## SECTION M  
### EVALUATION FACTORS

### M.1  EVALUATION FOR AWARD

The Contract will be awarded to the responsive and responsible Offeror(s) whose offer(s) are most advantageous to the District, based upon the evaluation criteria specified below. Thus, while the points in the evaluation criteria indicate their relative importance, the total scores will not necessarily be determinative of the award. Rather, the total scores will guide the District in making an intelligent award decision based upon the evaluation criteria.

### M.2  TECHNICAL RATING

#### M.2.1

The Technical Rating Scale is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeric Rating</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Fails to meet minimum requirements; e.g., no demonstrated capacity, major deficiencies which are not correctable; offeror did not address the factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Marginally meets minimum requirements; major deficiencies which may be correctable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minimally Acceptable</td>
<td>Marginally meets minimum requirements; minor deficiencies which may be correctable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Meets requirements; no deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Meets requirements and exceeds some requirements; no deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Exceeds most, if not all requirements; no deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### M.2.2

The technical rating is a weighting mechanism that will be applied to the point value for each evaluation factor to determine the offeror’s score for each factor. The Offeror’s total technical score will be determined by adding the offeror’s score in each evaluation factor. For example, if an evaluation factor has a point value range of zero (0) to forty (40) points, using the Technical Rating Scale above, if the District evaluates the Offeror’s response as “Good,” then the score for that evaluation factor is 4/5 of 40 or 32.

If subfactors are applied, the offeror’s total technical score will be determined by adding the offeror’s score for each subfactor. For example, if an evaluation factor has a point value range of zero (0) to forty (40) points, with two subfactors of twenty (20) points each, using the Technical Rating Scale above, if the District evaluates the offeror’s response as “Good” for the first subfactor and “Poor” for the second subfactor, then the total score for that evaluation factor is 4/5 of 20 or 16 for the first subfactor plus 1/5 of 20 or 4 for the second subfactor, for a total of 20 for the entire factor.
M.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA
The Evaluation Criteria set forth below have been developed by agency technical personnel and has been tailored to the requirements of this RFP for On-Call Facility Maintenance and Repair. The criteria serve as the standard against which all proposals shall be evaluated and serve to identify the significant matters which the Offeror should specifically address in complying with the requirements of this solicitation. Each offeror’s proposal will be evaluated, and the Government will make a determination of the relevancy and confidence level using the scales in the Table identified in Section [M.2.1]. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the evaluation process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the selection process. The offerors that provide the best value to the Government are based on the results of the evaluation criteria described in the paragraph below which outline the evaluation factors.

M.3.1 TECHNICAL CRITERIA 80 Points Maximum
These factors consider the Offeror’s experience, past performance, key personnel and proposed business operations model used in performing services similar to the required services as described in Section [C]. These factors include an examination of the quality of services provided, timeliness in service delivery, business practices, and overall satisfaction with the Offeror’s performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor A: Relevant Experience and Past Performance of Contractor and its Team</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor B: Relevant Experience of the Contractor’s Proposed Key Personnel &amp; Staffing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor C: Daily Operations Management Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MAXIMUM TECHNICAL POINTS ALLOWABLE</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M.3.1.1 Relevant Experience and Past Performance of the Contractor and its Team (30 points)
The Department desires to engage Contractor(s) with a minimum of two (2) years relative experience necessary to provide the in the Greater Washington DC area, that are similar in nature, scope and complexity as the service requirements identified in Section [C] – Scope of Work. The Offeror shall include with its Proposal a minimum of three (3) Past Performance Evaluations from the Offerors client roster substantially in the form of Attachment J.16. Offerors will be evaluated based on their demonstrated experience with: (i) performing building maintenance and repair services over the past two (2) years; (ii) supervising multiple work crews; (iii) experience with, and knowledgeable of facility maintenance and repair services, equipment and labor to implement and perform the necessary services to determine if the offeror provides a sound, compliant approach that meets the requirements of the SOW, and demonstrates a thorough knowledge and understanding of those requirements and their associated risks.

The past performance assessment will assess the confidence in the offeror’s/joint venture member’s ability (which includes, if applicable, the extent of its critical subContractors’ involvement) to successfully accomplish the proposed effort based on the offeror’s demonstrated present and past work record. A critical subContractor is defined as any subContractor providing
support for technical compliance which represents a significant out-sourced capability. The Government will evaluate the offeror’s/the critical subContractors’ demonstrated record of Contract compliance in supplying services and products and that meet users’ needs, including cost and schedule. The recency and relevancy of the information, the source of the information, context of the data and general trends in the Contractor’s performance will be considered. More recent and more relevant performance usually has a greater impact in the confidence assessment than less recent and less relevant performance. For purposes of this evaluation, recency is defined as active or completed efforts performed within the past two (2) years from the issuance date of this solicitation. The Government will perform an independent determination of relevancy of the data provided or obtained. A relevancy determination will be made for each of the recent submitted Contracts, but the Government is not bound by the offeror’s opinion of relevancy.

M.3.1.2 Relevant Experience of the Contractor’s Proposed Key Personnel & Staffing (30 points)
The Department desires that the Contractor’s Key Personnel assigned to this project will have experience in performing the Services contemplated by this RFP including Section [C.1.1] hereof, and shall be dedicated to providing the services under this Contract. The availability and experience of a Contractor’s Key Personnel (and other key staff) assigned to this Contract will be evaluated as part of this element. Proposals shall identify, at a minimum: (i) the Project Manager, the Field Supervisors/Crew Leaders and the Dispatcher as contemplated by Section [L.22.1.] hereof; and (ii) resumes for each other key staff member on the team, detailing each person’s role, relevant experience, and anticipated workload during the Contract Term and (iii) valid copies of all applicable licenses and certifications of its personnel by which is required to perform the services described herein.

M.3.1.2.1 The Offeror’s personnel must have the experience and, to the extent applicable, licenses to perform the required work. Toward that end, Offerors shall include within the proposal a description of the staff that will be made available to perform this work and their qualifications. The positions listed below are considered to be key personnel “Key Personnel”. The Contractor shall provide staff who, at a minimum, meet the listed qualifications.

M.3.1.2.1.1 The Offeror shall set forth in its proposal the names and reporting relationships of the key personnel the Offeror will use to perform the work required under the Contract. Their resumes shall be included.

4. **Project Manager (PM)**: shall serve as the Contractor’s primary point of contact and shall maintain overall responsibility for the successful completion of all Services. The PM shall have (i) a minimum of three (3) years of experience in the delivery of facility maintenance and repair services similar in nature, scope and complexity as the Services described herein, or (ii) a demonstrated capacity to deliver the services similar in nature, scope and complexity as the Services described herein. The PM shall be proficient in writing and speaking English.

5. **Supervisors/Crew Leaders**: shall have a minimum of three (3) years of experience with providing facility maintenance and repair services similar in nature, scope and complexity as the Services described herein.

6. **Dispatcher**: shall serve as the COTR’s primary point of contact for dispatching crews and equipment. This person shall have (i) a minimum of two (2) years of experience of
dispatching crews and equipment providing facility maintenance and repair services similar in nature, scope and complexity as the Services described herein, or (ii) possess significant experience in dealing with emergencies, including the knowledge and skill necessary to react and deliver under the pressure of emergency conditions. This individual shall be proficient in writing and speaking English.

M.3.1.3 Project Management Plan
Offerors are required to submit a Project Management Plan along with their proposals. This Plan shall clearly explain and outline the Offerors management approach, detailing how they will facilitate services across the large property portfolio taking into consideration the volume of work contemplated and the service standards required. It should clearly demonstrate its knowledge and expertise in providing facility maintenance services for multiple commercial properties of different size and complexity. The Offeror shall also demonstrate its knowledge of impediments typical to services and how the Offeror works to identify and mitigate these issues. At a minimum, this Project Management Plan should identify the following:

(i) **Scheduling & Assignment of Key Personnel** and their specific roles in managing the services and outline at a minimum the following:
   a. a description of the Offeror's workforce and how its crews will be mobilized so as to ensure that sufficient workers will be available.
   b. How the Offerors Key Personnel will manage and coordinate with the Department on all services requirements.
   c. Outline staffing, scheduling and the planning of services in the event the Department issues multiple Task Orders, including the number of properties covered by specific key rolls and the staffing level assignment to ensure quality and timely service delivery.
   d. Shall include an organization chart that described the staffing plan including all proposed staff.

(ii) **Vehicle, Equipment & Supplies** description and availability to the Offeror’s vehicle(s), equipment and supplies available demonstrating its ability to deploy in the case where the Department has a need to issue multiple Task Orders;

(iii) **Quality Control Plan (QCP)**, as must identify an acceptable approach and those actions employed to ensure compliance with product quality and control standards in the SOW. Describe in detail how the Contractor will assure the task are complete timely and to the service level standards identified in the SOW. Provide effective measures for HAZMAT handling and procedures that demonstrate compliance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations; and procedures that are tailored to support these services in accordance with the overall SOW. The Quality Control Plan shall clearly demonstrate the Contractor’s full effort to provide services which meet the full requirements, service level standards and site appearance standards as delineated herein. The QCP shall clearly outline how the Contractor will plan, deliver, manage and self-evaluate services and provide corrective action as outlined in Section [C.5].

(iv) **Risk Management** include an acceptable plan that clearly identify and address specific risks that may impact this program and its successful implementation and long-term management. The plan must demonstrate the ability to identify specific quantitative and
qualitative risks and effective mitigation strategies that demonstrate the clear ability to ensure uninterrupted performance at the required service level.

(v) **Customer Service** an acceptable plan will identify the means by which customer service is to include but not limited to timely response to project request and or complaints regarding service. The customer service plan shall also address how the offeror will ensure the availability of crews, timely completion of Salesforce ticket close out procedures and the Contractors overall methodology and approach to provide world-class customer service.

**M.3.2 PRICE CRITERION**

20 Points Maximum

The price evaluation will be objective. The Offeror with the lowest price will receive the maximum price points. All other proposals will receive a proportionately lower total score. The following formula will be used to determine each Offeror's evaluated price score:

\[
\frac{\text{Lowest price proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal being evaluated}} \times \text{weight} = \text{Evaluated price score}
\]

**M.3.3 PREFERENCE POINTS AWARDED PURSUANT TO SECTION [M.5.2] (12 Points Maximum)**

**M.3.4 TOTAL POINTS**

112 Points Maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL AVAILABLE EVALUATION POINTS</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Evaluation Pursuant To Section M.3.1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Evaluation Pursuant to Section M.3.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference Points Awarded Pursuant to Section M.3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M.4 EVALUATION OF OPTION YEARS**

The Department will evaluate offers for award purposes by evaluating the total price for all options as well as the base year. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the District to exercise them. The total Department’s requirements may change during the option years. Quantities to be awarded will be determined at the time each option is exercised.

**M.5 PREFERENCES FOR CERTIFIED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES**

Under the provisions of the “Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Act of 2014”, D.C. Official Code § 2-218.01 et seq., as amended (“Act”, as used in this section), the Department shall apply preferences in evaluating proposals from businesses that are certified
by the Department of Small and Local Business Development ("DSLBD") pursuant to Part D of
the Act.

M.5.1 **Application of Preferences**
For evaluation purposes, the allowable preferences under the Act shall be applicable to prime
Contractors as follows:

M.5.1.1 Any prime Contractor that is a small business enterprise (SBE) certified by the DSLBD will
receive the addition of three points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.2 Any prime Contractor that is a resident-owned business (ROB) certified by DSLBD will receive
the addition of five points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.3 Any prime Contractor that is a longtime resident business (LRB) certified by DSLBD will receive
the addition of five points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.4 Any prime Contractor that is a local business enterprise (LBE) certified by DSLBD will receive
the addition of two points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.5 Any prime Contractor that is a local business enterprise with its principal offices located in an
enterprise zone (DZE) certified by DSLBD will receive the addition of two points on a 100-point
scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.6 Any prime Contractor that is a disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) certified by DSLBD will
receive the addition of two points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.7 Any prime Contractor that is a veteran-owned business (VOB) certified by DSLBD will receive
the addition of two points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.1.8 Any prime Contractor that is a local manufacturing business enterprise (LMBE) certified by
DSLBD will receive the addition of two points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score.

M.5.2 **Maximum Preference Awarded**
Notwithstanding the availability of the preceding preferences, the maximum total preference to
which a certified business enterprise is entitled under the Act is the equivalent of twelve (12) points
on a 100-point scale for proposals submitted in response to this RFP. There will be no preference
awarded for subContracting by the prime Contractor with certified business enterprises.

M.5.3 **Preferences for Certified Joint Ventures**
A certified joint venture will receive preferences as determined by DSLBD in accordance with

M.5.4 **Verification of Offeror’s Certification as a Certified Business Enterprise**

M.5.4.1 Any vendor seeking to receive preferences on this solicitation must be certified at the time of
submission of its proposal. The CO will verify the offeror’s certification with DSLBD, and the
offeror should not submit with its proposal any additional documentation regarding its certification
as a certified business enterprise.
M.5.4.2 Any vendor seeking certification in order to receive preferences under this solicitation should contact the:

DEPARTMENT OF SMALL AND LOCAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
ATTN: CBE Certification Program
441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 850N
Washington DC 20001

M.5.4.3 All vendors are encouraged to contact DSLBD at (202) 727-3900 if additional information is required on certification procedures and requirements.

M.6 EVALUATION OF PROMPT PAYMENT DISCOUNT

M.6.1 Prompt payment discounts shall not be considered in the evaluation of offers. However, any discount offered will form a part of the award and will be taken by the District if payment is made within the discount period specified by the offeror.

M.6.2 In connection with any discount offered, time will be computed from the date of delivery of the supplies to carrier when delivery and acceptance are at point of origin, or from date of delivery at destination when delivery, installation and acceptance are at that, or from the date correct invoice or voucher is received in the office specified by the District, if the latter date is later than date of delivery. Payment is deemed to be made for the purpose of earning the discount on the date of mailing of the District check.