Attachment A – Source Selection Plan Requirements

The Source Selection Plan (SSP) shall contain the following elements:

- A brief description of the acquisition and the tradeoff process;
- A description of the organizational structure and duties of the members of the source selection organization;
- A description of the evaluation process including the rating system;
- A listing of the evaluation factors and their relative importance; and,
- A signature page.

Description of the Acquisition and Best Value Tradeoff Source Selection Process:
The SSP should contain a section that provides a general description of the procurement including the following elements:

- Square footage requirement.
- The type(s) of space required, i.e. office, warehouse, etc.
- Delineated area.
- NOAA entity for which the procurement is being conducted.
- Term of the lease.
- Any prospectus limit.
- A general estimate of the dates for SFO issuance, receipt of initial offers, and other schedule milestones.
- A note that NOAA will employ formal source selection procedures as outlined in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.3 to choose the offer that represents the best value to the Government.
- A statement that the CO, with concurrence by the SSA and based on the evaluation and recommendations of the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) (and Technical Evaluation Teams (TETs, if any)) may establish a competitive range based on evaluation of price and technical factors.
- A short statement outlining the general process. For example, "Once a competitive range has been determined, the CO may schedule discussions/negotiations. Discussions may be conducted orally and/or in writing. Revised proposals may be requested of all offerors remaining in contention for award. The evaluation of revised proposals will consider results of discussions/negotiations and revised proposals." (Note: If there are TETS include the following: "The TET will evaluate the revised proposals and reports will be prepared and presented to the SSEB.") "The SSEB will review the revised proposals (and TET reports if applicable) and prepare its report. It will then balance the technical evaluations against the price and make a written recommendation to the SSA." A statement outlining very generally the role of the SSEB, such as "During the course of the procurement, the SSEB will make recommendations regarding: offers that meet the minimum requirements; offers that should be included in the competitive range; and, final selection of the offer that provides the best value to the Government."
- A statement that the Government reserves the right to make an award based on initial offers, which may be prior to establishing a competitive range.

EXAMPLE

Description of the Organizational Structure and Duties:

The SSP shall contain a description of the Source Selection Organization including a list with the names of personnel serving in the following positions as well as descriptions of their duties:

- The Source Selection Authority (SSA);
- The Contracting Officer (CO);
- The Realty Specialist;
- The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Chairperson, Members, as well as Alternates, if any;
- The Technical Evaluation Team (TET) Chairperson, Members, as well as Alternates, if any;
- The Office of General Counsel advisor; and,
- Other members, including possibly a Broker or other advisors, of the Source Selection Organization, if any.

General requirements for those involved in the source selection organization including non-disclosure and conflict of interest documentation should be included in this section.

The following are general descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of the various components listed above. The definitions marked as such should generally be used but may be adjusted to reflect the specifics of the procurement. The additional information is general guidance and should not be included in the SSP.

Source Selection Authority (SSA) (Definition): The SSA is responsible for: reviewing and approving the source selection plan (including the technical evaluation factors, and relative importance of price and technical factors) and procedures and the SFO/RLP in conjunction with the CO; appointing the chairperson(s) and other members of the SSEB and TETs in conjunction with the CO; ensuring that offers are evaluated solely on the factors and subfactors contained in the SFO/RLP; ensuring conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest are avoided; concurring in the CO's decision of the competitive range; determining, in conjunction with the CO whether to award without negotiations or whether to award after receiving final proposal revisions or to call for further revisions; considering the recommendations of the SSEB; ordering the reevaluation of offers, or any part of them, if there is a doubt about the validity of the evaluation; documenting any departure from the recommendation of the SSEB, stating and supporting reasons for not following the recommendation; and, selecting the offeror whose proposal is the best value to the Government based upon the SSP, applicable statutes and regulations, and the Source Selection Authority's independent judgment. The SSA shall ensure the supporting rationale for his/her selection is fully documented.

Additional information: Although the SSA may use the recommendation, report, and analysis, prepared by the SSEB, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The SSA's decision shall be documented and the documentation shall include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs, including costs, made or relied on by the SSA. For major lease acquisitions -- acquisitions whose life cycle costs are $20 million or greater, or other high risk or complex acquisitions where there is likely to be measurable and significant differences between offers -- the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) shall be the SSA; the Deputy CAO may redelegated the SSA authority to the Director of Real Property, Facilities and Logistics Office (RPFLO), but such delegation may not be further redelegated.

EXAMPLE

Contracting Officer (CO) (Definition): The CO shall: direct the entire source selection process; appoint the chairperson and members of the SSEB and TETs, in conjunction with the SSA; provide the SSEB and TETs with appropriate guidance and specific instructions, as necessary, for conducting the evaluation and selection process, including the evaluation criteria and relative importance of price and technical factors, as approved by the SSA; reviewing and approving the SSP, in conjunction with the SSA; coordinating with the SSA on the preparation and issuance of the SFO/RLP; issuing any amendments to the SFO; preparing notifications and advertisements; safeguarding classified and other sensitive material, including all offers and revised offers and advising all SSEB members of requirements regarding nondisclosure of information and avoiding conflict of interest; conducting or coordinating price analysis as prescribed by GSAM 570.110 "Cost or pricing data and information other than cost or pricing data" and documenting the results; promptly notifying all offerors eliminated from the competition; determining offeror responsibility in accordance with FAR Subpart 9.1; determining the competitive range (with concurrence of the SSA), if any; serving as the focal point for inquiries from actual or prospective offerors; controlling exchanges with offerors in accordance with FAR 15.306; conducting all written or oral discussions and negotiations with offerors (and requesting clarifications if necessary); requesting revised proposals; determining contractor responsibility in accordance with applicable acquisition regulations; preparing and awarding the lease and taking all necessary contractual actions; and, conducting or supervising the debriefing of unsuccessful offerors. The CO, or someone designated by the CO, will collect and maintain a file with all procurement integrity forms. [1]

Additional Information: A critical responsibility of the CO is ensuring that discussions/negotiations with offerors are carefully documented. It is strongly recommended that COs prepare a list of written points they plan to cover in their negotiations with each specific offeror and that following such negotiations the CO send a follow-up letter covering those points to the offeror. Such correspondence has proven extremely useful in defending against protests where an offeror may try to argue that they were not made aware of a deficiency, weakness, requirement, or need for clarification.

Realty Specialist (Definition): The Realty Specialist will assist the CO in the duties detailed above including but not limited to acquisition planning, preparation of the SFO and SSP, preparing for and documenting all discussions with offerors, and performing/fulfilling all required due diligence including any statutory requirements prior to awarding the lease.

Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) (Definition): The SSEB shall be responsible for: holding scheduled Board meetings; understanding the SSP and SFO; reading and evaluating initial and final offers in accordance with the SSP and SFO including documenting strengths, weaknesses, areas for clarification, and deficiencies; reaching a consensus decision on each ranked factor and subfactor and on an overall recommendation; recording findings and preparing written reports on the evaluation results of the initial and final offers for recommendation to the CO and SSA; assisting the CO in debriefing unsuccessful offerors. The SSEB will include an SSEB Chairperson who will be responsible for: conducting and scheduling SSEB meetings; providing overall supervision, planning, and direction of SSEB activities; completing SSEB responsibilities within the time frame established in the SSP; and, summarizing the offer data (with assistance from the TETs as appropriate). The definition will also include the number of

[1] See RPMD Bulletin #7 "Procurement Integrity Certification"

EXAMPLE

SSEB voting members and the number of alternates. Alternates will attend all SSEB meetings and may consult with voting SSEB members but will not have a vote.

Additional Information: The SSEB may include representatives from the end-user, i.e. the line or staff office, but the majority shall be RPMD personnel. An RPMD official will serve as the Chair of the SSEB. If non-RPMD personnel are included as Board members, TET members, or advisors, managers and supervisors shall ensure that other work assignments of Board members and evaluators do not interfere with Board assignments and activities.[2] The chair is responsible for scheduling and conducting Board meetings; working with the SSA and CO to obtain required Conflict of Interest Statements from all Board members, TET members, and advisors; ensuring that proper control of offers is maintained throughout the evaluation process; briefing the SSA on Board activities; and, ensuring that SSEB reports are prepared and signed by all members of the SSEB after each review, i.e. initial offers, final proposal revisions, and other reviews, if any. In its review of initial offers, the SSEB shall note in its report any areas requiring clarification. The Chair of the SSEB submits the final report and recommendation to the SSA. The SSEB should consist of at least three members with sufficient expertise in the area of the procurement to be able to evaluate the offers. Non-voting alternates may be included in the event that an SSEB member retires, takes another position, or is otherwise no longer available. Consensus should be reached by the SSEB on each adjectival rating for each rated factor and subfactors (if any) and on the overall score for each offer. The SSEB shall have a non-voting advisor from the Office of the General Counsel.

Technical Evaluation Teams (TETs) (Definition): The TETs shall be responsible for: evaluating offers with respect to the technical evaluation factor(s)/subfactors under their responsibility in accordance with the SSP and SFO; identifying the strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and areas for clarification of each offer with respect to that factor(s); and, documenting their assessment of these strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and areas of needed clarification to the SSEB. The TETS shall report directly to the SSEB. The TETs shall receive direction from the SSA and SSEB.

Additional Information: A Source Selection Process may include TETs depending on the complexity and number of the offers and evaluation factors and subfactors. TETs are generally comprised of individuals with subject matter expertise relative to the evaluation criteria. For example, one TET might assess Past Performance and Key Personnel while another might assess Building Characteristics. The TET(s) generally will evaluate the factor(s) solely with a narrative describing the offers and their respective strengths, weaknesses, etc. but will not provide specific ratings. The SSP must detail whether the TET(s) will provide ratings in addition to their narrative evaluations. The SSP shall include the number of TETs that will be used, detail which factor(s) each TET will evaluate, and, if available at the time of the SSP drafting, identify the chairperson for each TET as well as the members.

Broker or Other Advisor (Definition): A real estate broker, or other persons may be contracted to serve as an advisor or representative of the Government for the purposes of the procurement. The Advisor shall assist the SSA, CO, Realty Specialist, SSEB, and TETs (if any), in the logistics of the procurement (arranging meetings, collecting offers, arranging market tours), provide general real estate knowledge, and assist in note taking and preparation of documents

[2] Commerce Acquisition Manual, CAM 15-2, Part 212 "Management Responsibility," Department of Commerce

EXAMPLE

including the SFO/RLP, the SSEB and/or TET reports, the lease, and any amendments to the SFO/RLP or lease.

A representative of the Office of General Counsel shall serve as an advisor on all SSEBs.

Contractor personnel shall not be used as voting members of the SSEB or TET(s) board except in unusual circumstances. See FAR 37.203(d) for additional information.

Description of the Evaluation Process including the Rating System in the SSP:
The SSP and SFO/RLP must include all factors (and subfactors, if any) that will be evaluated. They must indicate the relative importance of each factor (and subfactor, if subfactors are included).

A brief description of why the factor is relevant to the requirement should be included in the SSP. (See the "Evaluation Factors" Section of this Bulletin for additional guidance on the Evaluation Factor development.)

Attachments C, D, and E contain sample SSP Evaluation Process and Rating System sections. The sample sections and must be adjusted to reflect the specific procurement and the requirements of this Bulletin.

This SSP section must include information detailing:

- The trade-off process and whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are:
    1) Significantly more important than cost or price;
    2) Approximately equal to cost or price; or,
    3) Significantly less important than cost or price.[3]
- The process for the initial technical evaluation, the revised proposal evaluation, and the selection of the successful offeror; and,
- The rating system.

SSP Signature Page:
The SSP shall contain a signature page executed by all those concurring and approving the plan. All SSEB members should sign the SSP acknowledging their agreement to evaluate the offers received in response to the SFO/RLP based on the SSP.

EXAMPLE

[3] FAR 15.304(e)

Attachment B – Sample SSP Section Describing the Evaluation Process

X. Description of the Evaluation Process

A. Best Value Trade Off Process

1. The Government intends to use the best value trade off process in selecting the offer that is most advantageous. The trade off process is a method of evaluating price and other factors as specified in the solicitation to select the offer that provides the best value to the Government. Best value under this process is measured with respect to the available property and the anticipated performance of the offeror's team, and of rewarding offers that provide more than the minimum required project quality and/or quantity. This process permits tradeoffs among price and technical factors. It allows the Government to accept other than the highest technically rated offer and other than the lowest priced offer. If a best value trade off analysis is done it needs to include all technically acceptable offers within the competitive range.[4]

2. (Note: The following is an example when the tradeoff is established where all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. This section must be changed to reflect the determined relative importance.)

   Price is of significantly less importance than the combined weight of the technical factors; however, the degree of importance of price as a factor becomes greater as technical offers approach equality. Conversely, as price proposals become more equal to one another, technical proposals will become more important as a determining factor. The perceived benefits of the higher priced offer, if any, must merit the additional cost and the rationale must be fully documented in the file. The SSEB and SSA may select an offeror that has a significantly higher price if the technical benefits of the offer are identified and support the conclusion that the technically superior offer is worth the significantly higher cost.

B. General Requirements

1. All personnel participating in the evaluation process will review the SFO/RLP and SSP and become very familiar with their requirements before undertaking the evaluation process.

2. Individuals participating in the evaluation process must not discuss or reveal information concerning the evaluation except to another individual participating in the evaluation process. All SSEB board members, TET members, technical and other advisors, will be required to sign a Certificate of Nondisclosure and Conflict of Interest Statement.

[4] *Coastal Environments Inc.* (B-401889, December 18, 2009) and Systems *Engineering International (SEI) Inc.* (B-402754, July 20, 2010), the Government Accountability Office (GAO) sustained preaward protests where, in each case, the agency improperly conducted a best value trade-off between only the two highest rated, highest priced proposals and did not consider the lower prices offered by other lower-rated proposals that were found to be technically acceptable

EXAMPLE

3. Individuals participating in the evaluation process will not communicate with any offerors. Any needed clarifications will be forwarded to the CO for referral to the offerors concerned.

C. Initial Technical Evaluation

1. Each offer will be evaluated against the standards for each evaluation factor (and subfactor, if applicable) for purposes of establishing a competitive range. The competitive range, if established, shall be composed of the most highly rated proposals, price and technical factors considered, unless further reduced for purposes of efficiency….[5] Offers will not be compared with other offers. The technical evaluation teams will develop examples, interview questions and/or evaluation matrices, as appropriate to review and evaluate each proposal based on the evaluation standards for each technical factor (or subfactor).

2. Identifying deficiencies in offers and/or unacceptable offers: The evaluation will identify each aspect in which an offer is unable or unwilling to meet the solicitation's minimum requirements. A determination that an offer is unacceptable must be based on an inability or unwillingness to meet minimum requirements that are stated in the SFO/RLP.

3. Identifying ambiguous language and inadequate information: Sometimes language in an offer is ambiguous, and the offer's technical merit will differ depending on the interpretation given the language. In instances where inclusion or exclusion of the offer for further evaluation is uncertain, the CO will send a letter to the offeror requesting clarification. This communication will not be used to cure offer deficiencies or material omissions, materially alter the technical or cost elements of the offer, and/or otherwise permit revision of the offer.

4. Identifying strengths and weaknesses of offers: Assisted by the TETs, the SSEB will identify the strengths and weaknesses of each technical offer. In order to appreciate the technical merits of a given offer, the SSA needs to understand the ways in which a given offer is considered technically strong, as well as the ways in which it is weak or deficient. A catalog of the strengths and weaknesses of each offer, in terms of the evaluation factors, provides a summary that facilitates arriving at a well-informed judgment as to which offer is most advantageous overall to the Government. This information is essential and will be included in the report by the SSEB.

5. Recording Findings: At the conclusion of the technical evaluation process, TET(s) will formulate consensus narrative(s) under the guidance of their respective chairperson(s). This narrative description will include strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and areas for clarification.

D. Evaluation Process

1. Each TET will present the consensus results to the technical factor(s) (and subfactors) assigned to its team to the SSEB. (Note: If there are no TETs then the

[5] FAR 15.306(c)

EXAMPLE

SSEB will create the report.) Each TET Chairperson will prepare a summary and supporting documentation for review by the SSEB.

2. After the TET(s) have provided their report(s), the SSEB will formulate its collective conclusions. SSEB members will develop ratings to reflect the results of internal discussions and their review of the TET(s) report(s).

3. The consensus rating assigned to each offer by the SSEB as a unit will be accompanied by a narrative evaluation so that the Government can demonstrate that selection is based on intelligent and rational judgment of the technical merits of each competing offer. The narratives will include explanations when agreement has not been reached on any factor. The narrative will include information on the strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and any clarifications required of the offers.

4. In exceptional cases, where the SSEB is unable to reach agreement, the evaluation report will include the majority conclusion and the dissenting view(s), each with a supporting rationale. Agreement shall be defined as meaning that there is no significant different between the evaluators' ratings, i.e. all ratings must be no further apart than adjacent adjectives such as "Outstanding" and "Better" or "Better" and "Acceptable". If ratings differ by more than a single adjective agreement shall not have been reached.

5. The CO, with concurrence of the SSA, based upon the evaluation process and in consultation with the SSEB and TETs, may select offers to be included in a competitive range. Such a decision must be accompanied by a narrative justification. The CO may choose not to select a competitive range and to evaluate all timely offers. However, a competitive range shall be chosen if negotiations are to be held with the offerors. The CO, with concurrence of the SSA, may determine that the competitive range will include all offerors.

6. If a competitive range is created and an offeror's past performance is the determining factor preventing them from being placed within the competitive range, the CO will conduct discussions with that offeror to allow them to address that adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not had a prior opportunity to respond.

EXAMPLE

E. Ratings

Each factor (and subfactor, if applicable) <u>except</u> past performance, shall be rated according to the following ratings. Each offer also shall receive an overall rating based on the following.

The following ratings will be assigned to each technical factor, and subfactor, if any:

OUTSTANDING: Significantly exceeds solicitation requirements and meets all solicitation requirements. There are significant strengths. There are no significant weaknesses. Any weaknesses are considered to be of such small consequence that their impact on the overall superiority of the offer/factor is insignificant. The offer clearly demonstrates an understanding

of all aspects of the requirements. The offer represents a high probability of success with no apparent risk in meeting the Government's requirements.

BETTER: Meets all solicitation requirements. There are significant strengths. There are no significant weaknesses. There may be one or more minor weaknesses. Minor weaknesses, either alone or together, will have only minimal impact on the overall offer/factor. The offer demonstrates clear understanding of the requirements. The offer represents a strong probability of success with overall low degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.

ACCEPTABLE: There are no deficiencies. Significant strengths, if any, are limited and/or offset by weakness. There may be limited weaknesses, however, weaknesses will not (alone or together) jeopardize timely and satisfactory performance. The offer demonstrates an understanding of the requirements. The offer represents a reasonable probability of success with overall moderate degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.

MARGINAL: There is at least one significant weakness that will likely impact timely or satisfactory performance. One or more technical considerations and capabilities are questionable as to whether or not the offer meets standards necessary for acceptable lease performance. Strengths, if any, are outweighed by weaknesses. The offer may demonstrate a limited understanding of the requirements. The offer represents a low probability of success with overall high degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements. It is possible, however, that the offer may become acceptable through discussions (if held).

POOR: The offer has many significant weaknesses, omissions, and/or one or more deficiencies. Technical considerations and capabilities are questionable as to whether or not they meet standards necessary for acceptable contract performance. The offer may demonstrate a limited understanding of requirements. The offer represents a low probability of success with overall high degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements. (When applying this adjective to an offer as a whole, the offer would have to portray a weakness or a deficiency in one or more areas that would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than Poor.)

<u>Definitions</u>:
Strength: An aspect or characteristic contained in an offer that is unique, innovative or especially beneficial to the program or could increase the probability of successful contract performance (including scheduling, completion of deliverables, quality control and cost benefit). A significant strength is one that is a major consideration in the rating of the offer. A significant strength may be an area where an offeror far exceeds the requirements in a way that is beneficial to the Government.

Weakness[6]: A flaw in the proposal (offer) that increases the risk of not meeting the Government's requirements. A "significant weakness" in the proposal (offer) is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance or an inability of the real property or offer to efficiently or effectively support the Government's requirements.

[6] Partially taken from FAR 15.001 Definitions – note the FAR uses "proposal" while lease acquisitions usually use the term offer.

EXAMPLE

Deficiency[7]: A material failure of an offer to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. NOTE: In an award without discussions, a single deficiency will render an offer unsuitable for award.

Ratings for Past Performance shall be:

High Confidence: Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has high confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. "High Confidence" indicates there is essentially no doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Significant Confidence: Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has significant confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. "Significant Confidence" indicates there is little doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Satisfactory Confidence: Based on the offeror's performance record, the government has confidence the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Normal contractor emphasis should preclude any problems.

Unknown Confidence: No performance record is identifiable. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.

Little Confidence: Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

No Confidence: Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

F. Revised Proposal Evaluation Process

1. The CO will hold discussions/negotiations within the limitations of FAR 15.306 with all offerors included in the competitive range. In these discussions, the offerors will be advised of the deficiencies and significant weaknesses in their offers, and any adverse past performance information for which the offeror has not yet had an opportunity to respond. Each offeror and the Government may discuss alternative strategies which may result in the putting forth its strongest offer given the requirements of the Government as stated in the SFO/RLP. The Government may meet with each offeror one or more times. The Government need not treat each offeror identically as long as each offeror is treated fairly and given the opportunity to put forth their strongest offer.

2. In accordance with FAR 15.307, upon completion of discussions/negotiations, the CO shall issue to all offerors who are still under consideration, a request for final proposal revisions (FPRs). These FPRs are for purposes of clarifying and

[7] Partially taken from FAR 15.001 Definitions – note the FAR uses “proposal” while lease acquisitions usually use the term offer.

EXAMPLE

documenting understandings reached during discussions/negotiations. When these FPRs are received, a final technical evaluation will be performed to see if the proposal revisions affect the technical merits of the offers and the ratings. The final evaluation will be governed by the same basic rules and considerations as those used in the evaluation of the initial offers.

G. Selection of the Successful Offeror

1. Upon completion of the technical and price evaluation, the SSEB shall review the final technical ratings and the price analyses. If the highest technically rated offer is the lowest priced offer, then that offer shall be the recommendation for award presented to the SSA.[8] (NOTE: The following is based on technical factors being significantly more important than price. This section must be revised for other scenarios where price is of equal importance or more important than technical factors.)

2. If not, the SSEB must compare all offers to determine which, taking technical factors and price into consideration, offers the best value to the government. The SSEB must conduct a technical trade-off process. The perceived qualitative benefits of the higher priced offer that merit the additional cost must be identified and the rationale must be documented in the file. The degree of difference in technical merit in terms of evaluation ratings or scores need not be proportional to the difference in price for a technically superior offer to be selected, provided that the SSEB/SSA can demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the added value of the proposal is worth the higher price. The SSEB and SSA may select an offeror that has a significantly higher price if the technical benefits of the offer relative to the next ranked technical offer are identified and support the conclusion that the technically superior offer is worth the significantly higher cost.

3. The SSEB, and in consultation with the CO, will bring its recommendations to the SSA. The SSA's decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. The SSA may use the reports and analyses prepared by the SSEB and the CO, but the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent decision. The SSA's decision shall be documented and include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs.[9]

EXAMPLE

[8] Before Lease Award all required environmental reviews must also be completed. For example, if an Environmental Assessment is required then there must be a signed Finding of No Significant Impact before the Lease can be awarded. Any necessary Executive Order 11988/11990 Floodplain and Wetlands reviews must also be completed.
[9] FAR 15.308

Attachment C – Sample Evaluation Factor Section – Office

NOTE: The below is provided purely for illustrative purposes but must be adjusted for the specific procurement and to ensure compliance with this Bulletin.

Minimum Requirements: An offer will not be considered for award unless it will meet necessary minimum requirements at the time of award. The minimum technical requirements are fully described in the SFO. If it is determined that an offeror does not meet the requirements, and discussions are held with that offeror, the offeror will be given the opportunity to meet the requirements.

Technical Evaluation Criteria: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) requires a location that will promote and facilitate the effective and efficient performance of its mission. To that end, NOAA prefers a location that will enable interaction and collaboration between and among its personnel and divisions and will promote the productivity, recruitment, retention, morale, and well-being of its personnel. NOAA prefers a quality building that reflects the identity and stature of the agency, allows for efficient and flexible space planning, and provides an attractive and healthy working environment for its personnel. NOAA desires a building that is reasonably convenient to its employees and customers with metro (subway, transportation hub, airport, etc. might be substituted here) and proximity to a diverse number of amenities. The Lessor should be one with experience in developing and/or leasing buildings of similar size and tenancies with whom the Government can have confidence in their ability to deliver a quality work environment in a timely basis. The Government also requires that the offeror be able to meet the required schedule and schedule milestones as it must vacate its current location by x date as well as scheduling furniture, IT, and other moves. Accordingly, the following six factors that reflect the Government's program will be evaluated: (Note: for this example the following six factors are used but it is suggested that a smaller number may be ideal and/or relevant depending on the procurement.)

- Building Characteristics
- Site Design
- Location
- Past Performance
- Key Personnel
- Project Schedule

Of the six technical factors, Building Characteristics is more important than Site Design. Site Design and Location are of equal importance and more important than Past Performance, Key Personnel, and Project Schedule. Past Performance, Key Personnel, and Project Schedule are of equal importance.

<u>Building Characteristics</u>

In evaluating building characteristics, the buildings planning efficiency and flexibility will be reviewed. As part of its offer, Lessors shall provide a test fit showing the how NOAA's Program of Requirements can be accommodated as well as a narrative of how the offered space will accommodate the POR requirements. Offerors who demonstrate the ability to accommodate the

EXAMPLE

desired adjacencies between organizational elements and the ability to effectively and efficiently meet the government's requirements and preferences as outlined in the POR will receive higher ratings. The Government also prefers a building that contains the following features. Unless specifically indicated the feature is a preference not a minimum requirement with offers exceeding or meeting the preference receiving higher ratings than those that do not meet the preference: Floor plate of at least 20,000 USF (the 20,000 USF is a minimum requirement) and no more than 50,000 USF; Rectangular floor plate; R/U factor of no more than 1.20 with lower R/U factors considered more favorably; Even, regular column spacing of no less than 25'; Efficient interior core with a rectangular shape; Z-type corridor at the core; No more than 45' from the core to the window wall to allow for penetration of natural light; Regular window mullion spacing; Modular column, window, and ceiling grid; Live floor load capacity of 100 psi (the minimum requirement is set forth in the SFO/RLP); Consistent ceiling heights of at least 9' clear with 10' for conference rooms. (The SFO/RLP contains the minimum requirement);

The quality of building architecture will also be considered as part of the evaluation of Building Characteristics. A building whose architecture, construction, building systems, and finishes exceed the minimum requirements of the SFO/RLP will be rated more highly. A building that can demonstrate a 30% energy savings in comparison to other buildings of similar size and configuration shall be considered more favorably (calculations and additional information must be provided by the Lessor). Higher ratings will be given to buildings whose construction and finishes meet or exceed industry standards for new, first-class construction in prime commercial office districts. The Government also will consider qualitative attributes of the building's architecture, building systems, construction, and finishes, including but not limited to: The quality of the building lobby design including finishes, layout, ceiling height, and spaciousness; The quality of building common areas including finishes and layouts of elevator lobbies and restrooms; Parking access and availability, including number of parking spaces guaranteed to be available to the government for employees of the government (including at market rate if for employees of the government); Loading dock accessibility, size, and capacity; Proximity and accessibility of freight elevator from the loading dock; Energy efficiency and sustainability of the building design as evidenced by consistency with the criteria for LEED certification and the Energy Star building label; Window energy efficiency; HVAC energy efficiency; Vapor barrier of the building envelope; and, Building systems that provide the most capacity, efficiency, reliability, and flexibility.

Site Design

Offered sites will be evaluated on the quality of the site design. Site layouts that provide the greatest efficiency and ability to satisfy and exceed the requirements of the POR will receive higher ratings. Special attention will be paid to adjacency of required buildings and areas including parking, security buildings and perimeters, trash areas, storage areas, commercial vehicle and delivery access, and landscaping. Efficient traffic patterns and safe and efficient access within the site and to local roadways for pedestrians and vehicles will be considered. Aesthetics such as screening of trash areas and landscaping, as well as exterior lighting, will be evaluated.

EXAMPLE

Location

Evaluation of the offer's location will include review of the offer's access to Public Transportation. Each offer will be evaluated on the distance from the main, handicapped accessible, entrance of offeror's main building to the entrance of the closest Metrorail station (Note: this could be closest bus line, transportation hub, airport, etc. depending on mission needs for the specific procurement). The entrance of the Metrorail station will be defined as the closest handicapped accessible turnstile to the station where fares are collected. For distances under one mile, the distance shall be measured in walkable linear feet using the most direct handicapped-accessible path along public sidewalks and/or pedestrian paths. For distance measurement, all streets must be crossed at crosswalks. For distances at or beyond one mile in walkable linear feet, the distance will be measured by the most direct legal rush-hour driving route between the sidewalk at the closest entrance to the closest metrorail station and the sidewalk at the main entrance to the main building at the offered site. (Note: In many instances where there is a requirement to be near public transportation, offerors beyond a walkable distance are often required to provide a shuttle for office employees at no cost to the Government.) The following chart provides the rating system for the Access to Public Transportation subfactor:

Distance to Metrorail	Rating
Within 1,800 wlf from Metrorail*	Outstanding
More than 1,800 wlf from Metrorail but under 2,640 wlf (a half mile) from Metrorail*	Better
More than 2,640 wlf from Metrorail but under 5,280 wlf (one mile) from Metrorail*	Acceptable
More than 5,280 wlf from Metrorail but under 5 driveable miles from Metrorail.*	Marginal
More than five driveable miles from Metrorail.*	Unacceptable

* Distance from Metrorail is as defined in the above paragraph.

Each offer will also be evaluated based on the number of amenity categories listed below located within specific distances from the main front entrance to the property. Categories are: (1) fast food establishment serving at least breakfast and lunch; (2) Sit-down restaurant serving at least lunch (must have waiter/waitress service taking orders and providing food); (3) bank (must include teller service not merely an ATM); (4) dry cleaners; (5) gym or fitness center; (6) post office; (7) day care; (8) gas station; (9) convenience store. The amenity must either be existing and operating or the offeror must provide evidence of future operation acceptable to the Contracting Officer such as a signed Letter of Intent or signed lease. Offers will be rated according to the following:

Distance in wlf from the Main Entrance to Property	Rating
At least one establishment in at least six of the amenity categories within 1,320 wlf. This must include the fast food amenity category	Outstanding
At least one establishment in at least six of the amenity categories within 2,640 wlf. This must include the fast food amenity category.	Better
At least one establishment in at least three of the amenity categories	Acceptable

EXAMPLE

within 2,640 wlf. This must include the fast food amenity category.	
At least one establishment in at least six of the amenity categories within 5,280 wlf. This must include the fast food amenity category.	Marginal
Less than one establishment in at least six of the amenity categories within 5,280 wlf or no fast food amenity within 5,280 wlf.	Poor

Past Performance

The Government will evaluate the Past Performance of all offerors, as well as the experience of team members in designing, building, financing and managing projects of a similar size with similar qualities. This includes development, design, construction and property management - on projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. The Government will review three (3) references and three (3) case studies, not more than five (5) years old, provided by Lessor for projects identified as similar in size, scope, and complexity. The case studies must clearly indicate offeror's responsibilities for the subject projects. Projects that are more current and demonstrate a clear similarity with the requirements of this SFO/RLP, particularly the size of the requirement, will be rated more highly. From these references, case studies, and from other sources the Government may develop on its own initiative, the Government will evaluate the offeror's reputation for: Conforming to lease; Accurately estimating and controlling costs; Adhering to contract schedules; Demonstrating reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and, Offerors who have experience designing, developing, operating and financing multiple projects closer to the size of this procurement will receive higher ratings than those closer to the minimum requirements. Past performance in complying with subcontracting plan goals for small disadvantaged business (SDB) concerns, monetary targets for SDB participation, and notifications of substitutions submitted under FAR 19. 1202-4(b)

Offerors may also provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and corrective actions taken by the Offeror. Adjectival rating will be based on strengths and weaknesses. Failure to submit appropriate reference information so that references may be contacted will lower an offeror's rating. Failure to submit information on Past Performance due to lack of experience will be evaluated by the Government as neutral. Offerors will be required to submit a statement that they have no past performance in order to receive the neutral rating.

Key Personnel

The Government will evaluate the offeror's design, construction, and management team. The evaluation will be based on the offeror's ability to provide quality site and building development, on time and on budget as determined by evaluating the offeror's following proposed team members: (a) Building Owner and/or Developer, (b) Property Manager, (c) Base Building Architect; (d) Base Building Engineers (civil, mechanical, structural), (e) Interior Architect/Designer; and (f) Construction Manager/General Contractor. Offerors shall list the lead day-to-day person that will be responsible for providing each of the above functions (a through f); offerors shall provide detailed resumes of all persons listed. Resumes must include the individual's current position title and the proposed position title for the subject procurement. Resumes also must list comparable projects that the person has worked on including the square footage and the person's specific role for that project. Resumes containing a project list that

EXAMPLE

does not detail the person's specific role on each project will not be acceptable and will result in a lower rating. The resume must also list years of experience, education, and relevant licenses or certifications.

The offeror's Key Personnel will be evaluated as follows: a. Qualifications including number of years of experience, education, training, and special skills; b. Property Manager and Engineer with appropriate licensing certificates and credentials, and experience operating and monitoring mechanical systems for buildings of similar size; c. Experience in working with the proposed team members; and, d. Past experience on projects of similar size, scope and complexity with the Government. Experience with projects that are more current and demonstrate a clear parallel with the requirements of this SFO will be rated more highly.

Offerors whose Key Personnel provide the greatest qualifications, the most favorable past performance on similar projects, and a proven track record of working together as a team on past successful projects will be more highly rated. The offer must clearly state the extent to which each individual identified as Key Personnel will be involved in the performance of the SFO/RLP. Resumes may only be submitted for individuals who will actually be used in the performance of the SFO. Substitutions of Key Personnel identified in the offer shall be allowed only where the proposed substitute can demonstrate qualifications and experience equal to or greater that those of the individual being replaced and shall be subject to the advance written consent of the Government. Adjectival rating will be based on strengths and weaknesses, with experience designing, developing, operating, and financing buildings close to the project size receiving higher ratings than those meeting the minimum requirements.

<u>Project Schedule</u>

Offerors will be evaluated based on their project schedule including: provision of a sufficient level of detail demonstrating knowledge of the project and the tasks required; provision of realistic/sufficient time to accomplish the each major required tasks/milestone; allowing for sufficient government review times; allowing for sufficient commissioning of systems; provision of sufficient time for Government installation of furniture and IT and Government moves; and, ability to meet Government milestone requirements.

Offerors will be expected to provide a Critical Path Method project schedule (in Microsoft Project) showing key milestones and to include a narrative with the schedule addressing permit timing as well as any other pertinent environmental or local, state, or federal reviews/approvals.

Note: The CO may decide to set the project schedule and the ability to meet certain deadlines and milestones as a minimum requirement versus a technical factor. If project schedule is made a minimum requirement, the SFO/RLP should make clear that it is the offeror's responsibility to demonstrate the ability to meet the schedule/schedule milestones and that the determination of the offeror's ability to meet such schedule/milestones will be made by the Contracting Officer, at his/her sole discretion.

EXAMPLE

Attachment D – Additional Sample Evaluation Factor Section - Pier

PLEASE NOTE: The below only uses three rating categories. These should be expanded to include the rating system described in the Bulletin, i.e. Outstanding, Better, Acceptable, Marginal, Poor.

BEGIN SAMPLE TEXT

The Technical Proposals will be evaluated based on the non-price factors articulated below. The rating must be supported by a detailed narrative statement that indicates the strengths, weaknesses, the degree of worth, and the significant risks associated with each proposal.

6.1 Evaluation Factors

The following criteria will be used for the evaluation of the technical proposals to determine the offeror's ability to achieve the requirements stated in the solicitation.

Factor "A" Location of Site
Factor "B" Site Configuration and Management
Factor "C" Quality of Building and Piers
Factor "D" Availability
Factor "E" Past Performance & Project Financing
Factor "F" Quality of Life

The importance of the following factors is as follows:

Factors "A", "B" and "C" are of equal importance and are significantly more important than Factors "D", "E" and "F"; Factor "D" and Factor "E" are of equal importance and more important than Factor "F".

FACTOR "A": LOCATION OF SITE

In evaluating the location of site, site compatibility, proximity to shipping routes, proximity to NOAA's x office(s), proximity to "for hire" labor, access to fire protection, proximity to emergency medical facility, access to fuel, access to airport, access to public transportation, access to shipyard/dry dock, physical barriers to ship access, and access to solid waste removal will be considered. The following are descriptions of the elements that will be considered in evaluating the Location of Site factor.

Site Compatibility: Pier function and adjacent land uses must be compatible with XXXX operations. Compatibility considers not only the type of adjacent land uses, but also the level of activity and proximity (of adjacent uses). The following is a list of compatible uses: general purpose marine terminal, multiuse facility, warehousing/distribution services, fishing/workboat/recreational mooring, military terminal, limited shipyard, limited residential, marine-oriented research facility. The following is a list of generally incompatible uses:

EXAMPLE

container terminal immediately adjacent, ferry terminal immediately adjacent, cruise ship terminal immediately adjacent, exclusively recreational moorage, fish processing immediately adjacent, exclusively shipyard/heavy industrial, significant residential, shared piers/buildings.

Proximity to Shipping Route: Ships traveling to research grounds in XXXX frequently use inland routes east of XXXXXX. Convenient, efficient access to both the XXXX and the inland route to XXXXX are desirable. It is important that sites are within XX hours (ship travel) or XXX nautical miles of XXXX along the inland route, Sites within XX hours (XXX nautical miles) are preferred.

Proximity to NOAA's XXXX: XXXX percent of the research programs XXXX works with are based in the XXXX area. The farther XXX is from the XXXX-based research programs, the more travel time will be required, and therefore, sites not requiring extended travel times for visiting personnel are preferred.

Proximity to "for hire" Labor: XXXX spends an average of $XXXXM with suppliers and contractors each year. It is important that the appropriate type and variety of skilled labor is accessible, and that frequently required supplies are available on short notice. Therefore, proximity of a variety of all frequently required services and suppliers is desirable. Skilled labor includes full service ship repair contractors including electricians, ship fitters, riggers, welders, pipe fitters, sheet metal mechanics, machinists, insulators, and HVAC mechanics. Specialized contractors include electrical, HVAC, hydraulics, insulation, deck covering, control systems, navigation electronics, communication system electronics, electrical motors (rewinding, troubleshooting). The preference is for sites to be within 100 driving miles or less of a variety of skilled labor.

Access to Fire Protection: Fire protection is available,with shoreside response required and waterside response desirable.

Proximity to Emergency Medical Facility: Due to maintenance activities and general mission operations performed on the site, it is important that emergency medical facilities are easily accessible. Sites within 15 minutes of Level II or above trauma facilities (by ground transport) are preferred. Level II trauma facilities can provide a wide range of emergency services on-site, and helo-medivac service can be used to transport some patients.

Access to Fuel: The site is within reasonable sailing distance (3 to 5 hours)/33-55 nautical miles) of a fuel terminal, or fueling barge or truck is allowed/available on site. Because NOAA uses Government contract rates for fuel whenever possible, it is preferred that the site is within reasonable distance (3 to 5 hours) from a Government (U.S. Navy or U.S. Coast Guard) fuel facility.

Access to Airport: XXXX requires convenient access to airline transportation and a cargo hub to accommodate researchers/personnel who frequently travel from a number of locations to XXXX and equipment/materials shipped both to and from XXX to XXXX in-ports. Any delay in on-time delivery of parts and equipment can impact operational efficiency and delay scheduled on-time delivery of parts and equipment which can impact operational efficiency and delay

EXAMPLE

scheduled ship departures. Therefore, sites located within approximately 50 driving miles are desirable.

Access to Public Transportation: Public transportation within one-half driving mile is preferred.

Proximity to Shipyard/Dry Dock: NOAA vessels are required to perform dry dock maintenance twice every five years. While ships are in dry dock, NOAA Personnel must travel to the dry dock site a number of times during the repairs process. To maintain a variety of repair options and promote multiple bids for repair work, multiple shipyard/dry dock facilities within approximately 50 driving miles are desirable.

Physical Barrier: The number of physical barriers, including draw bridges and locks which ships must navigate to reach open water, may affect travel times/efficiency. Therefore, fewer physical barriers are preferred.

Access to Solid Waste Removal: Solid waste, recycling, and hazmat collection services should be available and convenient (within 1 to 2 hours of the site). Hazardous waste generated includes expired paints, acids (received from vessels), used solvents, oil filters, oily rags, spill response waste, lamps, batteries, mercury, electronic equipment, antifreeze, chemicals from on-board laboratories, PCB's, and asbestos. Additionally, to comply with a Federal Executive Order, NOAA has increased recycling efforts in recent years and annually completes a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Survey for EPA.

FACTOR "B": SITE CONFIGURATION & MANAGEMENT

The following factors will be considered in evaluating Site Configuration and Management: site configuration, site protection, environmental concerns and natural areas, tidal range and water characteristics, unscheduled port closures, frequency of dredging,

Site Configuration: An ideal configuration allows facilities to be un-constrained by adjacent piers/properties, allows for laydown immediately adjacent to multiple berths, provides protected berthing, clusters the boat house and shop near the piers, sites the admin building to overlook the piers, locates outdoor storage and long-term parking to be easily accessible yet out of the way of daily operations, and provides for ample circulation between buildings. All piers should be configured to accommodate access by a tractor-trailer, and should be designed to accommodate use of ships' cranes.

Site Protection: While in port, a variety of in-water and pier side work is performed on NOAA ships. It is important that the berthing area is protected from winds, waves (6 to 8 inched at the pier), strong currents (≥1.5 knots) and tidal surge by land configuration and/or the use of breakwater structures.

Environmental Concerns & Natural Areas: The site is clean or without need for significant environmental cleanup and has not been identified as a site with high probability for the

EXAMPLE

existence of cultural artifacts. Also it is important to NOAA that the XXXX site is not disruptive to sensitive natural areas or habitats. Therefore, sites which will have minimum impact on known natural areas/habitats are preferred.

Tidal Range & Water Characteristics: An extreme tidal range affects the efficient delivery of support and services to the ships, requiring continual adjustment of mooring lines, gangways, utility lines, etc. Therefore, minimal tidal range (6 feet or less) is desirable. While it is difficult to quantify the benefits of freshwater berthing as salt water impacts are affected by individual ship design and construction, ship operators and repair providers agree that freshwater berthing reduces the cost of ship maintenance operations and can extend the life of ship systems. Therefore, fresh water berthing is preferred.

Unscheduled Port Closures: The ships' homeport access is subject to minimal unscheduled closures resulting from severe weather conditions. This does not apply to scheduled maintenance activities for the maintenance or repair of bridges or locks.

Frequency of Dredging: Frequent dredging can impact the in-water maintenance operations XXXX performs while in port. Therefore, sites with infrequent maintenance dredging requirements are desirable.

FACTOR "C": QUALITY OF BUILDING AND PIERS

Quality of Building and Piers will be evaluated based on the following: quality of building design and efficiency, width of the pier, distance between piers (if two piers used to satisfy requirements), and, distance between the pier and fixed obstructions.

Quality of Building Design and Efficiency: how conducive the building is to efficient layout and space utilization. The test fit layout will be reviewed with a preference for avoiding narrow runs of space, irregular space configurations, and other unusual features. How the layout accommodates the Program of Requirements.

Width of Pier: Preference of 30-35 useable linear feet.

Distance Between Two Piers: Preference of a distance of more than 250 linear feet if two piers are used to meet the requirements.

Distance Between Pier and Fixed Obstruction: Preference for more than 125 linear feet between the pier and any fixed obstruction.

FACTOR "D": AVAILABILTY/TIMELINE

The Availability of Site: The site will be available for dedicated XXXX use for long-term (20 years). It is considered extremely important that the site be ready for occupancy (construction completed) by XXXX.

FACTOR"E": PAST PERFORMANCE/KEY PERSONNEL & PROJECT FINANCING

EXAMPLE

Key personnel, past performance, and project financing will be evaluated based on the following.

Key Personnel: Key members number of years of experience working on projects of similar size and scope with five-seven years preferred. Offers that can demonstrate that team members have worked together on projects of similar size and scope will be more highly rated as will those with personnel with more recent similar size and scope projects.

Past Performance: Offerors will be evaluated based on a review of the projects submitted (not to be more than five years old) and discussions with references including demonstrating offeror's ability to conform to language in the lease, accurately estimate and control cost, adhere to contract schedule, demonstrate reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to satisfy customer, and meeting subcontracting goals for small and disadvantaged business concerns.

Evidence of Capability to Perform: Demonstration that the offeror's plan to finance the project takes into consideration interest rate fluctuations, debt assumptions, equity assumptions and project financing savings, if any. The degree to which the financing plan demonstrates that it has been thoroughly developed and a contingency plan(s) is identified to mediate interest rate risks or financing challenges.

FACTOR "F"QUALITY OF LIFE FACTORS

Quality of life will be evaluated based on housing availability, schools, proximity to hotels/motels, food, and recreational facilities, proximity to medical/dental, and proximity to business district.

Housing Availability: Affordable, convenient housing should be available in the adjacent community for staff and ships' personnel. Affordability was assessed using the Housing Affordability Index (HAI)[10], which measures the ability of a middle-income family to carry the mortgage payments on a median price home. Higher indexes indicate the housing is more affordable.

Schools: Quality schools should be in the adjacent community. Area school districts were evaluated using the WASL (Washington Assessment of Student Learning) and OAKS (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) standardized tests. Tenth grade scores will be used because they provide the most complete data for all test subjects. Areas with above average test scores will be evaluated higher than those with average or below scores.

Proximity to Hotels/Motels, Food, and Recreational Facilities: The site should have convenient access to food services (preferably within walking distance, considered to be one road mile of the site). Also access to a variety of recreational facilities (theatres, bowling, shopping, outdoor

[10] Standard established by the National Association of Realtors (NAR) to gauge the financial ability of consumers to buy a home. A reading of 100 means a family earning the national median family income (reported by the Census Bureau) can qualify for a mortgage on a typical median-priced existing single-family home.

EXAMPLE

recreations, etc) in the adjacent community (within approximately 10 driving miles) is considered beneficial.

Proximity to Medical/Dental: An adequate number of medical and dental facilities should be available in the adjacent community.

Proximity to Business District: It is preferred that the site has convenient access to business districts, preferably within walking distance (less than 1 mile), which typically provide a variety of goods and services to workers and shipboard personnel.

EXAMPLE

Attachment E – Additional Sample Evaluation Factor Section –Site Related Criteria (build-to-suit lease expected)

The Government will select the site considered to be most advantageous to the United States, all factors considered. In addition, in order to ensure that the selected site is most advantageous to the United States, all factors considered, we will also consider any unique attributes or other nuances of a site deemed worthy of consideration, even if not listed below.

The following criteria (I-III) are in descending order of importance. Price, although important, is less important than the following criteria.

I. Development Capability including: zoning and land use conformity; capacity of local roadway network to traffic considerations; and, location and magnitude of environmental and physical site considerations.

Zoning and land use conformity shall include the offer's: consistency with X's County growth policy; consistency with local zoning; compatibility of the anticipated NOAA schedule with administrative and legal processes; and, infrastructure capacity.

Location and magnitude of environmental and physical site considerations shall include: wetlands, floodplains, endangered/threatened species, and historic resources.

II. Site Capacity including site contiguity and site geometry. Site Contiguity will be based on existing and planned roadways and transitways. Site Geometry will be based on the linear proportions of the site in relation to the geometry of the site, buildable size, and buildable shape.

III. Site Location including proximity to the existing NOAA site in City, State; proximity to interstate access; public safety - existing crime rate; and, proximity to existing hotels or motels; proximity to existing retail facilities

More Information:

The Program of Requirements for the XXX Centers in X's County has assumed three principal land use functions including office, laboratory, and parking facilities at each alternative site location. Those functions include XXX,XXX sf of office and shared use space, XXX,XXX of laboratory space, and surface parking area for approximately XXX employee and guest vehicles. The Program of Requirements for these facilities has assumed that the office and laboratory functions would be located within separate yet adjoining buildings, due to the significant differences in ventilation requirements, ceiling heights, and other structural requirements. To provide convenient access between the buildings and shared use functions used by all employees, both buildings would be linked with a climate controlled connector.

The Program of Requirements for these sites assumes that laboratory and office functions will generally occupy a combined footprint of approximately XX,XXX sf or X.X acres, while parking and circulation elements would occupy approximately XXX,XXX or X.X acres).

EXAMPLE

Site and building design for the preferred site will be based upon the guidance and direction of local government and community planning organizations in conjunction with project requirements of the General Services Administration and NOAA. The design intent for center is to provide a prominent new building complex that respects both local planning and environmental criteria, while serving the important mission of NOAA.

EXAMPLE