Section M
Evaluation Factors for Award

An offer will be selected for award based on the “best value” to the Government. This selection will be based on an integrated evaluation of the technical and price proposals as described below.

1. Factor 1. Plan of Action and Statement of Understanding

   a. Proposed plan of action for performance of the required work (including critical review of previous design effort and the plan for exhibit testing) is comprehensive, implementable and creative in meeting the requirements of the scope of work. The plan of action provides for design originality, creativity, aesthetics, appropriateness, and workability.

   b. Statement of understanding is consistent with the RFP and demonstrates the offeror’s complete understanding of the work required under the contract.

2. Factor 2. Past Performance

   a. Prior experience of offeror’s key personnel in performing design and fabrication work of a similar nature and within similar budgetary and time constraints, including:

      (1) Meeting creative expectations of clients.

      (2) Successful inclusion of visitor involvement techniques and ensuring that the interpretive message of all exhibits is accessible to visitors with impairments.

      (3) Successfully executing design development, especially when previous design work has been incorporated into the design process.

      (4) Fabricating and installing high quality interpretive exhibits.

      (5) Completing projects on time and in budget.

   b. Project samples submitted clearly document the technical capacity of the offeror’s organization to perform the required work.

3. Factor 3. Personnel Staffing / Production Capabilities

   a. Professional qualifications, experience and capabilities of personnel in essential aspects of the project.

   b. Experience with technical, state-of-the-art audiovisual and electronic equipment.

   c. Demonstrated familiarity with the Corps of Engineers mission and the natural and cultural environment of the region.
d. Demonstrated familiarity with and experience in technical, complex and scientific topics as interpretive material.

e. Proposed staffing is sufficient and appropriate commitments of team members have been demonstrated.

f. Offeror’s fabrication/production capabilities are fully addressed assuring sufficient capacity to perform the required work.

g. Previous experience of key personnel in working with each other as a team on project(s) of similar scope and magnitude has been documented.

4. **Factor 4. Management Plan / Quality Control**

   a. An effective project management plan and structure for performance of the work is presented in the proposal.

   b. The Quality Control provides adequate measure to ensure quality and timeliness. Management of subcontracted effort is well planned and described.

5. **Price Quotation.** Price quotes will be evaluated but not scored or otherwise combined with the other aspects of the proposal evaluation.

6. **Award.** The Government’s decision for award will be made on an integrated assessment of the evaluation results as a whole. When the lowest-priced quote is rated highest on the other evaluation factors, it is the apparent best value. Where the lowest-price quote is not highest rated in the other evaluation factors, the government shall determine whether the difference in price is worth the difference in the other factors. Award may be made to a technically superior, higher-priced quote when it is determined that the technical difference is sufficiently significant to outweigh the price difference. Conversely, award may be made to a lower-priced quote, lower technically rated proposal when it is determined that the cost premium involved in selecting a higher-priced quote, higher rated proposal is not justified.

7. **Relative Importance Of Evaluation Factors.** The four (4) technical evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance. The combined weight of factors 1 through 4 is significantly greater than price. Sub-factors are also listed in descending order of importance.