Rates.** If applicable wage rates will expire prior to contract award, new wage rates should be obtained. Offerors should be advised so that these new wage rates must be considered. See FAR 22.404-6 (reference 9-5) for additional guidance.

e. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror will be requested to document any changes to the proposal prices or technical information. The offerors will be given a reasonable period of time to make to respond to any remaining issues needing clarification. No indication will be made to any offeror of a price, which must be met to obtain further consideration.

3. SOURCE SELECTION.

Formal source selection in accordance with FAR 15.302 (reference 9-6) is permitted but not required. After discussions are completed, proposals are re-evaluated and the proposal most advantageous to the Government, based on technical and price factors identified in the RFP, is selected. The USACE activity, installation using activity, and Major Army Command (MACOM) should all have a voice in source selection.

a. **Criteria.** The following information should be considered in source selection:

- (1) Offeror's number. (If proposal #s are utilized by the Design District activity for proposals.)
- (2) Original proposals as modified by discussions.
- (3) Maximum price allowed under the RFP.
- (4) Basic proposal price and number of dwelling units.
- (5) Prices of options and number of dwelling units provided.
- (6) Price and number of dwelling units if the basic proposal and options are exercised. This information is required to determine if basic and option prices are balanced.
- (7) Total quality points.
 - (a) If basic only is exercised.
 - (b) If basic and options are exercised.
- (8) Priority recommendation or ranking.
- (9) Summary chart comparing features of each proposal.
- (10) Narrative describing overall good and poor features.
- (11) Site plan.
- (12) Typical dwelling unit layouts.

(13) Typical elevations.

(14) Color boards

(15) Proposed construction materials.

(16) Biographies of the evaluators.

b. Errors and/or Omissions. Should errors and/or omissions in the evaluation process be noted, the proposals will be referred back to the Contracting Division for appropriate action.

c. Final Selection. The final selection must be defensible, reasonable, and well documented. FAR 15.305 (reference 9-7) provides guidance on what should be documented in the contract file, including the following:

(1) The basis of the evaluation. If an offeror other than the low price offeror is selected, then the documentation should address the value received by the Government in selecting the higher priced offer.

(2) An analysis of the technically acceptable and unacceptable proposals, including an assessment of each offeror's ability to accomplish the technical requirements. Uniform selection criteria must be applied to all technical proposals. This means that offerors with the same experience must not be given materially different scores.

(3) A summary, matrix, or quantitative ranking of each proposal in relation to the best rating possible.

(4) A summary of findings.

d. Documentation. Complete and thorough documentation of the evaluation and selection process is critical when protests are filed, since the General Accounting Office carefully scrutinizes the records prepared by both the Contracting Division and the technical evaluation team in evaluating the legitimacy of the protest.

4. COORDINATING THE FINAL SOURCE SELECTION MEMORANDUM

The Contracting Division will normally prepare the Final Source Selection Memorandum with the recommendation for contract award to the selected offeror in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the Source Selection Authority. The PM should monitor the progress of the Source Selection Memorandum preparation and be available to provide support if needed. When completed the Source Selection Memorandum must be signed by all members of the Source Selection Board or Authority. The requirements of contracting regulations regarding subcontracting to small and disadvantaged businesses should be addressed at this time.

5. PREPARING FOR AWARD.

a. Request for Funds. As soon as the Source Selection Memorandum is approved, HQUSACE (CEMP-MA) should be advised in writing of the contract award cost data with a request for funding and authority to award. HQUSACE (CEMP-MA) will review the request for funding and authority to award, and will issue a Code 9 construction directive with a breakdown of the funds provided. When multiple USACE activities will be designing and constructing the project, the construction funds will be forwarded to the USACE construction activity in lieu of the USACE design activity. The receiving USACE construction activity will in turn provide a certification of funds available for contract award to the USACE design activity.

b. Congressional Notification. Congressional liaison must be notified 48 working hours prior to the date of intended award. This time may be critical for award on a tight schedule. Normally, notification will be accomplished by the USACE design activity's Contracting Division.

c. Public Affairs Announcement. The PM will provide the necessary information to the USACE Design Activity's Public Affairs Officer to announce the award of the project. The notice will not be released until after the actual award.

6. AWARD.

The formal contract between the Government and the successful offeror must include not only the standard contract clauses and schedules current at the time of issuance of the RFP or as modified by amendment, but must also include:

a. Request For Proposal (RFP). The RFP becomes part of the contract, including all amendments and drawings.

b. Proposal. The offeror's proposal in its entirety, shall include all drawings, cuts and illustrations, and modifications to the proposal made during evaluation or selection. This material constitutes a formal contract and defines the entire agreement between the offeror and the Government. No documentation should be omitted which in any way bears upon the terms of that agreement. Where discrepancies may arise between the RFP and the offeror's proposal, it must be made clear that the RFP will be the prevailing document.

7. ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST.

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

DISCUSSION AND AWARD ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA /PE	C S
a. Coordinate with Contracting Division to set up the Source Selection Board		X		
b. Ensure that Contracting Division has sufficient information to begin and execute discussions with offerors.		X	X	
c. Coordinate and lead efforts for In-House evaluations of the proposer's clarifications and corrections.			X	
d. Determine if clarifications and corrections require a re-convene of the evaluation team. If so, prepare requests for reconvene and funding to support.		X	X	
e. Compile summary of evaluation technical scores and comments.			X	
f. Assemble documents required for Source Selection Board Brief and reproduce.			X	X
g. Hold Source Selection Board Meeting and prepare final Source Selection Memorandum.			X	X
h. Request Authority from HQUSACE for funds to award project.		X		
i. Coordinate award package		X		X
j. Request Contracting Division prepare Congressional notification		X		
k. Prepare Public Affairs Announcement and forward to PAO		X		
m. Award				X
n. Coordinate with Contracting Division for identification and empowerment of the ACO for the contract.		X		X

REFERENCES

- 9-1 FAR 15.209, "Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses"
- 9-2 FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions"
- 9-3 FAR 15.306, "Exchanges with Offerors after Receipt of Proposals"
- 9-4 FAR 15.206, "Amending the Solicitation"
- 9-5 FAR 22.404-6, "Modifications of Wage Determinations"
- 9-6 FAR 15.302, "Source Selection Objectives"
- 9-7 FAR 15.305, "Proposal Evaluation"

CHAPTER 10 POST AWARD ACTIVITIES

1. DEBRIEFING UNSUCCESSFUL OFFERORS.

a. Requests for Debriefing. Requests for debriefing should be made in writing to the Contracting Division. When an offeror requests a debriefing, he or she should be offered an opportunity to visit the USACE design activity for a face-to-face critique of his or her proposal. This meeting should be held in the spirit of being helpful and cooperative, with the goal of improving future submittals. The debriefing can also be done in writing or by telephone if the offeror prefers. Debriefings may be accomplished pre-Award (reference 10-4) for proposals which were considered to outside the competitive range or conducted in a post-Award (reference 10-5) timeframe. An official summary of all debriefings shall be included in the contract file

b. Discussions. Debriefing should be conducted by the CS in coordination the PA/PE or other technical representative knowledge enough about the proposal to discuss the technical strengths and weaknesses of that proposal. Discussions should be limited to the individual offeror's own proposal. Technical comparisons with the other proposals must be avoided. Concentrate on important advantages and weaknesses of the proposal and avoid discussion of minor points. The total point value given the proposal may be revealed, but detailed point values assigned by the evaluation team will not be discussed. The Government may reveal the comparative rating between the debriefed offeror and the winning proposal.

c. At a minimum, a pre-Award debriefings shall include the following considerations: (1) The agency's evaluation of significant elements in the offeror's proposal; (2) A summary of the rationale for eliminating the offeror from the competition; and (3) Reasonable responses to relevant questions about whether source selection procedures contained in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed in the process of eliminating the offeror from the competition. Pre-Award debriefings shall not disclose: (1) The number of offerors; (2) The identity of other offerors; (3) The content of other offerors' proposals; (4) The ranking of other offerors; (5) The evaluation of other offerors; or (6) Any of the information prohibited in FAR 15.506(e) (reference 10-5).

d. As a minimum, post-Award debriefings shall include the following information: (1) The Government's evaluation of the significant weaknesses or deficiencies in the offeror's proposal; (2) The overall evaluated cost or price (including unit prices) and technical rating, if applicable, of the successful offeror and the debriefed offeror, and past performance information on the debriefed offeror; (3) The overall ranking of all offerors, when any ranking was developed by the agency during the source selection; (4) A summary of the rationale for award; (5) For acquisitions of commercial items, the make and model of the item to be delivered by the successful offeror; (6) Reasonable responses to relevant questions about whether source selection procedures contained in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed. Post-Award debriefings shall not include: (1) point-by-point comparisons of the debriefed offeror's proposal with those of other offerors. Moreover, the debriefing shall not reveal any information prohibited from disclosure by 24.202 or exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) including, Trade secrets; Privileged or confidential manufacturing processes and techniques; Commercial and financial information that is privileged or confidential, including cost breakdowns, profit, indirect cost rates, and similar information; The names of individuals providing reference information about an offeror's past performance.

2. PRE-DESIGN FOR CONSTRUCTION CONFERENCE

The predesign for construction conference represents the passing of project focus from Engineering to Construction. The conference is normally held at the office of the Resident Engineer for the installation. The Resident Engineer is normally the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and may also be the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) authority. See EP 415-1-260 (reference 10-1), for additional

definitions of these roles and responsibilities. The conference presents the best opportunity for the Resident Engineer, PM, PA/PE, Government reviewers, and the Contractor to establish the working relationships and understandings necessary for the successful execution of the project.

a. Timing. As soon as possible after contract award and prior to notice to proceed, the conference should be held to facilitate completion of design and establish the procedures for construction. Timing is important because it affects the Contractor's schedule as discussed in Volume 2 of this TI Section 01012. Notice to proceed should be given promptly after this conference.

b. Resident Engineer. The Resident Engineer should run the conference, and define the roles of the persons involved in the completion of design and construction. The Resident Engineer, who is normally the ACO, should define the appropriate points of contact, method of communication, transmission of materials, and the expected scheduling of submissions. In addition, the Resident Engineer should invite other military and, if affected, non-DoD utility agencies to the meeting to brief them on the expected commentary, the transmission of comments, and ground rules. Resident Engineer responsibilities with respect to the predesign for construction conference.

(1) Prepare meeting agenda.

(2) Establish roles for the Contractor, in relationship to the responsibilities assigned to the Contracting Officer (CO), Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), and Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO). Define the single point of contact and in the review process and delineate the activities of that individual. The role of the Government reviewers is to clarify design issues.

(3) Review the design for construction procedures as they apply in the design-build process. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the design-build Contractor.

(4) Review the design and construction schedules and the required design submissions. Establish the due dates for design submissions, completion of review, and review conferences.

(5) Follow-up with the Contractor to ensure responses to comments and minutes of the review conferences are distributed to all conference attendees within 10 days of the review conferences.

b. Project Manager. The PM should clearly define his role (e.g., that all design issues should be coordinated through his or her office and formal directives will originate from his or her office and be transmitted in writing through the ACO.) The PM should reiterate with all Government reviewers, that they are tied to the RFP requirements and the Contractor's proposal in that order. Design criteria and functional changes are to be avoided. The PM's support should include the following actions, most of which are performed by the PA/PE:

(1) Prepare a memorandum to remind reviewing activities when design submissions are scheduled to be submitted, reviewed, and completed.

(2) Coordinate with the in-house USACE design review personnel and ensure that the necessary human resources will be available when needed.

(3) Receive and consolidate comments from the reviewing activities. Forward copy of comments to the Contractor for review prior to the review conference.

(4) Reproduce comments for distribution to review conference attendees.

3. COMPLETION OF DESIGN.

a. Government Reviews. Design reviews by the Government are primarily to verify that the final design conforms with the RFP and the Contractor's proposal. They are not for technical verification of the

design. Where possible, obvious errors and omissions should be noted and brought to the Contractor's attention. However, the Government does not assume responsibility for the technical adequacy of the design.

b. Stages of Review. A minimum of two formal reviews are required: the 100 percent site design combined with the 50 percent vertical construction design, and the 100 percent vertical construction design. Volume 2 of this TI, Section 01012, defines the submission requirements. The design review team should be composed of personnel from the USACE design and construction activities who participated in the development of the RFP and evaluation of the proposals whenever possible (including the Resident Engineer for the project). In the spirit of partnering, the contractor, the construction area office, and USACE design reviewers should work continuously to clarify issues, preclude lost design effort, and ensure the constructability of the project.

c. Timeliness. Government reviewing activities should receive design review submissions from the Contractor approximately 14 days prior to review conferences. These documents should represent the current design status. Work by the Contractor should continue during the review process. The design shall be 100 percent complete prior to distribution for final review. The Government must complete the reviews in accordance with the schedule agreed upon at the predesign conference for construction. Unlike Invitation for Bid (IFB) contracts, the Government is working within the constraints of the Contractor's performance period. Government delays may form the basis for a Contractor claim for damages and/or time extensions.

d. Procedures. A review conference should be held at the Resident Engineer's office following the review period for each design submission. Government personnel should present review comments for discussion and resolution. Copies of comments, annotated with comment action agreed upon, should be made available to all parties by the Contractor within 10 days after the conference date. Unresolved comments should be resolved by immediate follow-up action. Upon receipt of the final corrected design documents, the USACE design activity should backcheck the design and ensure that follow-up actions are complete for all previously unresolved issues. Upon completion and Government acceptance of the design, the ACO should authorize construction in accordance with the RFP and the approved design.

4. CONSTRUCTION.

a. Authority to Initiate Site Construction. Authority to initiate site construction should be given upon acceptance of the 100 percent site design following incorporation and/or resolution of all design related comments. The responsibility for a totally integrated design, in accordance with the RFP and contract, remains with the Contractor and the site construction authority should so state. A preconstruction conference should be held at the Resident Engineer's office when this authority is given.

b. Authority to Initiate Building Construction. Authority to initiate building construction in accordance with the RFP and the proposed design should be given promptly after the 100 percent design is accepted. The Contractor's final design must be submitted, reviewed, comments incorporated, and accepted prior to the start of building construction.

5. RECORD KEEPING.

During the entire Design-Build procurement process it is important to keep accurate records of dates, timelines, schedules, correspondence and other important project data. In the post award phase it is particularly important to keep accurate records of proposed and actual design schedules, design submission dates, comment submission dates, review meeting dates, NTP dates, comments at each review stage, and comment resolutions. This information should be kept readily available by the PA/PE and must include all Installation interactions, as well as those with the contractor.

6. POST AWARD ACTIVITIES CHECKLIST.

The PM will ensure that the following activities are accomplished:

POST AWARD ACTIVITIES	Activity Lead			
	Customer	P M	PA /PE	CS
a. Notify proposers of results of evaluation and offer debriefings. This notification shall be in writing.				X
b. Receive requests for debriefing and schedule debriefings.				X
c. Prepare strengths and weakness in support of the debriefing of an unsuccessful contractor.			X	
d. Debrief the unsuccessful contractors.			X	X
e. Distribute copy of the successful proposal to each Government review agency.			X	X
f. Coordinate the date, time, and location of the pre-design conference.		X		
g. Receive, review, and coordinate the design review schedule with the Engineering Division and the customer in concert with the ACO.		X		
h. Determine and set locations and times for the design review meetings.		X		
i. Issue construction NTP when the site development plans are completed and all review comments have been satisfactorily addressed.				X

REFERENCES

- 10-1 EP 415-1-260, "Resident Engineer's Management Guide", 06 Dec 1990
- 10-2 FAR 15., "Contracting By Negotiation"
- 10-3 Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, Appendix AA, Formal Source Selection, Acquisition Letter 94-7, Department of the Army, October 1994
- 10-4 FAR 15.505, Pre-Award Debriefing of Offerors
- 10-5 FAR 15.506, Post-Award Debriefing of Offerors

APPENDIX A
TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL

APPENDIX A TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL

1. OVERVIEW OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION.

a. Relationship to Source Selection. The adequacy of the source selection process rests on ensuring that evaluations of proposals and discussions with offerors are based on the same technical, performance responsibility, and price and cost requirements. Consistency in the application of quality rating criteria during the technical evaluation is critical to obtaining the design and construction of family housing units procured through competitive negotiations.

b. Technical Quality Evaluation. Technical quality evaluation consists of an in-depth technical quality review of the proposals submitted. Each proposal will be awarded a total point score based on the grading procedure in this manual. The initial technical quality evaluation is conducted by the evaluation team. The team identifies quality issues, both positive and negative, that become the issues to be addressed by discussions between the Government and the offerors. Consensus evaluation results become the basis for determining the competitive range (that is, the grouping of offers that have a reasonable chance of being awarded a contract and merit further consideration by the Government). Further technical evaluations may occur during the discussions phase as required to identify and refine quality issues.

c. Purpose of the Manual. This manual establishes standards of acceptability and desirability with regard to various features of design, engineering, and materials. The weighing of evaluation factors takes into consideration, not only how important that particular factor is to the overall project, but also how much latitude is left by the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the offeror to provide some feature of design, engineering, or materials that would be substantially more advantageous to the Government.

2. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES.

The evaluation team is composed of not less than four and not more than six voting members representing the using activity, the USACE design activity, the USACE construction activity, and at least one or more technical experts from another District with family housing expertise. The Center of Standardization maintains a roster of available technical specialists which can be used to staff evaluation teams if suitable staff are not available or if specific technical support/guidance is deemed necessary by the project delivery team. The Contract Specialist (CS) acts as the evaluation team chairman and discussion moderator, but is not a voting member. The CS will brief the evaluation team on the negotiated procurement process and the evaluation procedures. The CS and the PA/PE are responsible for the collection of comments, evaluation materials, and prepare the consensus evaluation notes. The following procedures should be reviewed before starting the technical evaluation of proposals:

a. Security. Each member of the evaluation team is responsible for maintaining security of offerors' proposals and Government evaluation documents. No material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. In addition, proposals are not to be discussed outside the evaluation room.

b. Access to the Evaluation Room. Access to the evaluation room will be maintained from 0700 - 2200 hours. Evaluation team members are encouraged to work an extended work day to ensure that they have thoroughly reviewed the proposals and prepared comments prior to the time period set aside for discussion and development of the consensus evaluation comments.

- c. Attendance Sheets. Attendance sign-in sheets are to be maintained to provide room access accountability, ensure consistency in member participation, and reinforce the creditability to the evaluation process.
- d. Procurement Integrity and Non-disclosure. Evaluation team members must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.
- e. Written Comments. Written comments are required of each evaluation team member identifying the good and poor features of each proposal in addition to scoring sheets. These comments are essential to the CS in preparing the source selection memorandum, completing negotiations, and debriefing of offerors. Comments should be objective, and not transfer ideas and design concepts from one proposal to another.
- f. Clarifications. Clarifications are not to be requested from offerors during the evaluation. If additional information is necessary to complete the evaluation process, then the requirements should be communicated to the Contracting Division. The Contracting Division will request the information or clarification to be provided by the offeror in writing.
- g. Nonconforming Proposals. Proposals may be declared to be nonconforming by the evaluation team during the technical evaluation. Specific reasons for declaring a proposal to be nonconforming shall be clearly identified and documented. If it is determined that it is in the best interest of the Government, a nonconforming proposal may be corrected to make it conforming.
- h. Review of Source Selection Documents. Prior to the commencement of technical evaluation of proposals each evaluation team member will review the following:
- (1) TECHNICAL EVALUATION MANUAL. The evaluation team will familiarize themselves with the manual and note any point upon which the manual is not entirely clear or suitable to the specific requirements of the project for which it is to be used. Any changes in procedure or in the manual, which the evaluation team agrees are necessary, should be made at this time.
 - (2) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, [PROJECT TITLE], [PROJECT LOCATION]. Evaluation team members should become familiar with the STATEMENT OF WORK, SITE MAPS, EXCERPTS FROM INSTALLATION DESIGN GUIDE, DRAWINGS, and TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS, prior to evaluating proposals.

3. SCORING.

Proposals will be technically evaluated and assigned point scores based upon the factors shown in Paragraph 4. Evaluation will be based strictly on the requirements stated in the STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW) and the PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA as shown in Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00120 of the RFP. Decisions and recommendations of the evaluation team will be by consensus of the six voting members. Complete individual and consensus technical quality evaluation worksheets in the following manner:

- a. Zero Scores. A score of zero, on the evaluation element, is an indication that the item or feature being scored does not meet the minimum requirement of the RFP and is judged nonconforming. A score of zero should appear on individual and consensus evaluation comments when the evaluation team members agree an element is nonconforming. Nonconforming items must be supported by written documentation, with reference to the specific RFP requirement, including the paragraph number.
- b. Assigned Scores. The scores for housing unit types and net floor areas will be calculated by the TM using the formulas prescribed in this manual. Scores will be announced to the evaluation team

prior to totaling individual worksheets. Each member will then enter the calculated scores in the appropriate blanks on his or her worksheets.

c. **Unscored Elements.** Where points are available for optional elements and no element is provided by the offeror, a dash should be entered on the worksheet, indicating that no points were awarded.

d. **Point Distribution.** Although any number of points between zero and the maximum can be awarded to a given element, the distribution of points should reflect the following parameters for consistency:

(1) 25% Element barely meets minimum stated RFP criteria or has minor correctable deficiencies, but offers no advantage to the Government over the basic RFP requirements.

(2) 50% Element meets the RFP criteria, and contributes to a coordinated design approach which will produce an acceptable level of quality.

(3) 75% Element meets the RFP criteria, and has salient features that offer advantage to the Government in terms of design quality, potential energy cost savings, potential maintenance cost savings, or ease of Government administration.

(4) 100% Element meets the RFP criteria, and has salient features that offer considerable advantage to the Government in terms of design quality, potential energy cost savings, potential maintenance cost savings, or ease of Government administration.

e. **Technical Evaluation Worksheets.** Technical Evaluation Worksheets are provided for the use of the technical evaluation team at Appendix B.

4. TECHNICAL EVALUATION.

The major factors of consideration in the technical evaluation of family housing proposals are as follows:

FACTOR	DESCRIPTION	POINT VALUE
I	HOUSING UNIT DESIGN	438
II	HOUSING UNIT ENGINEERING	310
III	SITE DESIGN	248
IV	SITE ENGINEERING	104
V	OFFEROR PEROFMANCE (See Appendix C)	100
VI	OFFEROR PROJECT TEAM AND PERFORMANCE PLANS (See Appendix D)	100
TOTAL		1,300

FACTOR I: HOUSING UNIT DESIGN (438 Point Maximum). Housing unit design includes the function and appearance of housing unit materials, exclusive of the purely technical performance of internal engineering systems. The subfactors and elements considered herein deal with the planning and design of the housing units, as well as the durability and thermal performance of the materials. Consideration will be given to: the interaction of the individual housing unit to people; the degree to which the unit blends with those outdoor features of living normally associated with the family; the overall esthetics of the housing unit; and the amenities associated with livability. These latter elements include such items as separation of activities, convenience, logistics, leisure, bathing, food handling, and sleeping. Elements making up this factor are itemized below:

a. HOUSING UNIT TYPE (52 Point Maximum).

Calculate using the following formula: (Single Units x 52 Points) + (Duplex Units x 39 Points) + (Townhouses x 26 Points) + (Apartments x 13 Points) = Total points divided by the Total Number Housing Units = Average Housing Points.

b. NET FLOOR AREA (28 Point Maximum). Calculate using the following values:

- (1) Basic net area (Basic = 10 Points).
- (2) Add up to 18 Points to the basic 10 Points for areas larger than the basic net area up to 5 percent above the basic area.
- (3) Deduct 9 Points for a decrease in the area below the basic net area up to 2 percent. Proposals with net areas under the basic area by greater than 2 percent are non-conforming.

c. EXTERIOR APPEARANCE (36 Point Maximum). Evaluate:

- (1) Variety in facades, roof lines, and entrances.
- (2) Interesting staggering of housing units.
- (3) Proportions of fenestration in relation to elevations.
- (4) Visual effects of garages on the housing units.
- (5) Shadow effects, materials, and textures.
- (6) Proportion and scale within the structure.
- (7) Other aesthetic considerations.

d. STORAGE (24 Point Maximum). Evaluate size, location, and utility of all storage areas including shape of space, finish, lighting, and shelving provided.

- (1) Exterior bulk storage (8 Points).
- (2) Interior bulk storage (8 Points).
- (3) Closet (linen, coat, clothing) (8 Points).

e. VEHICLE STORAGE (24 Point Maximum). Give consideration to attachment, proximity, and/or covered walkways to the housing units, as well as climatic conditions. Exclude consideration of space in excess of that required for automobile storage only. Count additional space included or integral to garages as storage under STORAGE. Aesthetics are considered under EXTERIOR APPEARANCE. Apportion points as follows:

(1) 1 car garage, with ample circulation + storage (24 Points).

(2) 1 car garage, minimum requirements (12 Points).

f. FUNCTIONAL ARRANGEMENT (84 Point Maximum). Consider the following points in the evaluation of the unit functional arrangement:

(1) Does the floor plan of the housing unit provide convenient circulation between living, food handling, sleeping, and bathing areas?

(2) Does the relationship among the areas enhance flexibility of usage? Consider amenities which enhance the overall interior functions, for example, living, sleeping, food handling, and bathing.

(3) Is an entrance foyer with a closet and visual separation from living areas provided?

(4) Is access provided to functional areas without passing through living spaces? Where circulation is adjacent to living spaces without separation, is a minimum circulation path of 900 mm [3 ft] provided exclusive of the minimum room dimensions?

(5) Is there a balanced relationship in the sizing of these functional areas? Consider the impact of family size on the size and relationship of areas.

(6) Are the logistics of home operation considered, for example, furnishability, furniture movement, circulation of expendable supplies and disposal?

(7) Does the plan enhance indoor and outdoor living in relation to patios, screened porches, vistas, yard areas, and climate.

(8) What other design considerations are provided which enhance the overall livability and amenity of the unit?

g. LIVING, DINING, AND FAMILY AREAS (36 Point Maximum).

(1) Consider interior design elements which enhance the individual and family group aspects of recreation, leisure, and entertainment such as the following:

(a) Possibilities for joint use or concurrent separate activities.

(b) Location of convenience elements, for example, light switching, convenience outlets, and TV outlets.

(c) Amenities, such as fireplaces and built-in bookcases.

(d) Furnishability and circulation should be considered under Factor I, Subparagraph f (6) above.

(2) Rate each space separately as follows:

(a) Living room (12 Points).

(b) Dining area (12 Points).

(c) Family room and secondary dining (12 Points).

h. SLEEPING (20 Point Maximum). Consider the size and proportions of bedrooms related to windows, doors, furniture arrangement, and closet access in the area. Access to bedrooms, as well

as the relationship to other functional areas, are treated under FUNCTIONAL ARRANGEMENT. Closet size is addressed under STORAGE. Consider the following design issues:

- (1) Bedroom size. Add points for area and/or dimensions in excess of specified minimums.
- (2) Furnishability.
- (3) Visual and acoustic privacy.

i. BATHING (12 Point Maximum). The technical portion of the RFP sets forth the minimum size of full baths, as well as the required and/or desirable fixtures, furnishings, and finishes of the bathrooms. Beyond these design considerations are amenities gained through additional net area, furnishings, layout, and privacy.

- (1) Number and size. Add points for the number and size above the specified minimums.
- (2) Furnishings (e.g., vanities with or without cabinets, other storage, and heat lamps).
- (3) Layout (convenience and attractiveness).
- (4) Visual and acoustic privacy.

j. KITCHEN AND FOOD HANDLING (20 Point Maximum). The kitchen is the focal point of activity for the homemaker. Considerable initiative and innovative approaches to the design of the area can be achieved by the offeror to enhance this major logistics and control area. Its relationship to living, dining ingress and egress, and sleeping has been addressed in FUNCTIONAL ARRANGEMENT. Consider the following design issues:

- (1) Efficiency of food preparation triangle including the circulation of persons and materials.
- (2) Pedestrian and product circulation (controlled basically by relationship of counter space to major appliances).
- (3) Size and layout of cabinetry and counter areas. (Add points for area above the minimum requirements.)
- (4) Outlet number and placement.
- (5) Provision of a space with electrical outlet for an occupant-owned freezer.
- (6) Visual privacy.

k. UTILITY AND WORK AREAS (12 Point Maximum). Address provision for occupant-owned or Government-furnished washers and dryers in an area of the housing unit which provides for efficient product circulation and yet does not infringe on other functions. Are these areas suitable for ironing and/or light hobby work? Are the location and layout of areas for mechanical equipment well designed? Overall functional layout, as it relates to other areas, should be considered under FUNCTIONAL ARRANGEMENT. Location of laundry equipment in powder rooms is considered undesirable.

- (1) Does the area provide efficient work space and work flow without infringing on other functions?
- (2) Is the area suitable for ironing and/or light hobby work?
- (3) Is the location and layout well designed to accommodate mechanical equipment?

- (4) Size and layout.
- (5) Provision of shelving, storage, lighting, and convenience outlets.
- (6) Location of mechanical equipment with respect to access, convenience, and noise.

I. EXTERIOR FINISHES (20 Point Maximum). Evaluate the aesthetics, maintainability, and quality of windows, doors, siding, roofing, soffits, fascia and trim, and exterior painting and stains here. **Proposers are encouraged to review the materials and constructions submitted carefully with respect to Sustainable Design Considerations as listed in the Statement of Work.** Particular attention should be paid to finishes which require the minimum amounts of cyclical maintenance.

[Preferred and minimum acceptable exterior siding material should be identified in SOW Paragraph 5.1. and here.]

m. THERMAL ENVELOPE (18 Point Maximum). Evaluate the thermal performance of the following house elements: walls, roof and ceiling, floors and perimeters, windows and glazing, doors, and tightness (reduction of infiltration). The integrity of the thermal envelope is a prime consideration in complying with "Energy Star" program requirements. Proposals which do not comply with the stated minimums will be considered as non-conforming and can be eliminated from further consideration.

n. INTERIOR FINISHES (16 Point Maximum). Consider quality, durability, maintainability, and aesthetics for each of the following:

- (1) Walls and ceilings.
- (2) Flooring.
- (3) Shelving, wainscots and moldings.
- (4) Kitchen and Bath cabinets and tops. Also consider quantity.
 - (a) Factory pre-finished laminated (natural wood) is preferred for cabinets.
 - (b) Laminated plastic with integrally molded backsplash and nosing is preferred for countertops.

o. COLOR SCHEMES (12 Point Maximum). Consider aesthetics and coordination of interior and exterior finish designs.

p. PATIOS, SERVICE YARDS, AND FENCING (12 Point Maximum). Size, quality of materials, arrangement, and visual appearance of these supporting amenities will be evaluated here.

q. AMENITIES (12 Point Maximum). This area evaluates desirable features or amenities not required in the SOW (e.g., patio roofs, screened porches, built-in features, bus shelters, or other amenities).

FACTOR II: HOUSING UNIT ENGINEERING (310 Point Maximum). In addition to system design, each subfactor evaluates the choice of materials for the systems in terms of life cycle cost effectiveness. Since these new housing units will be "Energy Star" Homes, proposals must include information required to allow the evaluators to determine compliance with the minimum requirements of the solicitation with respect to Energy Conservation. Proposers are encouraged to adopt and/or develop additional means and methods to enhance the performance of the submitted units. Factors

such as durability, corrosion resistance, pest and termite resistance, ease of maintenance, life cycle cost of maintenance, and energy efficiency should be considered with respect to the following:

a. INTERIOR PLUMBING SYSTEM (56 Point Maximum). This element considers piping systems design quality, fixture quality, and water heater size and recovery.

- (1) Piping zoning, layout, and isolation (6 Points).
- (2) Piping size and material quality (5 Points).
- (3) Fixtures and accessories (20 Points). Evaluate quality and water usage.
- (4) Water heater size and recovery (25 Points). Evaluate quality of water heater with respect to energy conservation. Additional consideration should be given to power ventilated water heaters as well as sealed combustion water heaters.

b. INTERIOR ELECTRICAL SYSTEM (70 Point Maximum). This element considers wiring, switching, and panel design (e.g., panel size, number of circuits, provision of spares). Quality points are also given for provision of fixtures, outlets, and switching in excess of minimum requirements.

- (1) System design (20 Points).
- (2) Outlet and switch placement and quality (10 Points).
- (3) Fixture quality (25 Points). Evaluate both aesthetics and energy conservation qualities.
- (4) Electrical equipment quality (15 Points).

c. HEATING, VENTILATION, AND AIR CONDITIONING (75 Point Maximum). This element considers the quality of heating, ventilating, air conditioning, control systems, and associated equipment design to provide personal comfort in a life cycle cost effective manner. All central HVAC equipment shall be Energy Star labeled.

- (1) System design: Supply air distribution (20 Points).
- (2) System design: Return air (15 Points).
- (3) Kitchen exhaust systems (10 Points).
- (4) Air Handling/Furnace system (20 Points). Consider equipment efficiencies, features, and maintainability.
- (5) Condensing unit (15 Points). Consider equipment efficiencies, features, and maintainability.

d. ENERGY STAR PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS. (89 Point Maximum). This element considers the quality of the energy conservation investments which the proposer has included in the unit design. While the solicitation will set minimum standards for compliance, this element considers the overall quality of the housing unit systems and can provide additional consideration for systems which exceed the stated minimums.

- (1) Residential Appliances. (20 Points) Consider energy star labeled refrigerator and dishwasher and other appliance upgrades with respect to energy conservation.
- (2) Ductwork Systems. (50 Points) The design and general layout of the systems are evaluated in subfactor c above. This item represents efforts and procedures outlined in the proposal with respect to duct sealing and leakage reduction.

(3) Infiltration Reduction Systems (19 Points) This item considers measures proposed which exceed the minimum requirements set forth in the solicitation.

e. STRUCTURAL SYSTEM (20 Point Maximum). This element considers the quality of the foundation and framing system design.

FACTOR III: SITE DESIGN (248 Point Maximum). Site design includes overall planning, layout, design and development of the housing site(s), exclusive of utility systems. It embraces consideration of community appearance, compatibility of grounds and buildings, functionality, dignity, and livability. Generally excluded are considerations relative to the quality of materials, which are evaluated elsewhere. Elements making up this factor are itemized below:

a. SITE UTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT (136 Point Maximum). The project density in housing units per hectare [acre] is pre-established by the project scope and the composition (number of units and number of bedrooms) in relation to total area prescribed for development. Within this pre-established parameter, elements of site design to be evaluated include:

(1) Family Housing Area Development Concept (52 Points).

(2) Clustering (20 Points). Grouping of structures to provide good accessibility to and from streets, parking areas, and usable attractive open areas.

(3) Building Solar Orientation and Variation of Structure Setback and Appearance (32 Points). Achieving a desirable orientation of the majority of buildings with respect to solar gain, prevailing breezes and views, taking into account topography and climatic conditions in the area. Also consider unit setbacks, the relationship between units, and the relationship of units to the surrounding structural and existing landscape elements (e.g., trees, screens). A variation of the number and type of housing units shall be provided to produce a variety of exterior appearances.

(4) Buffering, Open Space, and Separation Between Structures (32 Points). Consider separation of buildings from heavy traffic lanes and surrounding land uses not compatible with a resident development. Consider open space other than major recreation fields and play lots provided by the proposed layout. Evaluate adequacy of spacing between units to ensure sound, light, and individual and group privacy.

b. VEHICULAR CIRCULATION (28 Point Maximum). This factor evaluates the capability of primary, secondary, and feeder streets to provide access to the units, community facilities, and service access to the units. The factor also evaluates vehicular and pedestrian safety. Considerations include the following:

(1) Access (16 Points).

(a) Is there convenient and direct access to and from and between each structure and/or cluster, and to community facilities?

(b) Is the new street system a logical extension of the adjacent community?

(c) Does the primary, secondary, and feeder street system minimize traffic conflict points, minimize the number of turning movements at intersections, and maximize spacing of intersections?

(2) Service (8 Points).

(a) Can service vehicles (maintenance, trash, moving vans and emergency) circulate efficiently in the development?

(b) Can delivery service trucks and moving vans gain access to and park in proximity to the housing units?

(c) Can fire trucks and ambulances gain immediate and direct access to each housing unit?

c. PARKING (20 Point Maximum). This factor evaluates the proximity of parking to housing units and the layout of parking spaces. Considerations include the following:

(1) Proximity to Housing Units (12 Points). Preferences are defined in descending order:

(a) Two spaces per housing unit adjacent to (within 7600 mm [25 ft]) the garage.

(b) One or two spaces adjacent to (within 7600 mm [25 ft]) the garage. Other spaces within 15200 mm [50 ft] of the housing units.

(c) Parking areas within 15200 mm [50 ft] of the housing units.

(d) Parking areas over 15200 mm [50 ft] from the housing units.

(2) Layout of Parking Areas (8 Points). Evaluate in terms of:

(a) Internal circulation.

(b) Minimizing conflicts between cars entering and leaving the parking areas.

(c) Elimination of the necessity for backing into primary streets.

(d) Separation of parking area entrances and exits from street intersections.

d. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION (20 Point Maximum). This factor evaluates the way in which the walkway system supports the movement of pedestrians from one location to another. If the overall street pattern does not make sidewalks functionally compatible with the sub-elements of a good pedestrian circulation system listed below, then the ratings assigned must reflect this functional inadequacy. Considerations include the following:

(1) Individual Units: Building Parking and Refuse Disposal (8 Points).

(a) Does the walkway system provide short direct access routes to the fronts of all housing units within a cluster and to adjacent clusters?

(b) Are parking areas connected to the structures they serve by walkways?

(c) Can all parts of the parking areas be reached without leaving the pavement?

(d) Does the walkway pattern minimize pedestrian traffic within the parking areas?

(e) Are walkways provided between housing units and trash containers and beyond that to street pickup points?

(2) To Play Lots, Neighborhood Park, Bus Stops, and Off Site Recreation Areas, Schools, Community Buildings, etc. (12 Points).

(a) Do walkways provide convenient routing to the above functions?

(b) Can play lots be reached without crossing primary or secondary streets?

(c) Does the walkway system provide a natural and convenient routing to a school within walking distance or to the nearest school bus stop?

e. CHILDREN'S OUTDOOR PLAY AREAS (20 Point Maximum). This factor evaluates the quality and quantity of play lots and neighborhood parks. Considerations include the following:

(1) Neighborhood Parks (4 Points). RFP requires one 700 m² [7,500 ft²] neighborhood park per 150 family housing units. The neighborhood park should be designed to accommodate two age groups; 5-9 years and 9-15 years. Capacity should be 30-50 children. See SOW Paragraph 3.g.(3) for additional requirements.

(a) Have age appropriate play events and equipment been provided for the 5-9 year age group?

(b) Have age appropriate play events and equipment been provided for the 9-15 year age group?

(2) Play Lots (16 Points). RFP requires one 325 m² [3,500 ft²] play lot per 30 family housing units. Play lots should be designed to accommodate two age groups; 6 weeks - 5 years and 5-9 years. Capacity should be 15-35 children. Play lots should be located within site lines of the housing units if possible. See SOW Paragraph 3.g.(2) for additional requirements.

(a) Have age appropriate play events and equipment been provided for the 6 week-5 year age group?

(b) Have age appropriate play events and equipment been provided for the 5-9 year age group?

(c) Have the requirements for age appropriate scale been applied to the children's outdoor play areas?

(d) Have the requirements for use zones under and around play equipment been applied to the children's outdoor play areas?

(e) Are the use zones shown on the site plan?

(f) Have the requirements for a playground safety surface been applied to the children's outdoor play areas?

(g) Have poisonous plants and plants with thorns been avoided or removed from the children's outdoor play areas?

f. LANDSCAPE PLANTING PLAN (28 Point Maximum). This factor evaluates the design, quality, quantity, and location of trees, shrubs, plantings, ground covers, and grass used to screen and enhance individual living units and recreation areas. Specific requirements are stated in SOW Paragraph 3.h. Considerations include screening, decorative planting, and the following:

(1) Screening and Shading (16 Points).

(a) Have plant material been specified that is hardy to the area?

(b) Are plantings provided which screen between adjacent housing units, structures, and clusters to enhance privacy of the occupants? Consider number, size, type, and quality of trees and shrubs proposed.

(c) Are planting clusters provided to discreetly conceal trash container sites and clothes drying areas to the maximum extent possible without interfering with pedestrian and service vehicle access? Consider number, size, type, and quality. (Mandatory if screening fence is not provided.)

(d) Do trees provide summer solar shading on east, west, and south exposures of children's outdoor play areas?

(e) Are foundation plantings provided as appropriate to meet low maintenance requirements? Consider number, size, type, and quality.

(f) Are trees and shrubs used appropriately to define the open spaces?

(2) Street Trees (12 Points).

(a) Are street trees provided in accordance with a street tree scheme for the hierarchy of streets in the area? Consider number, size, type, and quality.

(b) Have street trees been specified that are hardy to the area?

FACTOR IV: SITE ENGINEERING (104 Point Maximum). Site engineering includes the technical performance of site design and exterior utility systems. The quality of the proposed construction materials is also evaluated in each element. Particular emphasis is placed on durability, corrosion resistance, pest and termite resistance, ease of maintenance, and life cycle cost of maintenance requirements. Consideration will be given to the suitability of the chosen material to the environment in which it is to be placed. Evaluation includes consideration of engineering aspects of operation and maintenance. Utility systems are to be evaluated beyond the 1500-m [5-ft] line from the housing units. Elements making up this factor are itemized below:

a. WATER SYSTEM (16 Point Maximum). Evaluate system design, material quality, and maintainability. See SOW Paragraph 4.b. for additional requirements.

b. FUEL PIPING AND STORAGE (16 Point Maximum). Evaluate piping sizes, material quality, layout, accessibility, and cutoff isolation. See SOW Paragraph 4.e, 4.f, or 4.g for appropriate requirements.

c. SANITARY SEWER (16 Point Maximum). Evaluate system design, material quality, and maintainability. See SOW Paragraph 4.c. for additional requirements.

d. ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION (16 Point Maximum). Evaluate system design, material quality, and maintainability. See SOW Paragraph 4.h. for additional requirements.

e. SITE INTEGRATION (40 Point Maximum). This element evaluates grading, drainage, its integration with natural features, and the proposals integration with the surrounding area.

(1) Integration with Surrounding Area (4 Point Maximum). This element evaluates the integration of physical flows and relationships with, and between, the site and surrounding area.

(2) Preservation of Natural Features (4 Point Maximum). This element evaluates the preservation of trees, natural drainage swales, streams, and any other natural and historic features that lend interest and appeal to the community.

(3) Grading (12 Point Maximum). This element evaluates the effects of grading on the natural features of the site and the topographic features and character of the surrounding areas and region.

(a) Consider the aesthetic effects of grading.

(b) Does the grading plan enhance and blend with the natural conditions on the site? Does it blend the proposed development into the general topographic character of areas surrounding the site and the region in general?

(4) Drainage Design (20 Point Maximum). This element evaluates the quality and effectiveness of the drainage system design in handling surface runoff. See SOW Paragraph 4.d. for additional requirements.

APPENDIX B
TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
FACTOR 1 – HOUSING UNIT DESIGN (438 Maximum Points)				
a	Housing Unit Type Single 52 Duplex 39 Townhouse 26 Apartment 13	52		
b.	Net Floor Area	28		
c.	Exterior Appearance	36		
d.	Storage			
(1)	Exterior Bulk Storage	8		
(2)	Interior Bulk Storage	8		
(3)	Closet Space	8		
e.	Vehicle Storage	24		
f.	Functional Arrangement	84		
g.	Living, Dining, and Family Areas			
(1)	Living Room	12		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
(2)	Dining Room	12		
(3)	Family Area	12		
h.	Sleeping	20		
i.	Bathing	12		
j.	Kitchen/Food Handling	20		
k.	Utility and Work Areas	12		
l.	Exterior Finishes Windows Doors Roofing Siding Trim and Soffitts Painting (Evaluators should review and consider Sustainable Design Initiatives with respect to exterior finish materials proposed)	20		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
m.	Thermal Performance Walls Ceilings Floors/Perimeter Windows/Glazing Doors (Evaluators should review this area carefully to assure compliance with solicitation requirements and ensure acceptability with respect to the Energy Star Homes Program criteria.)	18		
n.	Interior Finishes Walls & Ceilings Floors Shelving Moldings Kitchen/Bath Cabinets and Counter Tops (Evaluators should review and consider Sustainable Design Initiatives with respect to exterior finish materials proposed)	16		
o.	Color Schemes	12		
p.	Patios, Service Yards, and Fencing	12		
q.	Amenities	12		
Total Factor I		438		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor	Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*	
FACTOR II – HOUSING UNIT ENGINEERING (310 Maximum Points)				
a.	Interior Plumbing			
(1)	Pipe Zoning, Layout, and Isolation	6		
(2)	Pipe Size and Material Quality	5		
(3)	Fixtures and Accessories	20		
(4)	Water Heater Size and Recovery (Evaluators should review and consider energy conservation aspects of proposed domestic water heating systems.)	25		
b.	Interior Electrical Systems			
(1)	System Design	20		
(2)	Outlet and Switch Placement Quality	10		
(3)	Fixture Quality (Evaluators should review and consider energy conservation aspects of proposed lighting systems.)	25		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
(4)	Electrical Equipment Quality	15		
c.	Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning			
(1)	System Design Supply Air Distribution	20		
(2)	System Design Return Air System	15		
(3)	Kitchen Exhaust Systems	10		
(4)	Air Handling/Furnace Systems (Evaluators must consider equipment efficiencies and proposed equipment carefully to assure compliance with the solicitation requirements and maintain Energy Star compliance)	20		
(5)	Condensing Unit (Evaluators must consider equipment efficiencies and proposed equipment carefully to assure compliance with the solicitation requirements and maintain Energy Star compliance)	15		
d.	Energy Star Program Considerations			

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
(1)	Residential Appliances Review proposed appliances and ensure Energy Star label. Upgrades to other appliances should also be considered here.	20		
(2)	Ductwork Systems This item specifically addresses materials and procedures included in the proposal to minimize duct leakage.	50		
(3)	Infiltration Reduction Systems This item provides for additional points for proposals which include materials and methodologies beyond the minimum requirements of the solicitation which reduce infiltration.	19		
e.	Structural System	20		
Total Factor II		310		
FACTOR III – SITE DESIGN (248 Maximum Points)				
a.	Site Utilization and Development			

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
(1)	Family Housing Area Development Plan	52		
(2)	Clustering	20		
(3)	Building Solar Orientation Variation of Structure Setback Appearance	32		
(4)	Buffering Open Space Separation Between Structures	32		
b.	Vehicular Circulation			
(1)	Access	16		
(2)	Service	8		
c.	Parking			
(1)	Proximity to Housing Units	12		
(2)	Layout of Parking Areas	8		
d.	Pedestrian Circulation			
(1)	Individual Units	8		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
(2)	To Play Lots, Neighborhood Parks, Bus Stops, Schools, Community Buildings, etc.	12		
e.	Children’s Outdoor Play Areas			
(1)	Neighborhood Parks	4		
(2)	Play Lots	16		
f.	Landscape Planting Plan			
(1)	Screening and Shading	16		
(2)	Street Trees	12		
Total Factor III		248		
FACTOR IV – SITE ENGINEERING (104 Maximum Points)				
a.	Water System	16		
b.	Fuel Piping and Storage	16		
c.	Sanitary Sewer	16		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
d.	Electrical Distribution	16		
e.	Site Integration			
(1)	Integration with Surrounding Area	4		
(2)	Preservation of Natural Features	4		
(3)	Grading	12		
(4)	Draining	20		
Total Factor IV		104		
FACTOR V – OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE (100 Points Maximum)				
	Scored Outside of Technical Evaluation Team	100		
FACTOR VI - OFFEROR PROJECT TEAM AND PERFORMANCE PLAN (100 Points Maximum)				
	Scored Outside of Technical Evaluation Team	100		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS (1,200 Points Max)				
Project Title:				
Proposal No:		Grading Scale:		
Evaluator:		100% Excellent, Significantly Exceeds RFP Requirements 75% Good, Exceeds RFP Requirements 50% Average, Full Compliance with RFP Requirements 25% Below Average, Minor Deficiencies, No Advantages 0% Non-Compliant Item – Significant Deficiency N/A Not Applicable – Not Scored.		
Factor		Max Points	Proposal Score	Comments*
PROJECT SCORING SUMMARY				
I	HOUSING UNIT DESIGN	438		
II	HOUSING UNIT ENGINEERING	310		
III	SITE DESIGN	248		
IV	SITE ENGINEERING	104		
V	OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE	100		
VI	OFFEROR PROJECT TEAM AND PERFORMANCE PLANS	100		
	TOTAL POINTS	1300		

* Comments are required for all scores above or below the 50% score.

APPENDIX C
OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE
EVALUATION MANUAL

APPENDIX C
OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MANUAL

1. OVERVIEW OF OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.

a. RFP Requirements. Requirements for demonstration of offeror past performance are stated in the Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00110. This paragraph requires completion of Attachment 4, Proposal Data Sheet. The past performance evaluation is also referred to as Factor V in Appendix A of this Volume and in Section 00110 of Volume II. It is approximately equal in weight to Factor IV, Site Engineering.

b. Purpose of the Manual. The Offeror Past Performance Evaluation Manual establishes minimum standards of acceptability and desirability with respect to contractor performance on previous design build projects.

2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

a. Security. Each evaluator is responsible for maintaining security of offerors' proposals and Government evaluation documents. No material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. Proposals are not to be discussed outside of the evaluation room and in no case with any evaluation team members who are scoring the technical aspects of the proposals.

b. Procurement Integrity and Non-disclosure. Evaluators must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.

c. Written Comments. Written comments are required of each evaluator identifying the advantages and disadvantages each proposal on the scoring worksheets. These comments are essential to the Contract Specialist (CS) in preparing the pre-business clearance memorandum, completing negotiations, and debriefing of offerors.

d. Additional Information. Additional information may be needed to complete the evaluation process, or to assure that all proposals in the competitive range are conforming to the Request for Proposals (RFP). The Contracting Division will request the information or clarification be provided by the offeror in writing.

3. EVALUATION MANUAL AND SCORING WORKSHEETS.

Project examples of past performance will be evaluated and assigned point scores based upon the information outlined in the subsequent forms. Fractional point scores are permitted.

a. PROJECT EXAMPLES (100 Point Maximum).

Evaluate examples (three are requested) of design-build projects for which the offeror has been responsible. The examples should be as similar as possible to this solicitation in project type and scope. The offerors will include the general character, scope, location, cost, and date of completion of the past performance project examples.

Evaluators will provide an individual score for each project example on a " PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM" as well as scoring the overall project examples with regard to levels of responsibilities and types of projects as shown in the " PAST PERFORMANCE SUMMARY CHART". The scores from each of the three example projects as well as the overall example project scoring will be summed to a single value on the "PAST PERFORMANCE SUMMARY CHART" and this total score will represent the Offeror Past Performance Evaluation Score.

PAST PERFORMANCE SUMMARY CHART

Description	Response	
	Yes	No
Questions:		
a. Are examples (preferably three) of design/build projects for which the offeror has been responsible been provided?		
b. Are the examples provided similar to the project in type and scope? (Complete Project Examples Scoring Matrix on following page.)		
c. Are references (with contact names and telephone numbers) provided for examples cited? NOTE: Each example should indicate the general character, scope, location, cost, and date of completion of the project. Reference No. 1 Reference No. 2 Reference No. 3 (Complete a telephone interview form (see following sheets) for each reference contacted. Insert scores from telephone interview ratings where indicated under Element Rating.)		
d. Have any projects within the last five (5) years been assessed liquidated damages?		
e. Have any projects within the last five (5) years been terminated? (Termination for the convenience of the Government should be ignored.)		
Element Rating:	Maximum Points	Actual Points
Project Examples Scoring Matrix	25	
Reference No. 1	25	
Reference No. 2	25	
Reference No. 3	25	
Total Score for Past Performance (Factor V)	100	
Narrative Comments:		
Evaluator:	Proposal Number:	

PAST PERFORMANCE SCORING MATRIX

Reference No.	Type of Facility	Prime or Sub	Value of Contract	Size of Structure	Quality Points
1					
2					
3					
TOTAL					

Scoring Instructions

Type of Facility	25 Points 12.5 Points 5 Point	If military (DoD) family housing project. If private sector residential development. If neither of the above.
Prime or Sub	Multiply by 1 Multiply by .5	If prime contractor. If Subcontractor.
Value of Contract	Multiply by 1 Multiply by .5	If project value \$10,000,000 or greater. If project value less than \$10,000,000.
Size of Structure	Multiply by 1 Multiply by .5	If project 200 units or more. If project less than 200 units.
TOTAL	25 Point Max.	Total scores and enter averaged value in TOTAL (Double Lined)

Narrative Comments:

--

Evaluator:	Proposal No.	
------------	--------------	--

PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM (1 of 2)	Offeror's ID No.	Reference No. 1
Information Required		
Point of Contact:		
Telephone Number:		
Name of Company/Agency:		
Name of Person Interviewed: Title:		
Name of Interviewer: Title:		
Description of Project:		
Dollar Amount/Value:		
Stage of Completion:		
Was the project a design/build turnkey project with fast track construction?	Yes	No
Was the project completed on time?	Yes	No
Narrative Comments: (If not completed on time, provide explanation here.)		

PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM (2 of 2)	Offeror ID No.		Reference No.	1
DESIGN PHASE	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory 0 Points Each	Satisfactory 1 Point Each	Outstanding 2.5 Point Each
Quality Control Procedures and Execution				
Accurate and Coordinated Plans and Specifications				
Plans Clearly and Sufficiently Detailed				
Project Management and Adherence to Schedule				
Cooperativeness and Responsiveness				
Quality of Briefings and Presentations				
CONSTRUCTION PHASE	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory 0 Points Each	Satisfactory 1 Point Each	Outstanding 2.5 Point Each
Quality Control Procedures and Execution				
Project Management and Adherence to Schedule				
Cooperativeness and Responsiveness				
Quality of Briefings and Presentations				
TOTAL POINTS (25 Point Maximum)				

PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM (1 of 2)	Offeror's ID No.	Reference No. 2
Information Required		
Point of Contact:		
Telephone Number:		
Name of Company/Agency:		
Name of Person Interviewed: Title:		
Name of Interviewer: Title:		
Description of Project:		
Dollar Amount/Value:		
Stage of Completion:		
Was the project a design/build turnkey project with fast track construction?	Yes	No
Was the project completed on time?	Yes	No
Narrative Comments: (If not completed on time, provide explanation here.)		

PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM (2 of 2)	Offeror ID No.		Reference No.	2
DESIGN PHASE	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory 0 Points Each	Satisfactory 1 Point Each	Outstanding 2.5 Point Each
Quality Control Procedures and Execution				
Accurate and Coordinated Plans and Specifications				
Plans Clearly and Sufficiently Detailed				
Project Management and Adherence to Schedule				
Cooperativeness and Responsiveness				
Quality of Briefings and Presentations				
CONSTRUCTION PHASE	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory 0 Points Each	Satisfactory 1 Point Each	Outstanding 2.5 Point Each
Quality Control Procedures and Execution				
Project Management and Adherence to Schedule				
Cooperativeness and Responsiveness				
Quality of Briefings and Presentations				
TOTAL POINTS (25 Point Maximum)				

PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM (1 of 2)	Offeror's ID No.	Reference No. 3
Information Required		
Point of Contact:		
Telephone Number:		
Name of Company/Agency:		
Name of Person Interviewed: Title:		
Name of Interviewer: Title:		
Description of Project:		
Dollar Amount/Value:		
Stage of Completion:		
Was the project a design/build turnkey project with fast track construction?	Yes	No
Was the project completed on time?	Yes	No
Narrative Comments: (If not completed on time, provide explanation here.)		

PAST PERFORMANCE PROJECT EXAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM (2 of 2)	Offeror ID No.		Reference No.	3
DESIGN PHASE	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory 0 Points Each	Satisfactory 1 Point Each	Outstanding 2.5 Point Each
Quality Control Procedures and Execution				
Accurate and Coordinated Plans and Specifications				
Plans Clearly and Sufficiently Detailed				
Project Management and Adherence to Schedule				
Cooperativeness and Responsiveness				
Quality of Briefings and Presentations				
CONSTRUCTION PHASE	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory 0 Points Each	Satisfactory 1 Point Each	Outstanding 2.5 Point Each
Quality Control Procedures and Execution				
Project Management and Adherence to Schedule				
Cooperativeness and Responsiveness				
Quality of Briefings and Presentations				
TOTAL POINTS (25 Point Maximum)				

APPENDIX D

**OFFEROR PROJECT TEAM AND PERFORMANCE PLANS
EVALUATION MANUAL**

APPENDIX D
OFFEROR PROJECT TEAM AND PERFORMANCE PLANS
EVALUATION MANUAL

1. OVERVIEW OF OFFEROR PERFORMANCE CAPABILITY EVALUATION.

a. RFP Requirements. Requirements for demonstration of proposed offeror project team and performance plans are stated in the Volume 2 of this TI, Section 00110. This paragraph requires completion of Attachment 4, Proposal Data Sheet. The offeror project team and performance plan evaluation is also referred to as Factor VI in Appendix A of this Volume and in Section 00110 of Volume II. It is approximately equal in weight to Factor IV, Site Engineering and Factor V, Past Performance.

b. Purpose of the Manual. This Evaluation Manual establishes minimum standards of acceptability and desirability with regard to the offeror's project team and performance plans.

2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

a. Security. Each person evaluating offeror teams and performance plans is responsible for maintaining security of offerors' proposals and Government evaluation documents. No material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. Proposals are not to be discussed outside of the evaluation room and in no case with any evaluation team members who are scoring the technical aspects of the proposals.

b. Procurement Integrity and Non-disclosure. Evaluators must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.

c. Written Comments. Written comments are required of each evaluator identifying the advantages and disadvantages each proposal on the scoring worksheets. These comments are essential to the Contract Specialist (CS) in preparing the pre-business clearance memorandum, completing negotiations, and debriefing of offerors.

d. Additional Information. Additional information may be needed to complete the evaluation process, or assure that all proposals in the competitive range are conforming to the Request for Proposals (RFP). The Contracting Division will request the information or clarification be provided by the offeror in writing.

3. EVALUATION MANUAL AND SCORING WORKSHEETS.

Proposals will be evaluated and assigned point scores based upon the categories described below and indicated on the subsequent forms. Fractional point scores are permitted. The weights of categories for consideration are shown in the following paragraphs:

a. PERSONNEL (35 Point Maximum).

Evaluate the resumes and levels of responsibility of the principal managers and technical personnel who will be directly responsible for the day-to-day design and construction activities. Information should include, as a minimum, the project manager; the project architect; landscape architect; the engineers responsible for civil, electrical, mechanical and structural design; the quality control manager; and the construction manager. Data should indicate whether each individual has had a significant part in any of the project examples cited. If reassignment of personnel is considered possible, the names and resumes of the alternative professionals for each assignment will be evaluated.

b. MANAGEMENT PLAN (25 Point Maximum).

Evaluate the offeror's Management Plan, which should indicate how the offeror will control the job. The term "management plan" is defined as a plan that includes the following subplans: Design Schedule; Construction

Schedule; and Contract Close Out Plan. As part of its Management Plan, the offeror has also submitted a Design Schedule and Construction Schedule for all phases of the project. The offeror has also submitted a rationale explaining how the schedules will be achieved. The schedule for construction should be task oriented, indicating dates by which milestones are to be achieved. The offeror may use a critical path or other method of his or her choice; however, the schedules must be graphically represented. A Close Out Plan is also required in a brief structured time scale schedule reflecting the planned activities during the final 90 days of the contract activity.

c. QUALITY CONTROL PLAN (40 Point Maximum).

Evaluate the offeror's Quality Control Plan. The alliance of the project designer and builder on a project such as this naturally removes one commonly used method of quality control; that is, the usual reliance of the owner or the design consultant for monitoring construction quality. Although the Government will provide an on-site representative during construction, offerors are expected to develop a formal program of monitoring to ensure a high level of construction quality. Evaluate the means by which the Contractor will ensure quality control.

PERSONNEL

Description	Response	
Questions:	Yes	No
<p>a. Has the offeror provided the names, resumes, and levels of responsibility of the principle managers and technical personnel who are responsible for the day-to-day design and construction activities? As a minimum, the following key personnel are to be included: (9 Point Maximum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Principal in Charge (2) Project Architect (3) Landscape Architect (4) Civil Engineer (5) Electrical Engineer (6) Mechanical Engineer (7) Structural Engineer (8) Quality Control Manager (9) Construction Manager <p style="text-align: right;">Point Score: _____</p>		
<p>b. Were any of the above key personnel significantly involved in the project examples cited in above? (9 Point Maximum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Principal in Charge (2) Project Architect (3) Landscape Architect (4) Civil Engineer (5) Electrical Engineer (6) Mechanical Engineer (7) Structural Engineer (8) Quality Control Manager (9) Construction Manager <p style="text-align: right;">Point Score: _____</p>		
<p>c. Does the offeror indicate the possible reassignment of key personnel?</p> <p>If reassignment of personnel is considered possible, have the names and resumes of alternative professionals in each assignment been provided?</p>		
<p>d. Are key design personnel professionally registered? (9 Point Maximum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Principal in Charge (2) Project Architect (3) Landscape Architect (4) Civil Engineer (5) Electrical Engineer (6) Mechanical Engineer (7) Structural Engineer (8) Quality Control Manager (9) Construction Manager <p style="text-align: right;">Point Score: _____</p>		

PERSONNEL

Description	Response	
Questions:	Yes	No
<p>e. Does the Contractor Quality Control (CQC) System Manager meet the following requirements? (2 Point Maximum)</p> <p>Graduate Civil Engineer (1 Point) Licensed Civil Engineer (2 Points)</p> <p>How many years experience has he/she had in building construction and inspection: (3 Point Maximum)</p> <p>Less than 7 years (0 Points) 7 - 10 years (1 Point) 10 - 15 years (2 Points) 15 - 20 years (3 Points)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Point Score: _____</p>		
<p>f. Does the CQC staff meet the following minimum requirements: NOTE: Actual staff may be reduced to a minimum of two if one person is fully qualified to perform more than one phase of the work. (3 Point Maximum)</p> <p>One electrical technician (1 Point) One mechanical technician (1 Point) One general construction inspector (1 Point)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Point Score: _____</p>		
<p>TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE = 35</p>	<p>Score this Proposal: _____</p>	
<p>Narrative Comments:</p>		
<p>Evaluator:</p>	<p>Proposal Number:</p>	

MANAGEMENT PLAN

Description		
Questions: Does the Management Plan adequately address each of the following?	YES	NO
a. Does the Management Plan adequately address the following sub-plans? Design Schedule. Construction Schedule (Network Analysis). Contract Close Out Plan.		
b. Does the Project Schedule include, as a minimum, the following phases of the project, and do the periods of performance appear to be realistic? 100% Clearing & Grading Plans. 50% Building Design. 100% Complete Design. Backcheck Design Submittal. Start of Construction. End of Construction.		
c. Does the construction phase of the schedule (Network Analysis) include, as a minimum, the following, and are they appropriately sequenced? Construction activities. Installation and testing of significant materials and equipment. Acceptance test. Time restraints imposed by the Government that affect progress.		
d. Is the offeror's submitted rationale explaining how the schedule will be achieved complete and reasonable?		
e. Is the Plan provided in a brief structured time scale schedule reflecting the planned activities during the final 90 days of the contract activity?		
f. Are the following items adequately addressed in the Management Plan? Testing of equipment and systems with schedules and reports. Equipment training and instruction schedules. Operations and Maintenance Manuals. As-built Drawings. Transfer procedures and schedules. Pre-final inspection procedures and correction of deficiencies. Warranty data submission and planned implementation. Cleanup of administrative deficiencies. Move off site.		
TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE = 25: <i>(Evaluator shall review the plans and information presented and provide a score for this item. If the information presented is 100% clear, complete, and in compliance with the RFP, a score of 25 would be expected.)</i>	Score this Proposal	
Pages of Narrative Comments Attached:		
Evaluator:	Proposal Number:	

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Description		
Questions: Are the following items adequately addressed in the offeror's Quality Control Plan?	YES	NO
a. Clear identification of Quality Control personnel.		
b. Clear policy establishing the authority of Quality Control personnel.		
c. Quality Control personnel separate and apart from the construction personnel.		
d. Provisions for the Quality Control group to report to the Contractor management at a level no lower than a vice president of the company.		
e. Clear description of the tasks and functions of the Quality Control personnel.		
f. A specific policy establishing schedules for the performance of Quality Control tasks.		
g. A policy for reporting Quality Control findings to the Contracting Officer.		
h. A procedure whereby the Contracting Officer may resolve disputes that have not received satisfactory responses from the first levels of Quality Control personnel.		
i. Names of testing laboratories and the procedures to be used for test data collection and reporting.		
j. A plan for material storage and protection.		
<p>TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE = 40:</p> <p><i>(Evaluator shall review the QC plan and information presented and provide a score for this item. If the information presented is 100% clear, complete, and in compliance with the RFP, a score of 40 would be expected. Evaluator judgment is required to score this item.)</i></p>	Score this Proposal	
Narrative Comments:		
Evaluator:	Proposal Number:	

APPENDIX E
US EPA ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM APPLICATIONS

APPENDIX E

US EPA ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM APPLICATIONS

1. OVERVIEW OF THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM

a. The Environmental Protection Agency has established a program to promote energy efficiency in residential and commercial facilities and equipment within the United States. Of particular interest in this Technical Instruction is the Energy Star Homes Program which focuses on residential construction and residential appliances. The goal of the program is to construct new housing which consumes at least 30 percent less energy than a home constructed to current commercial standards.

b. While it is true that the previous edition of this TI went far further in energy conserving considerations than "commercial standards", there are several areas in which significant improvement was still possible. Working with the EPA staff, those areas have been identified, Energy Star considerations listed, and appropriate language inserted into the TI to enable those using this document to adopt these requirements.

c. It is the intent of this TI to establish new and major renovations of existing military housing projects as Energy Star Homes Projects and for all completed work to bear the label, "Energy Star Home".

2. THE FOCUSES OF THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM

a. The Energy Star Homes program focuses on the six major areas outlined below. Through attention to detail in these areas during the planning, solicitation, and construction of a project significant savings can be realized in operation and maintenance costs as well as a general improvement in the quality of life for the occupants.

(1) Insulation Levels: The program lists minimum recommended insulation levels for ceiling, walls, floors, and basements. In most cases, the current requirements of this TI exceed those minimum levels.

(2) Window Selections: The program stresses the importance of good window selection and utilization in controlling operating costs as well as improving occupant comfort levels. Here again, the previous requirements contained in this TI reflect a window, which for the most part, complies with the requirements of the program. This edition of the TI contains modifications to the window requirements to address the program requirements.

(3) Sealed Ductwork: The program is very proactive with respect to testing installed ductwork systems. It is the EPA's estimate that 20 to 30 percent of the air conditioned through the central equipment is leaked from the installed duct systems without ever reaching the occupied spaces. The TI now includes language concerning the frequency and the requirement for ductwork testing.

(4) High Efficiency Central Equipment: The program sets a minimum standard for fuel utilization efficiency and for seasonal energy efficiency factors which exceed current industry standards and past editions of this TI. The TI now includes language concerning the requirements for efficiency and rating in accordance with the program.

(5) Reduced Infiltration Rates: The EPA estimates that between 25 and 40 percent of the energy used for heating and cooling in a typical home is directly a result of infiltration. Through blower door testing of completed housing units the program strives to reduce infiltration to the greatest extent possible. Coupled with this requirement to limit infiltration, the ESH Program requires the introduction of ventilation air into the housing units to assure acceptable indoor air quality considerations. This TI has been

modified to require active ventilation systems in the new units as well as to further define the requirements and applications of the required blower door testing.

(6) Reduction in Energy Consumed by Residential Appliances and Lighting: Through an accessory program the EPA reviews and rates residential appliances and encourages the application of fluorescent and compact fluorescent lighting fixtures.

3. ASSURING COMPLIANCE WITH ENERGY STAR CONSIDERATIONS DURING PROPOSAL EVALUATIONS.

a. During the proposal technical review process it is necessary to determine that the contractor's proposing on the project are aware of the requirements and implications of compliance with the Energy Star Homes Program. It is imperative that the key compliance areas are addressed in each contractor's proposal. This review is best accomplished during the proposal minimum technical evaluation.

(1) Insulation Levels: Proposal evaluators shall ensure that the insulation levels proposed meet or exceed the minimum levels established in the solicitation.

(2) Window Materials: Proposal evaluators shall ensure that the construction, materials, and methodologies proposed are in conformance with the solicitation requirements.

(3) Duct Tightness Testing: Proposal evaluators must ensure that the proposal addresses the requirements for duct testing as set forth in the solicitation.

(4) High Efficiency HVAC Equipment: Proposal evaluators must ensure that the proposed equipment complies with or exceeds the minimum efficiencies required by the solicitation.

(5) Air Infiltration/Blower Door Testing: Proposal evaluators must ensure that the proposal includes blower door testing of completed units in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation.

(6) Residential Appliances: Proposal evaluators must ensure that the proposed residential appliances are all rated as "Energy Star" appliances.

b. Results of the minimum technical evaluation shall be made available to the evaluation team during the technical quality scoring of the proposals. Proposals which fall below the required minimums shall be rated as less than fully compliant.

4. CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS – PERFORMANCE BY THE CONTRACTOR.

a. Through planning and patience the adoption of the requirements of the Energy Star Homes Program into Military Family Housing solicitations and criteria will provide a better product to the Military Families served by these residential quarters. However, the critical phase of the project begins when the selected contractor mobilizes and begins site operations.

b. Material Submittals:

(1) The Government's Quality Assurance Representative assigned to the project must review and assure that the materials submitted comply with the requirements of the solicitation, the design which was prepared and reviewed, and bear the "Energy Star" label where appropriate.

(2) Where deviations need to be made to suit availability and/or time constraints, the Contractor's Quality Control and the Corps Quality Assurance staff need to work together to ensure that the products selected for installation will not compromise the Energy Star rating for the quarters. There are a sufficient number of products available which meet the Energy Star requirements to allow the contractor some latitude in selecting equipment.

c. The Prototype Process:

(1) This process is the key to developing a demonstrable model for construction of the complete project. Through each phase of the construction of the building envelope, utility systems, and finishes the contractor and the Government investigate, review, process, test, examine, and finally accept installation details to be used throughout the process.

(2) As the contractor begins each phase of construction during the prototype development it is imperative that both the contractor and the Government representatives set out to establish the proper procedures, methodologies, and expected results to develop an acceptable level of quality for the construction of the new housing units. Of particular interest in the prototype development is the construction and detailing of the building shell including the windows, doors, insulation, infiltration barrier, and any penetrations to the building shell. Again, the emphasis is on developing a repeatable process whereby all the new units will be constructed in a similar manner.

(3) Sufficient oversight and review of the prototype process is required to assure the contractor begins on the correct path. Once the prototypes are approved it will be difficult to modify procedures and expectations if the completed units cannot pass the blower door test or the duct tightness testing required by the Statement of Work.

d. Tightness Testing for Ducts and Units

(1) Each of the completed proto-types will be tested for infiltration and for duct tightness. These prototype units MUST pass both these tests without exception.

(2) For units which do not pass either the blower door test for infiltration or a duct tightness test, the contractor shall document the failure and the means and methods taken to bring the units into compliance.

5. ENERGY STAR CHECKLISTS – STEP-BY-STEP COMPLIANCE

a. To document and verify that the new housing units are in fact constructed in accordance with the Energy Star Homes program guidelines, a sheet of Quality Assurance Checklists is included in this Appendix. A separate checklist must be completed for each proto-type housing unit and for each different unit type contained in the project. Completion of these checklists is the responsibility of the Government's Quality Assurance Staff with cooperation from the contractor's staff.

b. The intent of this checklist is to ensure that the actual construction practices comply with the requirements of the Statement of Work and also to serve as documentation for the contractor to use in coordination with the EPA in obtaining the "Energy Star Label" for each unit.

6. INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE CHECKLIST

a. The Government's Quality Assurance Representative, in coordination with the contractor's Quality Control Director shall complete a checklist for each individual unit type constructed in the project. Particular attention to completing these checklists shall be paid during the construction of the prototype units since the constructions and materials will all be exposed and easy to validate during this period.

b. As a minimum, a single checklist for each unit type is acceptable. However, since multiple units will be blower door tested the results of all similar unit blower door tests shall be attached to the respective unit type inspection checklist. The same methodology shall be used for duct tightness test results.

c. The original of the checklists shall be maintained in the Government Quality Assurance records for the project. Copies of the Checklists, as well as copies of the blower door tests and the duct tightness tests shall be provided to the contractor for his use in obtaining the "Energy Star Labels" for application to the new units.

**QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST
COMPLIANCE WITH ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM INITIATIVES
ALL WEATHER REGIONS**

PROJECT: _____

LOCATION: _____

UNIT TYPE TESTED AND ADDRESS: _____

CONSTRUCTING CONTRACTOR: _____

Component or Construction	Visual Inspection Requirement	Verified	Date	Initials
Exterior Wall Insulation	Verify installed exterior wall (including rim joists), is properly installed. List overall wall insulation level below: Opaque Wall Insulation R= _____			
Attic Insulation	Verify installed attic insulation is properly installed. List overall wall insulation level below: Attic Insulation R= _____			
Basement Insulation	Verify installed basement wall insulation is properly installed. List overall wall insulation level below: Wall Insulation R= _____			
Floor Above Unconditioned Spaces	Verify installed insulation is properly installed. List overall wall insulation level below: Floor Insulation R= _____			
Infiltration	Verify all seams, joints, and penetrations are sealed or foamed and record the results of the blower door test here. Blower Door Test Result: _____ ACH			

Component or Construction	Visual Inspection Requirement	Verified	Date	Initials
Window Performance	Verify installed windows have a U-Value as required and meet the water penetration and air leakage requirements set forth in the solicitation. Window U-Value = _____			
Exterior Doors	Verify that the installed exterior doors have a U Value in accordance with the solicitation. Exterior Door U-Value = _____			
Thermostat	Verify that the thermostat is installed properly and programmed for operation.			
Heating Equipment	Verify installed furnace [boiler] has an efficiency which meets or exceeds the requirements of the solicitation. Furnace/Boiler AFUE = _____			
Cooling Equipment	Verify installed cooling systems have efficiency ratings which meets or exceeds the requirements of the solicitation. Air Conditioning System SEER = _____			
Ventilation Systems	Verify ventilation systems are installed and active.			
Ductwork	Verify ductwork installed in accordance with the solicitation requirements. Indicate results of the prototype housing unit duct testing below:			
Duct Insulation	Verify duct insulation has been installed in accordance with the solicitation requirements. Verify installed insulation is free of rips, tears, or other improper installations.			

Component or Construction	Visual Inspection Requirement	Verified	Date	Initials
Domestic Water Heater	Verify Domestic Hot Water Heater has an efficiency in accordance with the solicitation requirements and that the insulation blanket is undamaged where required.			
Residential Appliances	Verify that the installed dishwasher and refrigerator are Energy Star rated appliances.			

Construction Contractor's Quality Control Representative:

Printed Name

Signature

Government Quality Assurance Representative:

Printed Name

Signature