

Presolicitation Notice: Architect-Engineer (A-E) Design Services for Traffic Studies at Multiple Intersections at Fort Drum, NY.

Solicitation Number: W911S226RA011

Agency: Mission and Installation Contracting Command (MICC) – Fort Drum, NY

PURPOSE.

The Mission and Installation Contracting Command – Fort Drum is procuring Architect–Engineer (A-E) Design Services for Traffic Studies at Multiple intersections at Fort Drum, NY. This procurement is conducted under the Brooks Architect–Engineer Act (40 U.S.C. 1102) and FAR Subpart 36.102, which require that A-E contracts be negotiated on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications for the required professional services.

This notice is issued in accordance with FAR 5.101 and FAR 36.102-1. Interested firms must submit a completed GSA Standard Form (SF) 330, Architect-Engineer Qualifications, as outlined in Paragraph 4 below.

Description:

1. CONTRACT INFORMATION.

Procurement Method: Brooks Act qualifications-based selection procedures (FAR 36.102).

NAICS Code: 541330 – Engineering Services.

Service Code: C1LB – Architect and Engineering – Construction: Highways, Roads, Streets, Bridges, And Railways

Contract Type: Firm-fixed price.

Set-Aside: Total Small Business (FAR 19.104-1).

Period of Performance: Not to exceed 90 calendar days from award.

Estimated Contract Award: September 2026.

Design Completion Deadline: January 2027.

Magnitude of Construction: N/A

SAM Registration: Required prior to submission deadline (SAM.gov).

2. PROJECT INFORMATION.

The selected A-E firm will provide design services to perform traffic studies at two intersections within the cantonment of Fort Drum, NY that have had traffic issues. The first intersection is Chapel Drive and Iraqi Freedom Drive. The second intersection is Munns Corner Road and FOB Shank Road. The traffic studies will include a recommended solution for each intersection that will assist the DPW in selecting a path forward to correcting the traffic issues.

a. Design Scope:

- (1) The purpose of the project is to perform traffic studies at two intersections within the cantonment of Fort Drum, NY that have had traffic issues. The first intersection is Chapel Drive and Iraqi Freedom Drive. The second intersection is Munns Corner Road and FOB Shank Road. The traffic studies will include a recommended solution for each intersection that will assist the DPW in selecting a path forward to correcting the traffic issues.
- (2) A detailed cost estimate will be required for each option that results from the study, which includes completion of design and all construction costs. Conceptual site plans for each option will also be required.

Note: In accordance with FAR 36.201-1 and FAR Part 9.5, firms that design the project are prohibited from participating in construction contracts or subcontracting on the same project.

3. SELECTION CRITERIA.

The selection criteria for this particular project are listed below in descending order of importance. Criteria a-e are primary. Criteria f are secondary and will only be used as "tie-breakers" among firms that are technically equal in order to determine the Most Highly Qualified Firms. Primary criteria a, b, d, e, f will be assigned a rating as follows:

TABLE 1 -COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS		
Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	SF 330 indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

Purple	Good	SF 330 indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	Acceptable	SF 330 meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	SF 330 has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	SF 330 does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

In accordance with the DoD Source Selection Guide, Section 2.3.2.6., the methodology for evaluating Technical Approach and Related Risk is the Combined Technical/Risk Rating, (see Table 1 above). This methodology considers risk, in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings.

Ratings are based on the risk to the Government that the firm will successfully perform that evaluated factor. An overall rating will also be applied to the proposal submission using the same rating scale. Proposals failing to respond or provide complete information for each factor as required by this notice will be determined non-responsive and will be removed from further consideration.

Criteria c will be determined using the following table (see Table 2).

TABLE 2 - Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the firm's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the firm will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the firm's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the firm will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral (Unknown) Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the firm's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Firm may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the firm's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the firm will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the firm's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the firm will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

a. Specialized Experience and Technical Competence (SF330, Part I, Sections F and G).

Specialized experience and technical competence in the following areas:

- (1) Traffic Engineering. Experience conducting traffic studies on complex and high-volume intersections and roadways both in NYSDOT settings and military installations. Experience in providing professionally designed traffic engineering plans that can be utilized for scope selection and/or bidding purposes in receiving either final engineering plans or construction bidding purposes. Experience in conducting field traffic studies to determine volumes, waiting times, stacking issues, and crash issues.
- (2) Military Installation Active Vehicle and Barriers and Threat Analysis. Experience in active vehicle barrier designs and layouts at military security checkpoints. Experience in performing threat analysis calculations and distances at military security checkpoints.
- (3) Project Cost Estimates. Experience in providing accurate project cost estimates for both construction portions of the work and other costs such as design fees, administration costs, and overhead and profits.

b. Professional Qualifications (SF330, Part I, Sections E and G).

- (1) Project Manager (Engineer). Proven leadership in managing traffic engineering field studies and reports for military installations and NYSDOT roadways.
- (2) Traffic Engineer. Experience in conducting traffic engineering studies. Experience to include field studies, NYSDOT traffic studies, and military installation studies.

- (3) Civil Engineer. Site planning, grading, drainage, and utility coordination for traffic engineering purposes.
- (4) Registration. Lead traffic engineer must be a professionally licensed engineer in the State of New York or attain reciprocity within 30 days from contract award.
- (5) Relevant Experience. Each key personnel must have a minimum of five (5) years of experience in projects of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity. No more than three projects should be listed for each resume, and each project listed must have been completed within six (6) years of publication of this announcement. (Note: The projects provided for this factor may also be used to address criteria a)
- (6) Project Relevance. Experience should reflect direct involvement in traffic engineering.

c. Past Performance (SF330, Part I, Section H).

Past performance will be evaluated using CPARS, FAPIIS, and submitted information. Evaluation will consider quality of work, schedule compliance, cost control, and management effectiveness on traffic-related or similar engineering projects completed within the last six years.

Firms choosing to use the PAQ may use the attached PAQ (Attachment 1), to this synopsis.

d. Capacity to Accomplish the Work (SF330, Part I, Section D and G).

The Government will assess the firm's ability to complete the traffic study within the required timeline. Evaluation will consider the availability of staff, current workload, and organizational structure.

SF330 should identify the office where work will be performed and include an organization chart (may be in SF330, Part I, Section H (Additional Information)).

e. Location in the General Geographical area of the Project and Knowledge of the Locality (SF330, Part I, Section H).

Evaluation will consider the firm's familiarity with Fort Drum and the regional (NYSDOT) traffic environment. Firms should describe relevant project experience in New York or the Northeast, understanding of local traffic conditions, and familiarity with applicable state/local criteria.

Secondary (Tie-Breaker) Criteria.

f. Geographic Proximity (SF330, Part I, Section H).

Proximity of the prime firm's office, as identified in Part I, Section C (Proposed Team), to Fort Drum, NY, measured in miles. This factor is a secondary criteria and will be used solely as a tiebreaker among technically equal qualification submissions.

4. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS.

a. Interested firms having the capabilities to perform this work must submit their response to this synopsis no later than July 02, 2026, 3:00 PM local time. Submissions received after this time will be viewed as late and not considered for contract award.

b. All questions shall be submitted no later than June 25, 2026, 3:00 PM local time to Mr. A. Milan Sanchez at alfredo.m.sanchez.civ@army.mil and Ms. Lyndsie Hall at lyndsie.j.hall.civ@army.mil. Questions submitted after this time may not receive a response. All timely submitted questions and/or comments will be addressed through subsequent amendments posted to this notice. No other means of communication (telephone, fax, etc.) will be accepted.

c. All SF 330s must be submitted digitally. The digital copy shall be submitted via the PIEE Solicitation Module. Solicitation packages are not provided, and no additional project information will be given to firms during the announcement period. This is not a request for proposal.

(1) One (1) electronic copy (PDF) of SF 330 Part I

(2) One (1) electronic copy (PDF) of SF 330 Part II for the prime firm and all consultants/subcontractors

The SF 330, 7/2021 edition, must be used, and may be obtained from the following web site: <https://www.gsa.gov/reference/forms/architectengineer-qualifications>.

d. The SF330 submittal shall meet the following requirements:

(1) Include UEI number or CAGE code in SF330 Part I, Section B, Block 5.

(2) The UEI number or CAGE code shall be identified in SF 330 Part I, Section C, Block 9, for EACH TEAM MEMBER.

(3) The submittal shall have a page limit of 100 pages (total of 100 pages allowed for complete copy of the submittal, ALL-INCLUSIVE). The selection board will not evaluate beyond 100 pages. A page is one side of a sheet. Blank sheets, divider sheets with section identifiers, and/or tabs with section identifiers separating the sections within the

SF 330 will not count against the maximum page count. Parts I shall be organized as follows:

Tab	Title
A	Part I, Section A, B, C, D
B	Part I, Section E
C	Part I, Section F
D	Part I, Section G
E	Part I, Sections H and I

(4) Formatting Requirements. To ensure fairness, readability, and consistency across all submissions, offerors shall use Arial, 10-point font or larger for all narrative text, resumes, Section H content, and any other written portions of the SF-330. No text smaller than 10-point is permitted, except that tables may use Arial, 8-point font when necessary to fit structured data. All table text must remain fully legible when printed. Captions, footnotes, graphics, and callouts are subject to the same 10-point minimum unless they appear inside a table. Page size, margins, and layout shall follow the standard SF-330 format unless otherwise specified.

(5) Pages shall be 8-1/2 inches by 11 inches. Organizational charts may be presented on a sheet up to 11 inches by 17 inches.

(6) A Part II is required for each branch office of the prime firm and any consultants/subcontractors that will have a key role in the proposed contract (i.e. a Part II is required for all entities identified in SF 330 Part I, Section C of the submittal). Part II shall be organized as follows:

Tab	Title
F	SF 330, Part II
G	Joint Venture Agreement (if applicable)
H	Additional information (if applicable)

In accordance with FAR 36.102-2(c), firms are encouraged to submit, on an annual basis, an updated Standard Form (SF) 330, Part II – General Qualifications. Fort Drum will maintain submitted SF 330 Part II documents on file for future consideration. Firms that have not submitted a current Part II are encouraged to do so to ensure their qualifications are accurately reflected.

(7) Cover letters, company literature and extraneous materials are not desired and will not be considered.

(8) Sections E and G of SF 330 Part I shall include only individuals proposed to perform the anticipated work, including all consultants/subcontractors.

(9) In SF 330 Part I, Section G, Block 26, along with the name, include the firm with which the person is associated.

(10) A total of three (3) projects may be submitted for the entire team (prime and subcontractors combined), for SF 330 Part I, Section F. If more than three (3) projects are submitted, only the first three (3) projects will be evaluated. Use no more than two (2) pages per project. Past performance documentation (CPARS or PAQs) does count toward the 100-page limit.

(11) When listing projects in SF 330 Part 1, Section F, an Indefinite Delivery Contract (IDC) with multiple Task Orders as examples is not considered a project. A task order executed under an IDC contract is a project.

(12) Past Performance evaluations (CPARS or PAQ - reference Paragraph 3c. above) shall be submitted for each project provided in SF 330, Part I, Section F. CPARS or PAQs submitted after the established deadline will not be accepted and may affect your ability to submit qualifications for this procurement.

If the Offeror submits past performance from a contract where the individual who served as the evaluator or past-performance point of contact is also proposed as a subcontractor on this acquisition, the Offeror shall provide a Memorandum for Record (MFR), signed by both the prime contractor and the proposed subcontractor, confirming: (1) the evaluator had no financial interest or anticipated role in this acquisition at the time the past performance evaluation was completed; (2) the evaluator did not influence, bias, or attempt to shape the past performance record for the benefit of the Offeror; and (3) no actual or potential organizational conflict of interest exists as a result of the evaluator's dual role. If the MFR is not provided, the associated past performance will not be evaluated.

(13) SF 330, Part I, Section H (Additional Information) shall contain the following information.

(a) Item 1: Quality Management. Reference Paragraph 3a. above. Provide a 1–5-page narrative discussing the firms design quality control procedures and their approach to ensure technical quality and accuracy of work products.

(b) Item 2: Capacity. Reference Paragraph 3d. Provide a 1–2-page narrative discussing the capacity of the design firm to perform nationwide and to meet schedules, including adequacy of qualified personnel available and past experience in meeting tight design schedules.

(c) Item 3: Organizational Chart. Reference Paragraph 3d. Provide a 1–5-page chart that demonstrates the firms primary office where the work will be performed, and the staff at this office, to include subcontractors.

5. JOINT VENTURES. Joint ventures shall submit the following additional documentation as evidence to support their existence as a joint venture entity:

a. Firms shall provide a copy of a legally binding joint venture agreement.

b. Identification of the party who can legally bind the joint venture.

6. ATTACHMENTS.

Attachment 1 – Performance Assessment Questionnaire.

NOTE: This is NOT a Request for Proposal. Respondents are hereby notified that, if designated as one of the most highly qualified firms, the response time for the issued Request for Proposal (RFP) is anticipated to be 14 calendar days from the date of RFP issue.