

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS
FOR
WORKSPACE STRATEGY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
KANSAS CITY, DISTRICT

1. Proposal General

All offerors shall be required to submit a proposal with the minimum content as specified herein. Proposal without the minimum content may be rejected. Proposals will be received until the date and time indicated in the combined synopsis/solicitation at the following address:

U.S. Army Engineer District, Kansas City
757 Federal Building
ATTN: CENWK-CT-C
601 E 12th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106-2896

2. Proposal Format and Submittal Requirements

a. In order to be considered for award of a contract for the requirements of this solicitation, the offeror must submit a proposal with its offer. Failure to submit a proposal will result in the entire offer being rejected. The proposal shall consist of 2 parts: (1) Technical/Management proposal; and (2) the Price proposal.

b. The following documents shall be submitted by the time and date set in this solicitation for receipt of offers:

- i. Technical/Management Proposal
- ii. Price Proposal, providing the proposed fee for each of the base and optional service line items as identified in the Scope of Work.

c. Proposal Characteristics

i. All text must be legible and easily read. The page size of the offerors' proposal shall not exceed 8-1/2 by 11 inches. Diagram, charts and tables shall conform to the paper size. All text shall be typed single-spaced. Margins (1-inch) shall be clean and clear. Volumes shall be contained within 3-ring loose leaf binders and submitted in the following quantities (no head or spiral bound volumes).

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Part I – Technical/management proposal | Original & 4 copies |
| Part II – Price Proposal | Original & 4 copies |

ii. All proposals shall contain the requirements stated herein. The volumes of the proposal shall be identified by the Solicitation number, the project title

–“ Workplace Strategy Plan”, Volume number, name, address and telephone number and point of contact of the offeror on the cover page.

- iii. The Proposal’s clarity, organization and cross referencing is mandatory. No material shall be incorporated by reference. In order for the proposal to receive an in-depth evaluation, it is necessary that the proposal be presented in a manner that will provide clarity, organization and cross referencing as required.
 - iv. Each evaluation factor and subfactor shall be described in a separate section, appropriately tabbed in a report form. The information in all volumes shall be concise. The narrative shall be written in a way to demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements, but should not parrot the Scope of Work. Elaborate or lengthy presentations are not necessary or desirable. The Technical/Management proposal shall not refer the reviewer to information contained in the Price proposal.
- d. Part I – Technical/Management Proposal: The offeror shall address each of the following Factors and subfactors, in sufficient detail to permit a complete and comprehensive evaluation.
- i. Factor #1 – Related Experience. Related experience will be evaluated based on the following: Provide information on a minimum of three similar workspace studies conducted in the last five years. Information shall include a brief description of the scope of the project to include the name and type of the organization or company for whom the study was performed, the size and complexity the study, and the types of services and products provided. The information shall include the name and phone number for a reference/point of contact from the organization or company who was directly involved in the procurement and/or management of the workspace study conducted by the offeror.
 - ii. Factor #2 - Past Performance: Past Performance will be evaluated in the following areas through telephone interviews with the points of contact identified in the information provided for similar projects under Factor #1- Related Experience. Performance in the following areas will include:
 - 1. Thoroughness of planning and coordination of the study effort
 - 2. Timely delivery of preliminary and final products
 - 3. Quality and thoroughness of the survey instrument to include ease of use.
 - 4. Quality of presentations and briefings
 - 5. Customer satisfaction with the product in terms of identifying key issues and presenting strategies for implementation.
 - 6. Customer satisfaction in terms of the cost for the services provided.

iii. Factor #3 - Management Plan: The offeror's rating on this factor will be based on the demonstrated level of the managerial approach to accomplish the required work

1. Work Plan - Provide a description of the work process proposed for the execution of the study to include a proposed schedule for the activities and submittals specified in the scope of work. Provide samples of survey tools and report formats typically used for workspace analysis. The management plan shall also describe the proposed method for conducting interviews and workshops.
2. Quality Plan – Present the quality plan proposed for use on the execution of the study. Describe the process by which the Quality Control staff will monitor the work and insure completeness and compliance with the contract requirements. Identify the individual or staff members responsible for Quality Assurance of the study process and deliverables to the government.
3. Experience of key management, professional and technical staff. Provide the resumes of background information and job descriptions for the key personnel of the offeror or its consultants to be involved in the execution of the study and analysis. Include information on education, training, general experience and specific experience on similar projects with the company and with previous employers.

iv. Part II – Price Proposal – The price proposal shall be submitted as a separate document from the technical proposal. The price proposal shall provide a lump sum cost for each of the major tasks as specified in the Statement of Work. A list of the work items is as follows:

1. Basic Work Items
 - A. Strategic Workplace Vision _____
 - B. Change Management _____
 - C. Develop Test Concepts _____
 - D. Adjacencies and Prototypical Layouts _____
 - E. Recommendations (Final Report) _____
2. Optional Work Item - Pilot Component _____

3. Proposal Evaluation Process.

- a. The technical and price portions of the proposals will be evaluated by independent teams that will brief the Source Selection Authority. Based upon the teams' evaluation the Source Selection Authority will determine the proposal offering the best value to the government. The technical components of the proposal are considered more important than price. The relative weight of importance of the three technical factors is as follows: Factors 1 and 2 are equal in importance, and factor 3 is equal in importance to Factor 1 and 2 combined. The technical portion of the proposals shall be scored by the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) based upon evaluation of each factor/sub-factor set forth in the RFP. Each

factor/sub-factor shall be assigned an adjectival rating of Excellent, Above Average, Average, Marginal or Unsatisfactory. In addition, proposals containing no past performance data and where no such data is otherwise available to the SSEB shall be scored “Neutral” for the past performance factor. Definitions of the adjectival ratings are as follows:

- i. Exceptional. Proposal possesses virtually all of the desired attributes and qualities set forth in the RFP, for the particular factor being evaluated. Strengths are present indicating maximum benefit to the government and no significant weaknesses are indicated.
 - ii. Above Average. Proposal possesses, many of the desired attributes and qualities set forth in the RFP, for the particular factor being evaluated. Strengths are present indicating significant benefit to the government. The proposal has only minor weaknesses that have no impact on the proposal as a whole and do not require correction.
 - iii. Average. Proposal possesses some of the desired attributes and qualities set forth in the RFP for the factor being evaluated. Strengths are present indicating some benefits to the government. Any weaknesses noted have only a minor impact on the proposal and are easily correctable.
 - iv. Marginal. Proposal possesses only a few of the desired attributes and qualities expressed in the RFP, for the factor being evaluated. The Government may still receive benefit from the proposal submitted. Weaknesses and deficiencies noted are correctable without major revision of the proposal.
 - v. Unacceptable. Proposal lacks the desired attributes and qualities necessary to receive a higher rating. Weaknesses and/or deficiencies noted are uncorrectable without a major revision of the proposal.
- b. The price proposal will not be point scored but will be evaluated subjectively. In selecting the best overall proposal, the Government will consider the value of each proposal in terms of the quality offered for the price. Price realism and reasonableness will be determined using the following criteria:
- i. Realism – The price is compatible with the solicitation’s scope and is neither excessive nor insufficient for the effort to be accomplished
 - ii. Reasonableness – The price is fully justified and documented, i.e. developed using established and verifiable labor rates and direct costs.
 - iii. Completeness – All price information required by the Request for Proposal has been submitted and tracks with the schedule.

