EVALUATION CRITERIA – CST EMERGENCY VEHICLE PROCUREMENT

Each Offeror will go through an initial screening, whereby they will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis according to the criteria listed in Section 1.0 below. Those Offerors that meet the stated criteria will receive a "pass" score and move on to the next phase, where they will be evaluated numerically according to the set of weighted evaluation criteria listed in Section 2.1.

The FAA will select for contract award the Offeror, which, in addition to conforming to the requirements of this solicitation, provides the best value to the agency. Best Value is defined as the offer that presents the most advantageous solution to the FAA's requirement. The FAA will determine the best value offer based on evaluation of technical, price and other factors specified in the SIR. In making this determination, FAA will make trade-offs between these factors and is not confined to making award to either the Offeror submitting the highest-rated technical proposal or the lowest-priced proposal, although FAA may award to either. In addition, the FAA must also determine the Offeror to be financially viable and otherwise responsible.

The FAA reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the evaluation of the initial offer, and may not require discussions or negotiations. Therefore, it is critical that the initial offer be fully responsive to this SIR and that it contains the Offeror's best terms.

In evaluating proposals, the FAA may conduct written or oral discussions with any and/or all Offerors. Discussions with one or more Offerors do not require discussions with all Offerors.

An Offeror may submit only one proposal.

The Government will evaluate each proposal as follows:

Technical Merit – Each Offeror's technical/management proposal will be evaluated using the following evaluation criteria.

Price – Proposed pricing will be evaluated to ensure that it is fair and reasonable.

Discussions – After evaluating written proposals, the Government may conduct written or oral discussions with all, or a limited number of the Offerors. Information obtained during discussions, whether or not it is reduced to written material, may be considered by the Government in the evaluation and best value decision. Note: It is also very possible that discussions will not take place and award of a contract will be made without discussions. Offerors should therefore submit their best technical and pricing proposals in the initial proposal.

Best Value Determination – In deciding which Offeror represents the best overall value to the Government, price and other factors considered, the Government will consider technical merit to be significantly more important than proposed price. The best value selection decision will be made as described below:

- ✓ A numerical scoring system will be used for the non-price criteria; and the Government will identify strengths, weaknesses, and risks and determine the overall technical merit of the proposal.
- ✓ If the Government determines that there are significant differences in technical merit among competing proposals, then a more expensive proposal may be selected for award, if the value of the selected proposal is deemed to be worth the price differential.
- ✓ The total evaluated price will be the determining factor for award where all proposals are considered substantially equal from a technical merit standpoint.

1.0 PASS/FAIL FACTORS

Vehicle capabilities, dimensions, chassis The FAA will evaluate proposed vehicle provided in response to this SIR, against the requirements found in the Statement of Work (SOW). Vendors who do not meet the requirements below will be removed from further consideration for award:

The vehicle *must* have the following capabilities:

- On-highway at highway speeds
- Off-highway on paved roads
- Mild off road use. This includes unpaved but reasonably maintained roads.
- Extreme weather fluctuations. 10 -100 Degrees F and relative humidity extremes.
- Inclines or declines of up to 27.5 degrees

The vehicle *must* have the following dimensions:

- Overall length 28' Excluding rear mast
- Width 8' 6"
- Height 12'
- Weight must be less than 26,000 lbs GVRW

The vehicle *must* have the following chassis/body requirements:

- Approximately 206" Wheelbase
- Gas powered engine
- 20KW Gas powered generator
- 4 WD
- Auto transmission
- Chassis Tie Downs for Air/Flatbed Transportation

2.0 WEIGHTED FACTORS

Upon completion of evaluations, the raw scores will be converted to an overall weighted score. The weights assigned to each criteria as follows:

Factor 1 - Technical approach – 77%
Factor 2 - Past performance – 15%
Factor 3 - Delivery Schedule – 8%

2.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Each criterion is composed of the following evaluated subcriteria:

Evaluation Factor	Sub-Factor Weight
Technical Factors = 77%	
A. Electrical Systems. Vendors should provide drawings and descriptions which clearly indicate their	18%

compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.1 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation.	
B. Electronics/Equipment. Vendors should provide drawings and descriptions which clearly indicate their compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.2 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation. Vendors should clearly indicate manufacturer and model for each piece of equipment they will install.	18%
C. Vehicle Interior Vendors should provide drawings and descriptions which clearly indicate their compliance with the criteria set forth in 3.3 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation. Vendors should clearly indicate manufacturer and model for each piece of equipment they will install. Vendors should indicate in drawing details the planned location for the GFE Secure phone and facsimile.	13%
D. Roof Top Equipment Vendors should provide drawings and descriptions which clearly indicate their compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.4 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation. Vendors should clearly indicate manufacturer and model for each piece of equipment they will install. Vendors should indicate in drawing details the planned location for the GFE MSAT and BGAN antennas.	13%
E. Exterior Requirements Vendors should provide drawings and descriptions which clearly indicate their compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.5 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation	5%
F. Graphics Vendors should provide drawings and descriptions which clearly indicate their compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.6 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation.	5%
G. Support Vendors should provide descriptions which clearly indicate their compliance with the criteria set forth in Section 3.7 of the Statement of Work (SOW). The vendor may propose alternatives and/or additional capabilities, but should provide detailed explanations of the rationale for the deviation.	5%
	77%
Past performance = 15% (as detailed in the Past Performance Questionnaire)	
A. Quality of Service	5%

B. Timeliness of Performance	3.33%
C. Price/Cost Control	3.33%
D. Customer Satisfaction	3.33%
	15%
Delivery Schedule = 8%	
Vendors should provide a delivery schedule.	**8%**
TOTAL	**100%**

Evaluators will provide comments on the Scoring Sheet.

4.4 Rating Scales

4.4.1 Technical Factors Rating Scale

All technical evaluation team members shall numerically score the specific criteria within the technical proposals on a scale of zero to ten with zero being poor and ten being excellent.

Rating Definition Table

Score	Definition	
10	Excellent	A proposal that satisfies all of the Government's requirements with extensive detail to indicate feasibility of the approach and shows a thorough understanding of the problems and offers numerous significant strengths, which are not offset by weaknesses, with an overall low degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.
7	Good	A proposal that satisfies all of the Government's requirements with adequate detail to indicate feasibility of the approach and shows an understanding of the problems and offers some significant strengths or numerous minor strengths, which are not offset by weaknesses, with an overall low to moderate degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements
5	Acceptable	A proposal that satisfies most of the Government's requirements with minimal detail to indicate feasibility of the approach and shows a minimal understanding of the problems, with an overall moderate degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.
3	Marginal	A proposal that satisfies most of the Government's requirements with minimal detail to indicate feasibility of the approach and shows a minimal understanding of the problems, with an overall high degree of risk in meeting the Government's requirements.
0	Poor	Proposal fails to meet minimum requirements.

The appropriate score above will be multiplied by the weight of each factor to obtain the Weighted Score.

4.4.2 Past Performance Rating Scale

Past performance will be evaluated using client input from the Past Performance Questionnaires. Scores received for each subcriteria (Quality of Service, Timeliness, etc.) will be weighted according to the percentages indicated in Section 2.1. Each Offeror should submit three (3) questionnaires. If less than three are submitted, the Offeror will be given scores of zero for each missing questionnaire. Scores for each subcriteria (Quality of Service, Timeliness, etc.) will be taken directly from page two of the Past Performance Questionnaire.

4.4.3 Delivery Schedule Rating Scale

Delivery Schedule Rating Definition Table

Score	Definition	
8	Excellent	A proposal that satisfies all of the Government's requirements and delivers within 135 calendar days from award date of delivery requirements.
4	Good	A proposal that satisfies all of the Government's requirements and delivers between 136 and 180 calendar days from award date of delivery requirements.
0	Poor	A proposal that satisfies all of the Government's requirements and delivers within 181 plus calendar days from award date of delivery requirements.