

PUBLIC INFORMATION & COMMUNICATION SERVICES (PICS)
NIH- TASK ORDER

RFTOP#: 136 TITLE: Assessment of Police Corps Training
OJP RFQ #: 2003-Q-015
DUE DATE: Written proposals due on 6/5/2003. Estimated Award on 6/19/2003.

PART I REQUEST FOR TASK ORDER (TO) PROPOSALS

A. POINT OF CONTACT

Contracting Officer: David A. James
Phone: (202) 514-0696
Fax: (202) 307-0086
E-mail: jamesd@ojp.usdoj.gov*

- * NOTE:
1. All questions should be sent to this address.
 2. Please send a message within four days of release letting OJP know if you intend to submit a proposal for this requirement.

Contract Administrator: David A. James, CPCM, CACM

First Class Mailing: Office of Justice Programs
Acquisition Management Division
810 7th Street, NW, Room 3625
Washington, DC 20531

Courier or Hand Delivery: Office of Justice Programs
Acquisition Management Division
810 7th Street, NW, Room 3625
Washington, DC 20531

Contracting Officer's Technical Representative: Glen Cuscino
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Budget and Management Services
810 7th Street, NW, Room 6224
Washington, DC 20531

*****Please see Part I, Section F. 5.4 below to learn about the Police Corps program.
There are web address listed in this section which provide information on the program.

B. PROPOSED PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance for this task order shall be for three months from the time of award. Estimated date of award is on or about 6/19/2003.

C. PRICING METHOD

OJP anticipates that the resultant award of the Request for Task Order Proposal (RFTOP) will be on a firm-fixed-price basis. However, we will consider Offerors who propose another pricing method..

The Contractor shall propose interim milestones or deliverables, including but not limited to such as the ones listed below. It is the intent of the Government to pay invoices on a firm-fixed-price basis in accordance with an approved schedule and acceptance of the deliverables.

	Proposed** Delivery Date	Proposed Payment Amount
8.1. Deliver of Approved Project Plan & Project Schedule	June , 2003	
8.2. Completion of Assessment	July , 2003	
8.3. Draft Final Report	Sept. , 2003	
8.4. Final Report	Sept. , 2003	

** Fill in the day of the month you propose to complete the task or deliver the report. Please note, the dates for the Draft and Final report must be in September, 2003.

The current estimated ceiling amount for this task order is \$200,000.00. Please see NOTE: on page 11 of this RFTOP for additional information about the pricing you propose.

D. PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

Offerors shall be required to provide written proposals. Written proposals shall be comprised of two volumes, with original and five (5) copies each, submitted to the Contracting Officer by 4:00 p.m. on June 5, 2003, at the address set forth on page 1 of this RFTOP document. Volume I shall address the Offerors technical approach in addressing the requirement as stated in the Objective, Scope of Work, and Description of Tasks below. The six Evaluation Factors, see below, need to be addressed in the Technical Volume I. Volume I should be limited to a maximum of 40 pages (12 pt. font minimum) exclusive of the resumes of

the personnel that will perform the work; and contact information (contact name, organization, address and phone numbers) regarding past performance, which must be included in this volume. Volume II shall provide the price for completing all work. The pricing must include all direct labor, direct materials and ODCs being proposed. If prices proposed are based upon a current GSA contract, please identify the contract number, and provide the amount of discount being offered.

Each of these volumes shall be separate and complete in itself so the evaluation of one may be accomplished independently of the evaluation of the other.

The proposal shall be signed by an official authorized to bind the Offeror's organization to perform, if a task order is awarded in response to this RFTOP. The same authorized official shall also sign Part II of the Task Order document (sample attached). Please submit an electronic version of your proposal in WordPerfect for Windows 8.0 to David A. James (jamesd@ojp.usdoj.gov) in addition to the hard copies.

ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Following receipt of technical proposals, the Government, at its discretion may invite those offerors whose proposals are rated 'acceptable', 'exceptional', or those deemed to have correctable deficiencies, to conduct an oral presentation. The presentations will consist of 45 minutes to make the initial presentation, followed by a 15 minute break to allow OJP staff to caucus, and then there may be a 30 minute question and answer period. The presentations will allow you to further detail your technical capabilities and will allow the OJP staff to meet your key personnel and to clarify any issues. Key personnel must conduct the oral presentation, if held.

The Government estimates Oral Presentations, if held, will be on or about June 17, 2003 in downtown Washington DC. (Chinatown area - 7th & H streets)

Discussions with Offerors

Negotiations may be conducted with those offerors whose responsive and technically acceptable proposals, combined with their price proposals, place them in the competitive range.

HOWEVER, OFFERORS ARE CAUTIONED TO SUBMIT THEIR PRICING PROPOSALS ON THE MOST FAVORABLE BASIS SINCE THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO MAKE AN AWARD WITHOUT ORAL PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSIONS OR ANY NEGOTIATIONS.

E. RESPONSE DUE DATE

Written proposals shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer by 4:00 p.m. on June 5, 2003, at the address set forth in Part 1, Section A. of this RFTOP document.

F. TASK DESCRIPTION

1. Background

The mission of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) is to provide federal leadership in developing the nation's capacity to prevent crime, administer justice and assist crime victims. OJP identifies emerging criminal justice issues, develops and tests promising approaches to address these issues, evaluates program results and disseminates findings and other information to State and local governments. The OJP funds a wide variety of programs with varying goals and objectives. Some programs have been funded over a period of years without established performance measures making it impossible to report even baseline results of program impact.

The Office of Budget and Management Services (OBMS) manages a wide variety of budget execution, formulation, and presentation activities, as well as management and planning, correspondence analysis, and coordination activities within the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Specifically, OBMS directs, coordinates, and prepares OJP's annual budget requests to the Department of Justice, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress. In addition, OBMS works with OJP's bureaus and offices to implement the President's Management Agenda (PMA), the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA), and the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), as well as other initiatives. Like other federal agencies, OBMS is leading OJP's aggressive movement toward performance-based budgeting where performance measures (and not simply "outputs") are tied to programmatic funding. Today's government environment demands more effective, efficient operations, improved customer service, and a focus on demonstrable results.

The Police Corps Program, created by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and amended through the 21st Century Department of Justice Reauthorization Act, is administered by the Office of the Police Corps and Law Enforcement Education (OPCLEE). Specifically, the Police Corps is designed to help State and local law enforcement agencies in two ways: first, address violent crime by helping police and sheriff's departments increase the number of officers with advanced education and second, provide these individuals with specifically designed, rigorous law enforcement training that will allow them to provide better services to the assigned community.

The program, which currently operates in 27 states, is designed to motivate highly qualified young people to serve cities and counties as police officers and sheriff's deputies. It does this by offering Federal scholarships on a competitive basis to college students who agree to serve as police officers for at least four years. The scholarship funds cover educational expenses, including tuition, fees, books, supplies, transportation, room and board, and miscellaneous expenses up to \$10,000 annually for four years. A student may receive up to \$40,000 under this program. To be eligible for the Police Corps, a student must attend (or about to attend) an accredited public or private four-year college or university. Undergraduate participants must attend full time. Participants may choose to study criminal justice and law enforcement or may pursue degrees in other fields.

Participants receiving undergraduate degrees begin their work as police officers upon graduation from college and completion of an intensive, 24-week residential, state run, Police Corps training academy. This academy training places heavy emphasis on physical fitness, ethics, leadership and self-discipline; prepares trainees to work effectively with children and youth; addresses issues of social context; focuses on community patrol; and relies heavily on hands-on learning. In addition to the Police Corps curriculum, each participant must complete the POST training established by his or her state program to meet the eligibility requirements to serve as a police officer in that state. Upon successful completion, participants become members of State and local police departments in geographic areas, within their States, that have the greatest need for additional police officers.

In addition to the state police corps training academies, The Police Corps Staff Development Program provides advanced police education and training to State Police Corps trainers and other State Police Corps staff, and front-line supervisors in law enforcement agencies that employ Police Corps officers. Developed by a working group of experienced State Police Corps directors, the Police Corps Staff Development Program is intended to help assure that all basic law enforcement training provided to Police Corps participants through state Police Corps programs meets the special guidelines and standards for Police Corps training. During 2002, the program included basic and advanced programs for Police Corps trainers and training directors; a program for State Police Corps directors; and a leadership training program for front-line supervisors of Police Corps officers.

The Police Corps also provides tuition assistance to dependents of slain officers in participating States. Once a State joins the Police Corps, dependent children of law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty are eligible for college scholarships. An eligible student may receive up to \$40,000 to cover educational expenses for study at any accredited institution of higher education. Dependent children incur no service or repayment obligation. The application process for eligible dependent children is non-competitive. In 2002, 45 dependents of slain officers received tuition assistance.

The Police Corps has increased the number of law enforcement officers with advanced education and training serving on community patrol in areas of our nation experiencing the greatest social need. As of July 30, 2002 in the 27 participating states, there were 682 Police Corps graduates working in state and local police agencies, 262 students in college, and 346 enrolled in a Police Corps training academy. Additionally, 106 participants have completed their four years of service.

The 2003 President's Budget included a provision requiring States to set aside the full amount of funding needed to support a Police Corps participant through the entire program experience (undergraduate college through Police Corps academy) in the year that the participant enrolls in the program. This would ensure funding availability to support each participant through the process, which takes approximately nine years to complete.

1. Objective

To provide the OJP with an assessment of the Police Corps Program to address the following requirements outlined in House of Representatives Conference Report 108-10, dated February 13, 2003:

- 2.1. A report describing/discussing the following areas:
 - 2.1.1. How successful Police Corps training techniques can be incorporated in State law enforcement academies;
 - 2.1.2. The feasibility of establishing regional Police Corps training centers.
- 2.2. The contractor will develop and provide a methodology of its own choosing in addressing these objectives so long as :
 - 2.2.1. The assessment addresses all categories of Police Corps training, as set forth below in Section 4.1, and explains how they can be incorporated by state law enforcement academies. In addition, at least 5 of the 10 states set forth below in Section 3 shall be visited by the contractor in order to determine the effectiveness of the police corps training offered across the 8 training elements listed, including describing which training techniques (for each of the elements listed) are most effective.
 - 2.2.2. The feasibility of establishing regional Police Corps training centers takes into account the cost of establishing those centers and contrasts them with the cost of training under the current individual state-based method. Each state's costs related to training participants in state POST requirements must be considered. The contractor must assess the costs in 10 states, set forth below in Section 3, and project the findings over the program as a whole to produce an average total cost of training over all 27 participating states.

1. **Scope of Work**

The contractor will perform an assessment of the Police Corps Program that addresses the two objectives set forth in Section 2.1. The assessment will include at least 10 of the 30 states currently operating a Police Corps Program. These states shall include Missouri, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina, Kentucky, Utah, Oregon and Minnesota. Resources available to become familiar with the program are set forth under section 5.4.

1. **Description of Tasks**

- 4.1 Identify successful Police Corps training techniques used in delivering curriculum and provide strategies for incorporating into State law enforcement academies. Elements of the Police Corps standard curriculum include the following:

- **Leadership and Conduct**
 - < Training in how to recognize “Character and Core Values” as the basis of leadership (core values incl. courage, commitment, honor, character, pursuit of excellence)
 - < Realistic and challenging field exercises to develop & test character, stamina, honesty, self-discipline and teamwork (incl. early morning, evening, late night and weekend exercises)
 - < Trait development (i.e., leadership, character, self-discipline) via integration of ethical issues, leadership development, and other cross-cutting themes in all training areas
- **Core Values and Ethics**
 - < Training that emphasizes Courage, Commitment, Honor, Character, and Pursuit of Excellence
- **Physical/Mental/Emotional Fitness**
 - < Around-the-clock residential setting where cadets live together in intense and constant proximity (i.e., rise together, eat together, train together, relax together)
- **People and Communities**
 - < Hands-on projects with community members
 - < Scenarios with non-English speaking role players
 - < Readings, debates
- **Communication**
 - < Classroom instruction
 - < Direct speaking engagements with community
 - < Youth mentoring
 - < Courtroom training
- **Academic content**
 - < Innovative training using readings, writings, research, discussions, and debates to enable cadets to address complex situations
- **Technical Skills**
 - < Arrest and control
 - < Firearms
 - < Emergency vehicle operation
 - < Basic investigation
- **Scenario Training**
 - < Realistic, scenario-based training that involves problem-solving, judgment, discretion, ethics and situational leadership

Source: The Police Corps “Principles for Selection and Training”.

- 4.2. ___ Determine the feasibility of establishing regional Police Corps training centers; identifying associated costs; criteria for competitive selection of training regions/sites; factors that could form the basis of a standardized training cost

schedule applicable to all states; and task/time line for implementation.

- 4.3. Produce a report for the Police Corps program that contains an executive summary; addresses the methodology used; and answers the questions posed in Section 2.1.

< **Deliverables and Work Products**

- 5.1 **Report.** The report shall be of any length and must be written in plain English. It should be thoroughly edited and proofed. The contractor must deliver one electronic copy of the report prepared in WordPerfect for Windows 8.0 as well as two bound hard copies.
- 5.2. **Start of Work Conference.** Prior to beginning the task, the contractor shall hold a Start of Work Conference to be scheduled by the contractor as mutually agreed with the Government COTR. The purpose of the Start of Work Conference is to ensure a complete understanding and agreement of the requirements by both the Government and the Contractor Team. The contractor will prepare and deliver minutes of the Start of Work conference.
- 5.3. **Develop a Project Schedule.** The Contractor shall develop a detailed project schedule within 10 working days after the effective date of the task order (but not before meeting with agency officials).
- 5.4. **Review Existing Data/Documentation.** The Contractor shall review data and documentation provided by OJP to become familiar with the programs identified for analysis. Data to be provided includes but is not limited to the references contained below:

Office of Justice Programs web site: www.ojp.usdoj.gov

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) web site:
www.ncjrs.org<http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov>

~~House of Representatives Conference Report 108-10, February 13, 2003~~

~~Police Corps web site: www.ojp.usdoj.gov/opelee/~~

~~“Police Corps Principles of Selection and Training”, April 8, 2003~~

- ~~5.5. **Prepare and Present Reports and Briefings.** The Contractor shall prepare and present biweekly progress reports, beginning 10 working days after contract award. Such progress reports shall include the status of all ongoing work on the project, any findings and conclusions to date, any problems encountered, and proposed solutions to any such problems. The Contractor shall provide a draft final report to the COTR no later than 10 calendar days before the end of the~~

~~period of performance of this task order.~~ The Contractor shall resolve all comments raised by OJP personnel in the final report. The Contractor shall provide the final report to the COTR no later than two days before the end of the period of performance for this task order.

G. EVALUATION FACTORS

The government will evaluate all technical factors as exceptional, acceptable, marginal, or unacceptable.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RATINGS

Exceptional: The proposal meets or exceeds the most important factors in a way that is beneficial to the Agency. Risk is low, and the proposal indicates a very high probability of successful performance. There are no weaknesses in major subject areas or items.

Acceptable: The proposal meets all significant standards. Risk is low, and there is a good probability of success. There are no deficiencies or significant weaknesses.

Marginal: Some important standards have not been met. Risk is evident, and there is a low probability of success. There are serious deficiencies in the proposals, but they are correctable.

Unacceptable: Several important standards have not been met. Risk is high, and there is little likelihood of success. The proposal would need major revision to make it acceptable.

1. Past Performance. Offerors shall submit THREE documented instances of past performance of work similar to the work that the contractor is proposing to perform in order to fulfill this requirement. (See Attachment 1 for format.) For each instance, submission shall contain a brief narrative of the tasks performed, major accomplishments, work performance, task/contract total award and period of performance. The examples must also contain, government point of contact name familiar with the contract, current telephone and current email address.

Past performance will be evaluated based upon the relevancy and quality of the offeror's past performance. The Government seeks to award a contract to an offeror that has a consistent record of providing high quality services. The three completed Past Performance Questionnaires **must be submitted with the technical proposals.**

2. Technical Understanding. The offeror shall submit a narrative demonstrating its technical understanding and approach for this analysis. The narrative shall include the quality, comprehensiveness, and feasibility of the methods and plans proposed to accomplish the tasks

specified in Part 1, Section F and the application of the offeror's understanding in accomplishing these tasks. **The narrative must not exceed five (5) typed pages.**

3. **Experience.** The narrative must demonstrate a minimum of three years of government or commercial experience performing the requested type of services as an organization. If corporate experience is not available, an offeror may substitute relevant experience information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement. If this substitution is made, the offeror must clearly indicate how this experience relates or compares to that necessary to complete the services. The narrative must demonstrate relevant technical ability and experience directly related to providing the services they are proposing to meet the requirements outlined in this RFTOP. It must also describe two of the largest dollar projects that were completed on time at or under cost by offeror's firm in the last three years. The narrative may include any awards received for projects, and must include key personnel who worked on the projects.

The offer or should include a general statement of no more than one (1) page detailing the organization's history, which may include the organization's structure, the number of years it has been in business, and an organizational chart indicating key personnel designated to conduct the study.

4. **Quality Control.** The offer or shall provide a narrative that identifies the internal review procedures to ensure that high quality standards are sustained. The narrative shall contain a company profile showing all highly qualified individuals who will directly supervise or review projects to ensure quality control, which includes any quality control measures for subcontractors resulting in acceptable measures for subcontractors. The narrative shall also address the approach for application of innovative quality leadership; productivity enhancement; cost reduction methods and techniques; handling of potential problem areas and solutions; and customer relations and procedures for meeting urgent requirements. **The narrative shall also contain a statement of how the offeror's firm will execute multiple studies for multiple agencies simultaneously, if applicable. The narrative must not exceed three (3) typed pages.**

5. **Professional Staff.** The offer or shall submit resumes of key staff members to be assigned work resulting from this solicitation. Resumes must be sufficiently detailed to permit an assessment of the capability of professional staff to perform the work described in the Performance Work Statement. If subcontractors or consultants perform a major or critical aspect of the work, the offer or must submit a Letter of Commitment from such individual(s). **Resumes shall not exceed two (2) typed pages each.**

6. **Management Approach.** The offeror shall include a narrative that clearly demonstrates the management approach that will be utilized to successfully achieve the tasks stated in this RFTOP, with particular emphasis to clearly show how work will be performed within a politically-charged Government environment. Your proposal must clearly demonstrate that your company has or will the implement the necessary corporate infrastructure to ensure that

the project is properly managed. Narrative shall not exceed five (5) pages each.

Award of Task Order

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) anticipates awarding a three month task order resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is evaluated as being the most advantageous to OJP. The intent is to award a task order to the vendor who clearly demonstrate the highest level of technical competency backed by long term experience in designing and conducting the type of assessment required by this RFTOP, representing the best value to the Government.

Thus, for this solicitation, technical merit is more important than cost or price. The award will not be automatically determined by numerical calculation or formula relationship between cost or price and technical merit. As technical merit of the offerors proposals becomes more equal, the evaluation of cost or price will become more important and may become the determining factor. The Contracting Officer shall determine what trade-off between technical merit and cost or price promises the greater value to OJP. For evaluation purposes, in terms of importance, the six technical criteria listed in Part 1, Section G above shall be considered approximately equal.

The award of a Task Order will be based upon best value and in accordance with the technical criteria spelled out for this Request for Task Order.

NOTE: A firm that is able to complete this project for less than the amount of \$200,000.00 is invited to propose a lower fixed price. Prices will be a significant factor in the determination of the firm that is selected for award. If, in the opinion of your firm, that this is not a sufficient amount to successfully execute this task, please specify how to best spend the available funds, which tasks will remain undone, and the additional funding necessary to complete the work. Firms should address the benefits and drawbacks for alternative approaches proposed.

Subcontractors

Please identify all subcontractor personnel proposed for this task. The level of effort proposed by the subcontractor should be identified under the Technical Evaluation Criteria Quality Control.

FAR 52.232-15 PROGRESS PAYMENTS NOT INCLUDED (April 1984)

A progress payments clause is not included in this solicitation, and will not be added to the resulting contract at the time of award. Bids conditioned upon inclusion of a progress payment clause in the resulting contract will be rejected as nonresponsive.

Task Order # ICS-136 TITLE: Assessment of Police Corps Training
PART II - CONTRACTOR'S REPLY: CONTRACT #263-01-D-0_____

Contractor:
Points of Contact:
Phone: Fax:
Address:

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST: Pricing Method:
TOTAL ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HOURS:
PROPOSED COMPLETION DATE:
FOR THE CONTRACTOR: _____
Signature Date

SOURCE SELECTION:

WE HAVE REVIEWED ALL SUBMITTED PROPOSALS HAVE DETERMINED THIS FIRM SUBMITTED THE BEST OVERALL PROPOSAL AND THE PRICE/COST IS REASONABLE.

Billing Reference # _____
Appropriations Data: _____

RECOMMENDED: _____
FAX # Signature - Project Officer Date

APPROVED: _____
FAX # Signature - Contracting Officer Date

NIH APPROVAL -

CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT EXCEED THE ESTIMATED LABOR HOURS OR ESTIMATED TASK ORDER AMOUNT WITHOUT THE WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE CONTRACTING OFFICER & ICS COORDINATOR

APPROVED: _____
Signature -Anthony M. Revenis, J.D., NIH-ICS Coordinator Date

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

SOLICITATION OJP-2003-Q-015
NIR RFTOP #:

I. CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION

CONTRACTOR

CONTRACT NUMBER

CONTRACT TYPE

COMPETITIVE () YES () NO

FOLLOW-ON () YES () NO

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE _____

II. E. ESTIMATED COST FEE TOTAL VALUE

FIRM-FIXED PRICE

II. CONTRACT VALUE: _____

INITIAL CONTRACT COST _____

CURRENT CONTRACT COST _____

DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE
PROVIDED

III AGENCY IDENTIFICATION

J. NAME

Comment:

- c. To what extent were the contractor's reports and documentation accurate and complete?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ()4
Exceeded minimum requirements..... ()3
Met minimum requirements..... ()2
Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

- d. To what extent was the contractor able to solve contract performance problems without extensive guidance from Government counterparts?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ()4
Exceeded minimum requirements..... ()3
Met minimum requirements..... ()2
Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

e. To what extent did the contractor display initiative in meeting requirements?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ()4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....()3
- Met minimum requirements..... ()2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

f. Did the contractor commit adequate resources in a timely fashion to the contract to meet the requirements and to successfully solve problems?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ()4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....()3
- Met minimum requirements.....()2
- Less than minimum requirements.....()1

Comment:

g. To what extent did the contractor submit change orders and other required proposals in a timely manner?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ()4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....()3
- Met minimum requirements.....()2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

h. To what extent did the contractor respond positively and promptly to technical directions, contract change orders, etc.?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ()4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....()3
- Met minimum requirements..... ()2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

i. To what extent was the contractor effective in interfacing with the Government's staff?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements... () 4

Exceeded minimum requirements.....() 3

Met minimum requirements..... () 2

Less than minimum requirements.....() 1

Comment:

B. TERMINATION HISTORY

10. Has this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience?

() Yes () Default () Convenience

() No

If yes, explain (e.g., inability to meet cost, performance, or delivery schedules).

11. Are there any pending terminations?

Yes No

If yes, explain and indicate the status.

C. EXPERIENCE HISTORY

l. How effective has the contractor been in identifying user requirements?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements... ()4
- Exceeded minimum requirements..... ()3
- Met minimum requirements..... ()2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

m. To what extent did the contractor coordinate, integrate, and provide for effective subcontract management?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.. ()4
- Exceeded minimum requirements..... ()3
- Met minimum requirements..... ()2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ()1

Comment:

n. To what extent did the contractor coordinate provide timely technical assistance, both on-site and off-site, when responding to problems encountered in the field?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements... () 4
- Exceeded minimum requirements..... () 3
- Met minimum requirements..... () 2
- Less than minimum requirements..... () 1

Comment:

D. COST MANAGEMENT

15. To what extent did the contractor meet the proposed cost estimates?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements. . () 4
- Exceeded minimum requirements..... () 3
- Met minimum requirements..... () 2
- Less than minimum requirements..... () 1

Comment:

NARRATIVE:

Use this section to explain additional information not included above.

