**AWARD DECISION DOCUMENT – LPTA**

**(Janitorial/Custodial Services)**

1. **INTRODUCTION:** This source selection document contains the written justification and rationale for basis of award and determination that the proposed estimated contract price is both fair and reasonable, while offering the best value to the Government.
2. **DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES:** Janitorial/Snow Removal Services for **XXX**. Contract requirement is for a base year + 4 Option Years.
3. **BACKGROUND:** SIR **XXX** was publically announced on January **XX**, **20XX on Sam.gov**. The closing date for receipt of proposals was March **XX**, **20XX**. Amendment number One (1) was issued on February **XX**, **20XX**. This procurement was set-aside for 100% for 8(a) Certified Socially and Economically Disadvantaged Business. Requirement was publicly announced on System for Award Management (SAM) on January XX, 20XX.
4. **OFFERS:** Three (3) proposals were received by the closing date of March **XX**, **20XX**, 2:00 PM EST.
5. Contractor A
6. Contractor B
7. Contractor C
8. **RESPONSIVENESS:**

Each Offeror was required to submit:

1. Cover Letter
2. Financial Capability
3. Proof of Insurance
4. Offeror attended the Mandatory Pre-Proposal/Walk Thru at No Name, USA on February **XX**, **20XX**.
5. Offeror has a home office that has been staffed for 1 year within 100 Mile Radius of No Name, USA.
6. Certification from the Small Business Administration that the offeror is 8a certified.

The following table provides an overview of the Offeror’s responsiveness to the SIR requirements.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Contractor A | Contractor B | Contractor C |
| Cover Letter | No exceptions taken | No exceptions taken | No exceptions taken |
| Financial Capability | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable |
| Insurance Capability | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable |
| Site Walk Attendance | Attended | Attended | Attended |
| Home Office | Proof Provided | Proof Provided | Proof Provided |
| 8(a) Certification | Proof Provided | Proof Provided | Proof Provided |

As demonstrated above, all contractors were timely and submitted the required documentation. For this reason, they were all determined responsive to the requirement.

1. **TECHNICAL EVALUATION:**

In accordance with Sections L&M of the SIR, proposals were technically evaluated as either “Acceptable” or “Not Acceptable” with regard to the following criterion:

1. Past Performance (Qualifications and References):

Section L:

Offerors must supply a list of all contracts and subcontacts completed during the past three (3) years and all contracts and sub-contracts currently in progress. Each offeror will be evaluated on his/her performance under the existing and prior contracts for similar products or services. The Government will focus on information that demonstrates quality of performance relative to (1) Past Performance Business Practices, (2) Timeliness of Performance, (3) Quality of Service, and (4) Customer Satisfaction.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Contractor A | Contractor B | Contractor C |
| Past Performance Rating | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable |

As demonstrated above, all contractors were determined technically acceptable. Full documentation on how each met the criterion is detailed in the Technical Team’s consensus report.

1. **PRICE EVALUATION:**

Evaluation of Options

In accordance with AMS 3.2.4-31, which is included in the SIR, the Government evaluated offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Contractor A | Contractor B | Contractor C |
| Price = Base Year + 4 Options | Total Proposed Price  $ | Total Proposed Price  $ | Total Proposed Price  $ |

Fair and Reasonable Determination

It has been determined that Contractor A’s proposed price for base year + 4 Option Years of $3,048,041.80 is determined fair and reasonable on the basis of competition. Contractor A’s proposal was approximately $460,000.00 less than the second-lowest proposal (Contractor B) and approximately $972,000.00 less than the highest proposal (Contractor C). Additionally, the IGCE for the base year + 4 Option Years was estimated at $3,321,808.00 (approximately 9% less than the IGCE). Contractor A’s proposal is $273,767.00 less than the government estimate for 5 years.

1. **SOURCE SELECTION: LOWEST PRICED TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Contractor A | Contractor B | Contractor C |
| Past Performance | Acceptable | Acceptable | Acceptable |
| Cost – Base Year + 4 Options | Total Proposed Price  $ | Total Proposed  $ | Total Proposed  $ |

Determination for Award

All offerors were determined to be responsive and technically acceptable on the basis of the one evaluation criterion: Past Performance. Contractor A was the lowest-priced; Contractor A’s price was also determined to be fair and reasonable. Contractor A was determined to be responsible as it had no exclusions in the System for Award Management (SAM). For these reasons, in accordance with Sections L & M of the RFO, Contractor A is the best value to the FAA, and hereby awarded the subject contract.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| John Doe  Contracting Officer |  | Date |