

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION / MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. Contract Number DCBN-2007-R-7014	Page of Pages 1 15	
2. Amendment/Modification Number M0002	3. Effective Date November 16, 2007	4. Requisition/Purchase Request No.	5. Solicitation Caption Exercise Support	
6. Issued by: Office of Contracting and Procurement 441 4 th Street, NW, Suite 720 North Washington, DC 20001		Code	7. Administered by (If other than line 6) Office of Contracting and Procurement 441 4 th Street, NW, Suite 720 North Washington, DC 20001	
8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. street, city, county, state and zip code) Prospective Bidders Phone: Code		X	9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. DCBN-2007-R-7014	
Facility			9B. Dated (See Item 11)	
			10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.	
			10B. Dated (See Item 13)	
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended. X is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) BY separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14				
A. This change order is issued pursuant to (Specify Authority): The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.				
B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.				
C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of: 27 DCRM, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2(c)				
D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return <u>1</u> copy to the issuing office.				
14. Description of Amendment/Modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) Item No.1 Delete attachment J.07 and J.08 in Section J of this solicitation and replace with the attached J.07. Item No.2 See questions submitted by bidders with answers from the District. Item No.3 Delete Section M in its entirety and replace with the attached new Section M.				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document is referenced in Item 9A or 10A remain unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)		16A. Name of Contracting Officer <i>JOSEPH ALBANESI</i>		
15B. Name of Contractor (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. Date Signed	16B. District of Columbia <i>Joseph Albanesi</i> (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. Date Signed <i>11/19/07</i>	

ITEM No. 1 New Attachment J.07

ATTACHMENT J.07 - PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

(Check appropriate box)

Performance Elements	RATING (See Rating Guidelines on Page 2)					
	5 – Excellent	4 – Good	3 – Acceptable	2 – Minimally Acceptable	1 – Poor	0 – Unacceptable
Quality of Services/Work						
Timeliness of Performance						
Cost Control						
Business Relations						
Customer Satisfaction						

1. Name of Contractor being Evaluated: _____

2. Name & Title of Evaluator: _____

3. Signature of Evaluator: _____

4. Name of Evaluator's Organization: _____

5. Telephone Number of Evaluator: _____

6. Type of service received: _____

7. Contract Number, Amount and period of Performance _____

8. Remarks on Excellent Performance: Provide data supporting this observation. Continue on separate sheet if needed)

9. Remarks on unacceptable performance: Provide data supporting this observation. (Continue on separate sheet if needed)

RATING GUIDELINES

Summarize Contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unacceptable), 1 (Poor), 2 (Acceptable), 3 (Good), 4(Excellent), or ++ (Plus). Use the following instructions a guidance in making these evaluations.

Business Relations	Quality	Cost Control	Timeless	
	Product/Service		of Performance	
management	-Compliance with contract requirements	-Within budget (over/under target costs)	-Meet Interim milestones	-Effective
Businesslike correspondence	-Accuracy of reports	-Current, accurate, and complete billings	-Reliable	-
requirements	-Responsive to contract requirements	-Relationship of negated costs to actual	-Completed on time, including wrap-up and	-Prompt
notification of contract problems	-Appropriateness of personnel	-Cost efficiencies	-contract administration	-
Reasonable/cooperative	-Technical excellence	-Change order issue	-No liquidated damages assessed	-Flexible -Pro-active -effective contractor recommended solutions -Effective snail/small disadvantaged business Subcontracting program
0. Unacceptable	Nonconformances are comprises Response to inquiries, technical/ the achievement of contract service/administrative issues is requirements, despite use of effective and responsive. Agency resources	Cost issues are comprising performance of contract requirements.	Delays are comprising the achievement of contract requirements, Despite use of Agency resources.	not
1, Poor	Nonconformances require major response to inquiries, technical/	Cost issues require major	Delays require major	

	Agency resources to ensure service/administrative issues is achievement of contract marginally effective and requirements.	Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. responsive.
2. Minimally Acceptable	Nonconformances require minor Responses to inquiries, technical/ Agency resources to ensure service/administrative issues is achievement of contract somewhat effective and requirements.	Costs issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract responsive.
3. Acceptable	Nonconformances do not impact Responses to inquires, technical/ achievement of contract service/administrative issues is requirements. responsive.	Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Delays do not impact achievement of contract usually effective and
4. Good	There are no quality problems. Responses to inquiries, technical/ issues is responsive,	There are no cost issues.	There are not delays. service/administrative effective and
5. Excellent	The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in some or all of the above categories.		

ITEM No.2 Question and Answers

- 1) Does the submission of a redacted proposal apply to the Technical proposal only, or to both the Technical and Price Proposal?

Both

- 2) The Past Performance Evaluation form referenced in Section M.7.1.(b) was not included in the solicitation documents. Will it be provided?

The Past Performance Evaluation form will be provided as part of this amendment

- 3) The J.07, J.08, and J.09 attachments were not included with the solicitation. Will they be provided?

J.09 is located in Section H.11, J.07 and J.08 is the same as the Past performance Evaluation form that will be part of this amendment as the new J.07

- 4) Are email invitations acceptable?

Yes

- 5) Will this meeting take place in HSEMA offices or is the District expecting it to occur in a hotel or other meeting space?

HSEMA.

- 6) Can the Government please define "multimedia presentation equipment"?

PC, projector, possibly use of the government's video teleconference system.

- 7) Section B.3.1 indicates that "Any estimated quantities...shall not be construed to limit the quantities that may be ordered from the Contractor by the District." Section B.3.3 similarly states "There is no limit on the number of orders that may be issued." Should the District's requirements increase beyond Section B.4 and the scope of the original contract, will the District allow for a contract modification to address unscheduled changes to the nature of the project?

If the District's scope of the original contract changes a modification would be required. The District has no limit on the number of orders as long as they are within the original scope. All orders within the original scope will be priced at the rates stated in Section B.4.

- 8) What is the estimated date of award?

Estimated date would be January 4, 2008.

- 9) RFP documents suggest two different types of exercise programs. Section B.4.1 calls for one full Scale Exercise (2days, 100 people), and four Tabletop Exercises (1 day, 30 people). Section C.1.2 calls for one Leadership Tabletop Exercise, two Field Exercises, two Command Center Functional Exercise (no-notice) and three tabletop exercises / workshops. Section 3.1.4 indicates "The number of exercises shall be determined in the project plan, after the (five-year training and exercise) strategy is developed." For purposes of this proposal and planning, which section of the document most accurately represents the District's desired exercise program for the base year?

The number of exercises to be conducted will be determined after the strategy is delivered.

- 10) SECTION c.2.8 MENTIONS THE District has over 30,000 employees responsible for supporting disasters, but exercise activities appear targeted to a very specific subset of this group (approximately 100 personnel). What are the anticipated training audiences for this exercise program (e.g. Emergency Operation Center personnel, city senior leadership, etc.)?

To be determined.

- 11) Section C.3.1.28 indicates “The Contractor shall provide simulated victims (role players) for operations-based exercise.” Approximately how many simulated victims are anticipated as requirements for supporting exercise play?

The bidder should make a reasonable estimate.

- 12) As referenced in Section L.6, have any amendments been made to the solicitation based on questions received at the pre-proposal conference?

This will be the second amendment to this solicitation the first can be found on the DC OCP website.

- 13) In Section F.5, the District outlines deliverable requirements for the proposed work. But each item only references “1” for quantity. Is this number correct or is there a more accurate depiction of publication requirements for the exercise program (e.g. how many after action reports, how many exercise plans, how many briefing print-outs, etc)?

The bidder should make a reasonable estimate.

- 14) Section C.1.1.xi. This section is incomplete. Please provide the conclusion to the sentence, “Design, development, conduct and evaluation of...”

Strike line xi of Section C.1.1.

- 15) Section C.3.1.18 If the contractor is to “arrange for meeting, conference, and event facilities, audio-visual equipment, copies, or to procure other equipment and supplies to support administrative and technical aspects of the meetings, conferences, and events, especially for those activities occurring outside of government facilities”, should estimates be provided in the cost section or DC HSEMA pay for these services directly?

Estimates should be provided in the cost section.

- 16) Section G.9.1 Has a COFR been identified?

No.

- 17) Section M.1.2 Selection criteria listed in order of importance are not included in this section, as stated. Please provide the selection criteria listed in order of importance.

See Section M.5.

- 18) Section I.5.11 Is (i) only referring to any violations of proprietary rights arising from publication, use, disposition, etc. of any data furnished by contractor or is it also referring to violations by any third party

supplier/subcontractor when contractor doesn't know or reasonably could not have known of such violation?

Only referring to violations by the contractor.

19) Attachment J01 Standard Contract Provisions dated March 2007, Article 5, Inspection of Supplies

Last part of (e)(2) is missing—should this say “when prior rejection makes re-inspection or retest necessary”?

That is correct.

20) Attachment J.03 E.E.O. Information and Mayor's Order 85-85, District of Columbia Register, Administrative Issuance System, Compliance with Equal Opportunity Obligations in Contracts, Office of the Mayor. Mayor's signature should show Mayor Adrian M. Fenty, not Marion Barry, Jr. and Secretary of the District of Columbia should show Stephanie D. Scott, PhD, not Clifton B. Smith.

The section that you refer to states the document was signed by Marion Barry, Jr. and Clifton B. Smith. That is correct.

21) Section B.4.1.A.iv Does compressive support includes any permits for use of the location and/or portable bathrooms?

Yes.

22) Amendment 1 Item #4, Response to question 9 does not answer the question regarding whether the contractor will be requested to develop “real event after action reports” and whether the cost of these AARs will be costed as a new CLIN. This response indicates that “real after-action reports” will be required as per section C.1.2xx, which provides a requirement to produce AARs and improvement plans for exercises. However, section C.1.2 states that “... DCEMA is requesting support to develop after action reports for 4 events during the period of performance, which can include a mix of both special events and local response. These after action reports are in addition to the exercise after action reports, which must be completed for the aforementioned exercises.” Will the scope of the contract include “real event after action reports” and will they be negotiated as a separate CLIN after contract award?

Yes, that requirement would be negotiated separately after contract award.

23). Amendment 1 Item #4, Response to question 11 instructs the offerors to use HSEEP Guidance, but this response does not address the basic question to clarify HSEMA's definition of a two-day exercise. HSEEP Guidance does not specify whether a sponsoring agency should choose a six-hour, eight-hour, or 12-hour exercise day, nor whether the cost estimates should assume the Exercise Controller and Evaluator Debriefing is part of the second exercise day or will be conducted on a third day. To provide a common basis for estimating exercise costs, please provide HSEMA's preferred duration of the full-scale exercise day (i.e., two eight-hour periods, two 12-hour periods, continuous 24-hour periods, etc.) and whether HSEMA intends for the Exercise Controller and Debriefing to be part of the second day or conducted separately on a third day.

For costing purposes, assume two eight-hour periods, which includes the exercise controller and debriefing.

24). Does HSEMA want offerors to assume that the two sites for the full-scale exercise (see B.4.1.A.iii) include the HSEMA Emergency Operations Center and one field site, or does HSEMA want offerors to assume that the exercise will take place at two field sites?

HSEMA EOC and a field site.

- 25) Will HSEMA coordinate with the Metropolitan Police Department for exercise security and DC Fire and Emergency Medical Services for first aid/medical support?

The contractor will facilitate that support.

- 26) RFP section L.4.3.1 requests that contractors provide no more than five (5) past performances. However, under M.7.1 section b), the language refers to three (3) past performance references. How many past performances is DC HSEMA requesting from offerors?

Minimum 3 no more than 5.

- 27) Can DC HSEMA provide that questionnaire (preferably in an editable format) and provide a due date for responses?

The questionnaire is part of this amendment see Item 1.

- 28) How long does the awardee have after contract award/kickoff meeting to stand up the exercise registration website?

A minimum of 90 days. The deliverable date will be established after the completion of Task 1.

- 29) Is there an incumbent for this effort or a current contractor providing similar or related services? If so, can DC HSEMA identify who the incumbent is?

There is no incumbent.

- 30) Are offerors required to fill out the detailed cost sheets housed under Attachment J.2.5 as part of the solicitation or are those to be filled out post-award? If they are to be filled out as part of the solicitation, can DC HSEMA provide an editable version of that Attachment (e.g., in a Microsoft Word or Excel)?

The attachment can be downloaded for the OCP website as well as the solicitation.

- 31) Attachment J.2.5 includes separate line items for Fringe Benefits, Overhead, etc. Will providing commercial rates (e.g., from an approved GSA rate schedule) that are inclusive of fringe, overhead, and G&A be sufficient? If commercial rates are acceptable, do offerors need to provide the breakdown of fringe, overhead and G&A?

Commercial rates from approved GSA rate schedule will be sufficient and the Offerors will not need to provide the break down of fringe, overhead and G&A.

- 32) For Attachment J.2.5, the template indicates that offerors are to provide hours and costs for individuals. Is it sufficient to provide hours/costs rolled up at the labor category level? If personnel are not key personnel, do they have to be named in the costing worksheet or will using placeholder names suffice (e.g. Exercise Evaluator #1)?

Placeholders will suffice.

- 33) Please provide the number of planning meetings that should be assumed in the pricing for both the tabletop and full-scale exercises.

That number is up to the contractor.

Item No. 3 New Section M

M EVALUATION FOR AWARD

M.1 It is vital that the contractor has: 1) a broad knowledge of the Emergency Management programs, as well as a broad knowledge of the responsibilities of the public safety and health agencies within the District government; 2) experience in developing exercise materials; 3) knowledge of District programs in order to provide adequate information as well as answer any questions pertaining to the District of Columbia Government; and 4) contractor must possess strong communication, community planning and meeting coordination skills.

M.1.1 The contract will be awarded to the responsible Offeror whose offer is 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.1.2 The Emergency Management Agency's evaluation team will evaluate the proposals based on the following selection criteria (listed in order of importance).

M.2 TECHNICAL RATING

The Technical Rating Scale is as follows:

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

M.3 EVALUATION STANDARDS

M.3.1 The District will make award to the responsible offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the District, cost or price and technical factors listed below considered. For this solicitation, technical quality is more important than cost or price. As proposals become more equal in their technical merit, the evaluated cost or price becomes more important.

M.4 PREFERENCE FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES, DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES, RESIDENT BUSINESSES OWNERSHIP OR BUSINESSES OPERATION IN AN ENTERPRISE ZONE

a. General Preferences

Under the provisions of D.C. Law 13-169, "Equal Opportunity for Local, Small, or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Amendment Act of 2000" (the "Act", as used in this section), the District shall apply preferences in evaluating offers from businesses that are local, disadvantaged, resident business ownership or located in an enterprise zone of the District of Columbia.

For evaluation purposes, the allowable preferences under the Act for this procurement are as follows:

- 1) Four percent reduction in the bid price or the addition of four points on a 100-point scale for a local business enterprise (LBE) certified by the Local Business Opportunity Commission (LBOC);
- 2) Three percent reduction in the bid price or the addition of three points on a 100-point scale for a disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) certified by the LBOC;
- 3) Three percent reduction in the bid price or the addition of three points on a 100-point scale for a resident business ownership (RBO), as defined in Section 2 (a)(8A) of the Act, and certified by the LBOC; and
- 4) Two percent reduction in the bid price or the addition of two points on a 100-point scale for a business located in an enterprise zone, as defined in Section 2(5) of D.C. Law 12-268 and in 27 DCMR 899, 39 DCR 9087-9088 (December 4, 1992).

Any prime contractor that is a LBE certified by the LBOC will receive a four percent (4%) reduction in bid price for a bid submitted by the LBE in response to an Invitation for Bids (IFB) or the addition of four points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for bids submitted by the LBE in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP).

Any prime contractor that is a DBE certified by the LBOC will receive a three percent (3%) reduction in the bid price for a bid submitted by the DBE in response to an IFB or the addition of three points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the DBE in response to a RFP.

Any prime contractor that is a RBO certified by the LBOC will receive a three percent (3%) reduction in the bid price for a bid submitted by the RBO in response to an IFB or the addition of three points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by the RBO in response to a RFP.

Any prime contractor that is a business enterprise located in an enterprise zone will receive a two percent (2%) reduction in bid price for a bid submitted by such business enterprise in response to an IFB or the addition of two points on a 100-point scale added to the overall score for proposals submitted by such business in response to a RFP.

b. Preferences for Subcontracting in Open Market Solicitations with No LBE, DBE, RBO Subcontracting Set Aside

The preferences for subcontracting in open market solicitations where there is no LBE, DBE or RBO subcontracting set aside are as follows:

- 1) If the prime contractor is not a certified LBE, certified DBE, certified RBO or a business located in the enterprise in an enterprise zone, the District will award the above-stated preferences by reducing the bid price or by increasing the points proportionally based on the total dollar value of the bid or proposal that is designated by the prime contractor for subcontracting with a certified LBE, DBE, RBO or business located in an enterprise zone.
- 2) If the prime contractor is a joint venture that is not a certified LBE, certified DBE or certified RBO joint venture, or if the prime contractor is a joint venture that includes a business in an enterprise zone but such business located in an enterprise zone does not own and control at least fifty-one percent (51%) of the joint venture, the District will award the above-stated preferences by reducing the bid price or by increasing the points proportionally in the proposal based on the total dollar value of the bid or proposal that is designated by the prime contractor for a certified LBE, DBE, RBO or business located in an enterprise zone, for participation in the joint venture.

For Example:

If a non-certified prime contractor subcontracts with a certified local business enterprise for a percentage of the work to be performed on an RFP, the calculation of the percentage points to be added during evaluation would be according to the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Amount of Subcontract}}{\text{Amount of Contract}} \times 4^* = \text{Points Awarded for Evaluating LSDBE Subcontracting}$$

***Note: Equivalent of four (4) points on a 100 point scale**

The maximum total preference under the act of this procurement is twelve percent (12%) for bids submitted in response to an IFB or the equivalent of twelve (12) points on a 100-point scale for proposals submitted in response to a RFP. Any prime contractor receiving the full bid price reduction or point addition to its overall score for a particular preference will not receive any additional bid price reduction or points for further participation on a subcontracting level for that particular preference.

However, the prime contractor shall receive a further proportional bid price reduction or point addition on a different preference for participation on a subcontracting level for that different preference. For example, if a LBE prime contractor receives the four percent bid price reduction or the equivalent of four points on a 100-point scale, the LBE prime contractor does not receive a further price reduction or additional points if such contractor proposes subcontracting with an LBE. However, if this same LBE prime contractor proposes subcontracting with a DBE, the LBE prime contractor receives a further proportional bid price reduction or point addition for the DBE participation on the subcontracting level.

M.5 EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points
	Experience and Past Performance:	45%
	Price	15%
	Skills and Knowledge	20%
	Technical Approach	20%
	*LSDBE	12
	TOTALS	112

For example: If a sub factor has a point evaluation of 0 to 6 points, and (using the Technical Rating Scale) the District evaluates as "good" the part of the proposal applicable to the sub factor, the score for the sub factor is 4.8 (4/5 of 6). The sub factor scores will be added together to determine the score for the factor level.

M.6 PRICE CRITERIA (15Points)

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:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest price proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal being evaluated}} \times 15 \text{ weight} = \text{Evaluated price score}$$

M.7 TECHNICAL CRITERIA (65_Points)

M.7.1 Past Performance (45 Points)

Description: This factor considers Offeror's past performance in performing services similar to the required services as described in Section C of this solicitation. This factor includes an examination of the quality of services provided, timeliness in service delivery, business practices, and overall satisfaction of Offeror's performance. Sub factors listed in descending order of importance include:

The standard is met when:

- a) The Offeror provides references for all contracts in which the Offeror has performed similar work in the past five (5) years. Work is similar, if the function, responsibilities, and duties of the Offeror are essentially the same as the required services described in C.3; and

- b) The past performance evaluations obtained by the District from a minimum of three (3) references provided by the Offeror, are satisfactory or better, as described in the instructions and rating criteria on page 2 of the District's Past Performance Evaluation Form.

M.7.2 Technical Approach (20 points)

- M.7.2.1** Description: This factor considers the Technical Approach and proposed technical plan to perform the requirements set forth in Section C, including an assessment of the Offeror's service description, service delivery, and knowledge of the population to be served. The following sub factors are listed in descending order of importance:
- M.7.2.2** The Offeror's understanding of the technical components of the requirements and demonstrated awareness of the scope and complexity of the services to be provided as evident through the narrative description provided in the technical
- M.7.2.3** Supporting information to establish the extent to which the proposed plan and methodology conforms to industry standards and best practice models.
- M.7.2.4** The realism and reasonableness of timelines given the complexity of the project while balancing this against the need to demonstrate sufficient aggressiveness given the District's external pressures and liability risks.

M.7.3 Technical Expertise (20 points)

Description: This factor considers the technical capacity and expertise to be accessed and provided by offeror to perform the District's requirements as described in Section C of this solicitation. The sub factors are as follows listed in the descending order of importance:

- M.7.3.1** All components of offeror's staff and staff related activities; including, offeror's organizational structure, the qualifications and expertise of offeror's proposed staff, and offeror's staff development initiatives will be evaluated to assess each staffing component, together and independently, and the importance of the interrelationships of each component toward meeting the service requirements.
- M.7.3.2** The adequacy and appropriateness of the offeror's technical capacity to perform the required services as described in C.3, including offeror's quality assurance plan, system to measure and trace service delivery outcomes, and the scheduling, coordination and documentation of the requirements. This entails an examination of the offeror's description of its overall contribution and plan of utilization relating to its techniques and processes in attaining the successful fulfillment of the requirements.
- M.7.3.4** The adequacy of the offeror's description and accompanying explanation of its system to identify and measure service delivery outcomes that demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements relevant to the population to be served and the desired objectives.
- M.7.3.5** An assessment of the offeror's demonstrated knowledge and ability to schedule, coordinate and execute service delivery requirement and to comply with District

performance reporting standards and requirements.

M.8 PRICE CRITERIA (15 Points)

M.8.1 The price evaluation will be objective. The offeror with the lowest ceiling price with a realistic level of effort 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:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest price proposal}}{\text{Price of proposal being evaluated}} \times 15 = \text{Evaluated price score}$$

M.9 TOTAL POINTS

M.7.1 MAXIMUM TECHNICAL AND PRICE POINTS (100 Points)

M.7.2 MAXIMUM PREFERENCE POINTS (12 Points)

M.7.2.1	Local Business Enterprise	(2 Points)
M.7.2.2	Small Business Enterprise	(3 Points)
M.7.2.3	Resident Business Ownership	(5 Points)
M.7.2.4	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise	(2 Points)
M.7.2.5	Enterprise Zone	(2 Points)
M.7.2.6	Longtime Resident Business	(10 Points)

M.9.3 TOTAL MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE (112 Points)

M.10 EVALUATION OF OPTION YEARS

The District 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 District's requirements may change during the option years. Quantities to be awarded will be determined at the time each option is exercised.

M.11 EVALUATION OF PROMPT PAYMENT DISCOUNT

M.11.1 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.11.2 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.

