

**APPENDIX D**  
**SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS**  
**FOR**  
**SYSTEMS ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT COMPLEX (SAMS)**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SECTION TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE #</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>1.1 Program Overview and Description. ....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.2 Program Direction. ....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>2.0 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS/BUSINESS APPROACH .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>2.1 Approved Process.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2.2 Program Description.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>3.0 SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>3.1. Source Selection Authority (SSA).....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>3.2. Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>3.3 Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>3.4 Advisors.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>4.0 PRESOLICITATION ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>4.1 Market Research .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>4.2 Early Strategy and Issues Session (ESIS) .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>4.3 Draft Solicitation.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>4.4 Presolicitation Notice.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>4.5 Notice of Source Selection Process Initiation.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>5.0 EVALUATION PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>5.1 Definitions.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>5.2 Evaluation Methodology. ....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>5.3 Color Rating.....</i>	<i>9</i>

*5.4 Past Performance* ..... 9

*5.5 Proposal Risk* ..... 12

*5.6 Cost and Financial Strategy*..... 13

**6.0 EVALUATION FACTORS**..... **14**

**7.0 NON-GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL**..... **15**

*7.1 Non-government Advisors*..... 15

*7.2 The release of proposal information to non-government advisors* ..... 15

*7.3 Prohibitions*..... 15

*7.4 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI)*..... 15

*7.5 Permission from Offerors*..... 15

**Attachment 1 - Phase III Resolution of Administrative Details** ..... **16**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The following document describes the process the Air Force will use to conduct the source selection for the SAMS Project.

### **1.1 Program Overview and Description**

The Space and Missile Systems Center (SMC) at Los Angeles Air Force Base (LAAFB) CA under the Systems Acquisition and Management Support (SAMS) complex initiative undertakes the conveyance of a large portion of the LAAFB's existing real property to a selected developer, in exchange for that developer's build-to-suit completion of new facilities for the Air Force on a portion of the LAAFB remaining property or alternatively on property near the base. The existing properties at LAAFB total approximately 113 acres and are located in El Segundo, Hawthorne and Sun Valley, California.

### **1.2 Program Direction**

Pursuant to the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, 106 Pub. Law 398, 114 Stat. 1654, Title XXVII, Subtitle D, Section 2861, Land Conveyance, Los Angeles Air Force Base:

“The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, by sale or lease upon such terms as the Secretary considers appropriate, all or any portion of the following parcels of real property, including any improvements thereon, at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California:

- (1) Approximately 42 acres in El Segundo, California, commonly known as Area A.
- (2) Approximately 52 acres in El Segundo, California, commonly known as Area B.
- (3) Approximately 13 acres in Hawthorne, California, commonly known as the Lawndale Annex.
- (4) Approximately 3.7 acres in Sun Valley, California, commonly known as the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service Broadcast Center.

As consideration for the conveyance of real property under subsection (a), the recipient of the property shall provide for the design and construction on real property acceptable to the Secretary of one or more facilities to consolidate the mission and support functions at Los Angeles Air Force Base. Any such facility must comply with the seismic and safety design standards for Los Angeles County, California, in effect at the time the Secretary takes possession of the facility.”

## **2.0 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS/BUSINESS APPROACH**

### **2.1 Approved Process**

The source selection strategy for the SAMS Complex project is to use a streamlined, trade-off selection methodology that allows maximum flexibility in proposal development while encouraging innovative solutions. Under this process, the Air Force will consider tradeoffs among cost or price and non-cost factors and may, at its discretion, award to or select other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically rated Offeror. The purpose of this strategy is to select the proposal that best realizes the SAMS complex goals while meeting all performance requirements and minimizing Air Force investment beyond conveyance of the available land. The Air Force will determine the “Best Value” based on an integrated assessment of management, technical and financial strategy factors, as well as past performance and proposal risk.

The Air Force will carry out a three-phase process to select a private entity (“Offeror”) to undertake this project:

- The objective of Phase I is to select those Offerors whose proposals demonstrate the highest probability of success. The Air Force intends to select no more than five fully qualified developers. Evaluations in Phase I will consist of an integrated assessment of past performance and preliminary project concept (to include financial strategies and proposal risk). Offerors not selected will be notified in writing. The Offerors determined to be most qualified under Phase I will be invited to submit proposals in Phase II.
- The objective of Phase II is to select the developer offering the best value. In Phase II, Offerors will be required to submit detailed business and technical proposals (including proposal risk and financial strategies). Past performance ratings will be carried over from Phase I and updated as necessary. The Offeror submitting the proposal representing the best value to the Air Force will be selected to continue into Phase III.
- The objective of Phase III is to conduct final negotiations with the selected Offeror to finalize the remaining financial contingencies and complete the administrative details of implementing all agreements for award to the selected Offeror (see Attachment [31](#)). Final negotiations are administrative in nature and will not encompass issues that affect the basis for the source selection decision. If, for whatever reason, the Air Force and the selected Offeror are unable to complete Phase III within ninety (90) days, the Air Force will either reschedule the milestones or select a new Offeror.

## 2.2 Program description

The goals of the SAMS complex are to:

- Provide our people safe and excellent, state-of-the-art facilities and dispose of buildings that do not meet seismic and safety codes
- Reduce the total cost of the real property infrastructure while meeting performance, service and quality requirements

Using an overarching concept of capital asset management, the Air Force intends to make underutilized assets available for public and/or private commercial development, in exchange for consideration that would reduce Air Force (O&M and capital) appropriation requirements. The developer will be required to provide acceptable facilities (located on or nearby Area B). The Air Force identified underutilized facilities and land area, recognizing that this land has value based on income potential, and plans to convey the property outright allowing the real estate market to bring several sources of financing. The Air Force hopes that by using this approach, the selected private developer could generate a significant level of private sector funding toward the cost of consolidating Air Force space at Area B or elsewhere.

The Air Force may lease back, for up to ten years, the new facilities in order to finance any gap in the market values of the real property to be conveyed and the new facilities but the Air Force must be vested with all right and title to the new facilities at the end of the lease period.

### 3.0 **SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION**

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations) (SAF/IEI), has retained the authority to confirm the selection of an Offeror for final selection and to sign the final agreements on behalf of the Air Force. SAF/IEI initially delegated authority to AFMC/CV to solicit, evaluate, select and negotiate final real estate agreements. Because SMC was transitioned to Air Force Space Command on Oct 01, the decision was made to re-delegate the SSA to AFSPC/CV beginning with the start of Phase II.

The organization for the Source Selection will consist of a Source Selection Authority (SSA), a Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC), and a Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET). AFSPC/CV has designated SMC/CC as chair of the SSAC.

#### 3.1 **SAF/IEI Duties**

1. Confirm SSA's decision to proceed to Phase II
2. Confirm SSA's selection of Offeror
3. Sign the final agreements on behalf of the Air Force.

#### 3.2 **Source Selection Authority Duties**

1. Approval of the Source selection Plan (SSP).
2. Approval to release the solicitation document and all amendments.
3. Approval of the Phase I and II evaluations.
4. Approval of the determination to exclude Offerors from the competitive range.
5. Recommendation to proceed to Phase II.
6. Selection of the Successful Offeror.

7. Documentation of the selection decision.

### 3.3 Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) Duties

1. Responsible for the proper and efficient conduct of the source selection process.
2. Review the SSP.
3. Review of evaluations and findings of the SSET in Phase I and Phase II.
4. Approval of determination of competitive range.
5. Approve release of Evaluation Notices.
6. Provide briefings and consultation at the request of the SSA.
7. Review and approve proposal analysis report.
8. Offer a recommended source selection decision for the SSA

### 3.4 Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) Duties

1. Prepare the SSP in coordination with the SAMS integrated product team.
2. Review Solicitation prior to release.
3. Provide an independent review of all proposals.
4. Comply with applicable standards of conduct.
5. Substitutions for members identified in Attachment 2 may be approved by SSET chair.
6. Prepare and review Evaluation Notices (ENs) prior to release.
7. Provide briefings and consultation as requested by the SSAC.
8. Prepare proposal analysis report that documents the results of the evaluation.
9. Prepare Source Selection Decision Document for SSA signature.

### 3.5 Advisors

SMC IPT, AFMC/CEI, AFSPC/CEC and representatives from the Cities of El Segundo and Hawthorne will be assigned to assist with all aspects of the source selection process. At the discretion of the SSET Chairperson, advisors may assist in evaluating particular requirements or aspects of a proposal. They may provide material for Evaluation Notices (ENs), but they will not evaluate strong or weak points or evaluation narratives.

In addition, the Executive Steering Group, an ad hoc group consisting of senior Air Force leadership personnel with either functional or programmatic expertise, will advise the SSA and/or SAF/IEI.

#### **4.0 PRESOLICITATION ACTIVITIES**

##### 4.1 Market Research

A Request for Statements of Interest (RSI) was released in June 1999 and was favorably received by the real estate development community. Twenty-five developers indicated they were interested and 5 submitted actual definitive cost data. Likewise, Air Force – commissioned real estate development feasibility studies concluded much development potential exists for a wide range of private sector uses.

##### 4.2 Early Strategy and Issues Session (ESIS)

An SMC senior level ESIS was conducted in August 2000 to discuss the AFMC recommended process for conducting the SAMS solicitation.

##### 4.3 Draft Solicitation

Upon approval of the project, the SAMS IPT released a draft solicitation to industry on 14 Mar 01.

##### 4.4 Pre-Solicitation Notice

Prior to release of the solicitation, the SAMS IPT will issue a notice to industry through all practical media.

##### 4.5 Industry Day

On 4 Apr 01, an Industry Forum was conducted at LAAFB. Over 70 representatives from industry attended.

##### 4.6 Notice of Source Selection Process Initiation

Upon release of the solicitation, the SAMS IPT will issue a notice to appropriate parties.

#### **5.0 EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

##### 5.1 Definitions

*Competitive Range:* The proposals that are most highly rated, unless the “range” is reduced for purposes of efficiency.

*Deficiency:* A material failure of a proposal to meet a Air Force requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

*Discussions:* Negotiations that occur after establishment of the competitive range that may, at the Business Representative's discretion, result in the Offeror being allowed to revise its proposal.

*Evaluation Notices (EN):* Written reports provided to an Offeror, after establishment of the competitive range, used to indicate to, or discuss with, each Offeror still being considered for award, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of its proposal (such as cost, price, technical approach, past performance, and terms and conditions) that could, in the opinion of the Business Representative, be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award.

*Exchanges:* Communications for the purpose of clarifying certain aspects of proposals (e.g., the relevance of an Offeror's past performance information and adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond) or to resolve a minor or clerical error. These communications do not constitute discussions.

*Proposal Inadequacy:* An aspect or omission from an Offeror's proposal that may contribute to a failure in meeting specified minimum performance or capability requirements.

*Strength:* A significant, outstanding or exceptional aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit and exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the Air Force, and either will be included in the contract or is inherent in the Offeror's process.

*Weakness:* A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A "significant weakness" in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

## 5.2 Protection Of Source Selection Information

A quality control process using color coded cover sheets for each Offeror's proposal information will be employed to ensure the separation of source selection documentation by Offeror. In addition, a check and balance system will be employed where, at a minimum, two people will prepare information for release. The Business Representative will perform a final check of documentation in the packages before they are released. Verification of this review will be accomplished by initialing a checklist that will become part of the source selection file.

## 5.3 Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation requirements, described in the section of the solicitation entitled "Evaluation Factors for Selection" are the baseline against which each Offeror's proposal will be rated and establish the level an Offeror's proposal must meet in order to be judged acceptable. Factors were derived from key project characteristics and broken down into subfactors, which will be used as the basis for assessing each Offeror's ability to meet the Air Force's needs. Factors (and subfactors) for this source selection have been limited to those considered to be the real discriminators and are listed in Part 6 below. In each phase, proposals will be evaluated and rated focusing on strengths, weaknesses, inadequacies, and deficiencies.

Offerors will be advised in the solicitation that a down-select decision in Phase I, or a selection in Phase II, may be made without discussion or any contact concerning the proposal received. Specifically, they cannot assume that they will be contacted or afforded an opportunity to clarify, discuss, or revise proposals. Therefore, the solicitation will state that proposals should be submitted initially on the most favorable terms regarding financial, technical, and other factors.

Discussions may be conducted with Offerors within the competitive range in Phase I or Phase II. In Phase I, “competitive range” refers to those Offerors who have a reasonable chance of selection for down select. In Phase II, “competitive range” refers to those Offerors who have a reasonable chance for selection as the developer offering the best value. If discussions are conducted, evaluation notices (ENs) will be issued and, Offerors will have the opportunity to submit revisions to their proposals.

Limited exchanges with the Offerors for the purpose of clarifying certain aspects of proposals (e.g., the relevance of an Offeror’s past performance information and adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond) or to resolve a minor or clerical error do not constitute discussions. Communications with Offerors before establishment of the competitive range may be conducted to enhance Air Force understanding of proposals; allow reasonable interpretation of the proposal; or facilitate the Air Force’s evaluation process. These communications are for the purpose of addressing issues that must be explored to determine whether a proposal should be placed in the competitive range. Such communications will not provide an opportunity for the Offeror to revise its proposal, but may address ambiguities in the proposal or other concerns (e.g., perceived deficiencies, weaknesses, errors, omissions, or mistakes); and information relating to relative past performance; and shall address adverse performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to comment. These communications do not constitute discussions.

After the final evaluation of proposals against the factors (and subfactors) is completed and documented, the SSET will summarize the information using color and other ratings in a briefing to the SSA. The color and other ratings to be used are discussed below.

#### 5.4 Color Ratings

The color ratings, defined in the table below, will be assigned at the subfactor level in all Factors except past performance, proposal risk and for Phase II, “Cost to Air Force”, to depict how well each Offeror’s proposal meets the solicitation requirements. (A separate but parallel color rating system for past performance is discussed in paragraph 5.5 below. Proposal risk will be assessed as discussed in paragraph 5.6 below. No color rating will be used for the cost factor.)

Color	Rating	Definition
Blue	Exceptional	Exceeds requirements in a way beneficial to the Air Force.
Green	Acceptable	Meets requirements necessary for acceptable performance.
Yellow	Marginal	Does not clearly meet some specified requirement necessary for acceptable performance, but any proposal inadequacies are correctable.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet specified requirements. Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable.

Each subfactor will be evaluated against the following basic assessment criteria (equal in importance):

- *Soundness of approach:* The Offeror's proposal will be assessed in terms of the degree to which the proposal, relating to particular items, is logical, defensible, and consistent with all other parts of the proposal. Additionally, proposal will be assessed as to whether or not all assertions made by the Offeror are supported and thoroughly documented, assumptions are clearly labeled and justified and the proposal assumptions are consistent with current market conditions. Finally, the proposal will be assessed as to whether it provides an effective and efficient method of performing the work.
- *Understanding the requirement:* The Offeror's proposal will be assessed in terms of the degree to which the Offeror understands the requirements relating to a particular item, as evidenced through compliance with the requirements of the solicitation. The proposal must indicate concise, complete, responses, which are clearly cross-referenced or indexed with the solicitation.

### 5.5 Past Performance

In Phase I, the most important evaluation factor will be past performance. The team will conduct a structured evaluation that examines an Offeror's relevant present and past performance record to determine its ability to perform as proposed. The past performance evaluation will consider the number and severity of problems, the effectiveness of any corrective actions taken, and the Offeror's overall performance record.

Under the Past Performance factor, the Performance Confidence Assessment represents the evaluation of an Offeror's present and past work record to determine confidence in the Offeror's probability of successfully performing as proposed. The Air Force will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products

and services that meet user's needs, including cost and schedule. The Past Performance Evaluation is accomplished by reviewing aspects of an Offeror's relevant present and recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the SAMS project. In determining relevance, consideration will be given to similar type of efforts (development, maintenance, contract scope, schedule and type).

The information evaluated may include data on efforts performed by other divisions, critical subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the performance of the proposed effort. The Air Force may consider as relevant, efforts performed for agencies of the federal, state, or local governments and commercial customers.

Rating	Definition
Most Relevant (MR) 5	Past performance projects involved the magnitude and complexity specified and are essentially what the solicitation requires (i.e. mid-rise office buildings in campus like setting, business arrangements that limit customer's exposure to cost growth).
Acceptable (A) 3	Past performance projects involved the magnitude and complexities specified and include most of what the solicitation requires.
Marginal (M) 1	Past performance projects involved some of the magnitude and complexities specified and include some of what the solicitation requires.
Not relevant (NR) 0	Past performance projects did not involve any aspects of what the solicitation requires.

As a result of an analysis of the favorable and unfavorable information (risks and strengths) identified, a past performance confidence assessment will be done to determine an overall Past Performance confidence assessment. Each Offeror will receive one of the following ratings defined in the table below:

Rating	Definition
Exceptional/ High Confidence (Blue)	Based on Offeror's performance record, no doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Very Good/ Significant Confidence (Green)	Based on Offeror's performance record, minimal doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory/ Confidence (Yellow)	Based on Offeror's performance record, doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Marginal/ Little Confidence (Red)	Based on Offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

In addition to evaluating the extent to which the Offeror's performance meets contract requirements, the assessment will consider things such as the Offeror's history of forecasting and controlling costs, adhering to schedules (including administrative aspects of performance), reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction.

After a confidence assessment has been made, the SSA may then consider as discriminators: 1) whether the past projects evaluated were comprised of the same teaming partners as proposed for this project; and 2) whether the developer demonstrated the same level of past performance as other developers but over a greater number of projects.

Where the performance record indicates performance problems, the Air Force will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Air Force may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness. Offerors will have the opportunity to address any negative or adverse past performance information received by the SSET during this evaluation for which they have not previously had an opportunity to respond.

Past performance information will be obtained through records of DoD and other government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Army Corps of Engineers channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Air Force, including commercial sources. Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Air Force reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources.

## 5.6 Proposal Risk

Proposal Risk assesses the weaknesses and associated risks with the Offeror's proposed approach as it relates to accomplishing the requirements of this solicitation. It includes an

assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Air Force oversight, as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Evaluators will make an independent judgment of the probability of success, the impact of failure and the Offeror's proposed risk mitigation solutions when assessing proposal risk. The proposal risk will be rated as described in the table that follows:

Rating	Definition
High (H)	Likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance even with special Offeror emphasis and close Air Force monitoring
Moderate (M)	Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. However, special Offeror emphasis and close Air Force monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.
Low (L)	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal Offeror effort and normal Air Force monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

Phase I: The proposal risk assessment will focus on the risks and weaknesses associated with Factor 2, the Offeror's proposed Preliminary Project Concept. For each identified risk, the assessment will address the Offeror's proposal for mitigating the risk and why that approach is or is not manageable.

Phase II: To ensure that only the proposal with the highest probability of success is selected, Factors 2, 3, and 4, Financial Strategy, Facility Capability, and Project Management, will be evaluated for proposal risk. Risk will be assessed at the subfactor level, or where there are no subfactors, at the factor level.

### 5.7 Cost and Financial Strategy

Affordability of the project is a major consideration of this source selection. As stated in the evaluation factors for Phase II, the goal is to achieve absolute minimum cost to the Air Force. Therefore, affordability is defined as the combination of "cost to the Air Force" and "financial strategy" employed by an offer which minimizes the additional funds the Air Force would have to provide (both in total and by Government Fiscal Year) if the offeror's proposal was accepted. This includes but is not limited by new/additional Congressional appropriations, cost of interruptions or dislocations during construction, and any other conceivable funding contingencies.

Information in the cost volume must provide evaluators with a clear picture of the Offeror's financial projections for the development and must be supported by detailed cost estimates. The following assessment criteria will be used when evaluating and rating cost:

- **COMPLETENESS:** All information/data required to support the proposed financial strategy has been provided. Assumptions and estimates on which the strategy is based are clearly identified.
- **REASONABLENESS:** Cost estimates, financing terms, and financial projections are fully justified and supported and are considered fair under current market conditions.
- **REALISM:** Cost estimates and financial projections are compatible with proposed scope of effort and operations reflect reasonable economy and efficiency.

The “Cost to the Air Force” factor, in Phase II, will not be color rated but will be evaluated by the criteria described above. The SSA will consider the overall costs to the Air Force in making his best value determination. Zero cost to the Air Force is desired, and therefore, more important to the Air force than some cost to the Air Force.

The “Financial Strategy” subfactor/factor, in both phases, will be color rated using the system described in paragraph 5.3 above after an assessment is made for completeness, reasonableness and realism.

## **6.0 EVALUATION FACTORS**

Evaluation factors for each Phase are described in the solicitation (see “Evaluation Factors”). Selection will be made to the Offeror proposing the most advantageous technical features and program benefits based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below:

### **PHASE I:**

Past Performance is the most important factor. Within Factor 1, subfactors are of equal importance. Within Factor 2, the subfactor 1 is most important and subfactors 2-4 are of lesser importance to subfactor 1 but of equal importance to each other.

#### **Factor 1: Past Performance**

- i) SUBFACTOR 1 - Activity/City Relations
- ii) SUBFACTOR 2 - Customer Assessment
- iii) SUBFACTOR 3 - Cost Performance
- iv) SUBFACTOR 4 - Schedule

#### **Factor 2: Preliminary Project Concept**

- i) SUBFACTOR 1 - Financial Strategy
- ii) SUBFACTOR 2 - Project Siting and Design Approach
- iii) SUBFACTOR 3 – SMC Corporate Integrity
- iv) SUBFACTOR 4 – Proposal Risk Assessment

### **PHASE II:**

Factors are listed in descending order of importance. Subfactors are of equal importance.

FACTOR 1: COST TO THE AIR FORCE

FACTOR 2: FINANCIAL STRATEGY

FACTOR 3: FACILITY CAPABILITY

- i) SUBFACTOR 1 - Building Core and Shell
- ii) SUBFACTOR 2 – Tenant Improvements.
- iii) SUBFACTOR 3 – Integration with Area B.

FACTOR 4: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

- i) SUBFACTOR 1 - Project Execution Plan
- ii) SUBFACTOR 2 – Project Management Team

FACTOR 5: PROPOSAL RISK.

FACTOR 6: PAST PERFORMANCE (carried forward from Phase I and updated if necessary if additional information becomes available.).

## **7.0 NON-GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL**

- 7.1 Non-governmental consultants, including any local city, county or state representatives, will provide advisory services during this source selection and, as such, will be privy to proprietary information submitted by competing Offerors. Representatives of these firms also will work with each of the team leaders but will be restricted from participating as a voting member on any of the source selection evaluation teams. All non-government advisors will sign non-disclosure statements.
- 7.2 The release of proposal information to non-government advisors will be subject to the controls outlined herein. Non-government advisors will be allowed access to past performance information and proprietary financial data (dollar figures) contained in the cost proposal and any other area determined by the SSET Chairpersons.
- 7.3 Prohibitions. Non-government advisors will be prohibited from proposal rating, ranking, or recommending the selection of a source. However, it is anticipated that non-government advisors will be allowed to participate in Air Force decision making meetings such as SSAC (or SSET) sessions, or SSA briefings, when invited by the chairperson(s) to be present during a particular portion of the meeting if they are needed to provide specific technical information.
- 7.4 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI). OCI clauses are included in the contracts under which non-governmental technical advisors will provide support to this source selection. The OCI clauses require the companies and individual non-government advisors to protect Offeror proprietary data and government source selection information and prohibits the companies from otherwise participating as an Offeror, a subcontractor, or as a consultant to an Offeror/subcontractor in relation to this acquisition.
- 7.5 Permission from Offerors. Provisions will be included in the solicitation in order to obtain permission from Offerors for non-government advisors to have access to proposal information.

**ATTACHMENT 1****PHASE III: RESOLUTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS**

The objective of Phase III of the source selection process is to specify and document the details of the Selected Offeror's proposal, and assure that it will be implemented in a manner consistent with the basis on which the Successful Offeror was selected. These administrative details are non-negotiable, non-selection, closing details.

The Successful Offeror will be required to attend a kickoff meeting to identify all tasks and documents that must be completed prior to closing. The Air Force/Successful Offeror will establish a transition plan including but not limited to security, mobility, utility, facility operations, maintenance and management requirements.

The Air Force goal for closing the real estate transaction is sixty (60) days following approval of source selection. Execution of the real estate agreements shall be contingent upon satisfactory evidence that the Successful Offeror:

- Within ten (10) days of Air Force notification, provided a cash security deposit in the amount of \$250,000.
- Within ten (10) days of Air Force notification, provided proof of equity including, but not limited to amount and form of equity, location and number of account, financial institution and name of contact at the financial institution. For equity other than cash, describe the type, condition and location of the equity and the form of legal instruments necessary to transfer ownership of the equity to the project. Also describe how the value of the equity will be determined.
- Obtained a firm commitment for both construction and permanent financing, on the terms set forth in the Successful Offeror's proposal, contingent only upon closing within a specified time frame (not less than 90 days) following Air Force notification. If the Successful Offeror and the Air Force can obtain substantial advantage, in either interest rate or other financing terms, from closing more quickly, the Air Force may, in its sole discretion, accept a different period for closing the financing.
- Documentation. The Successful Offeror in proposed final form shall provide all documents required to be executed at closing within thirty (30) days following Air Force notification. If the Successful Offeror can show good cause for delay, the Air Force may, at its sole discretion, choose to extend this period or choose to proceed to the next Offeror.