SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
MULTIPLE AWARD CONSTRUCTION

I, along with senior officials from Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Chairperson of the Multiple Award Construction (MAC) Source Evaluation Board (SEB), SEB voting members and advisors to the SEB to review their findings based on the evaluation of proposals received in response to the MAC solicitation. This Source Selection Statement documents the rationale for my selection.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the MAC procurement is to provide construction services for Goddard Space Flight Center which includes two separate sites: Greenbelt, Maryland and Wallops Flight Facility in Wallops Island, Virginia. These services may include new construction, modification, or rehabilitation of facilities, varying from routine general construction to installation of complex special test or laboratory systems. It may include work on building interiors and exteriors, including, but not limited to: architectural, structural, electrical, mechanical, environmental, and fire protection/detection. It may also include civil site work and both underground and surface site utility work. Services under this contract shall be furnished on an as-needed basis, in response to Task Orders that are issued.

This is a competitive 100% small business set-aside procurement that will result in multiple Firm Fixed Price, Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts. Each contract will have an effective ordering period of five years from the date of contract award. The minimum amount of supplies or services that shall be ordered during the effective ordering period is $2,500 per contract. The maximum amount of supplies or services that may be ordered during the effective ordering period is $75M, cumulatively across all awarded contracts.

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

On June 28, 2010, thirteen (13) proposals were received from the following companies:

Allen & Shariff Corporation
Beltsville Industries Group (BIG)
Biscayne Contractors
Construction Development Services Inc. (CDSI)
CJW/Desbuild Joint Venture (JV)
Facility Site Contractors, Inc (Fascon)
Grimberg/Amatea JV
Grunley/Goel JV
Meltech Corporation
Nastos Construction Inc.
North Island/Centennial Contractors (NICC) JV
Specialty Construction Management (SCM)
Stella May Contracting

On June 29, 2010, the Government received an additional proposal from M&J Construction of San Antonio, TX. This proposal was considered late and was not evaluated. The Offeror was sent a letter on July 6, 2010, informing it that the proposal was late and would not be evaluated.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND SUMMARY RESULTS

This procurement was conducted in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15.3 source selection procedures, NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3 and the Request for Proposal (RFP) evaluation criteria. The RFP stated that the factors used for evaluation are Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Price. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of these factors as follows:

The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Price Factor is equal to the Mission Suitability Factor, and also equal to the Past Performance Factor.

Mission Suitability has three Subfactors as follows: Understanding Key Requirements; Management Approach; and Safety and Health Plan. . The weights identified with each subfactor were used to allocate the 1000 total available points.

Subfactor A:	*Understanding Key Requirements*		*500*
Subfactor B:	*Management Approach*		*400*
Subfactor C:	*Safety and Health Plan*		*100*
		TOTAL	***1000***

The following chart provides an overview of the Mission Suitability, Price and Past Performance level of confidence ratings for each Offeror:

Offeror	Mission Suitability Total Score	Pricing Ranking	Past Performance Level of Confidence Rating
Allen & Shariff	572	12	High
BIG	591	5	Moderate
Biscayne	626	10	Very High
CDSI	475	2	High
CJW/Desbuild	554	3*	High
Fascon	353	11	High
Grimberg/Amatea	866	6	Very High
Grunley/Goel	269	1	High
Meltech	720	3*	High
Nastos	180	9	Moderate
NICC JV	820	8	Very High
SCM	359	7	Moderate
Stella May	485	13	Moderate

*Two offerors tied as the third lowest price offered.

The following chart provides an overview of the adjectival ratings for each Mission Suitability subfactor along with the total Mission Suitability score.

Offeror	Subfactor A	Subfactor B	Subfactor C	Mission Suitability Total Score	Mission Suitability Rating
Allen & Shariff	Good	Fair	Good	572	6
BIG	Good	Good	Good	591	5
Biscayne	Good	Good	Good	626	4
CDSI	Good	Fair	Good	475	9
CJW/Desbuild	Good	Good	Fair	554	7
Fascon	Fair	Fair	Good	353	11
Grimberg/Amatea	Excellent	Very Good	Good	866	1
Grunley/Goel	Poor	Fair	Poor	269	12
Meltech	Good	Very Good	Very Good	720	3
Nastos	Poor	Poor	Poor	180	13
NICC JV	Excellent	Good	Very Good	820	2
SCM	Fair	Fair	Poor	359	10
Stella May	Fair	Good	Good	485	8

Past Performance evaluations were conducted in accordance with provision M.5 of the solicitation. As stated in provision L.16, the past performance record indicates the relevant

quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size, content, and/or complexity to the requirements of this acquisition.

The evaluation of the Price Factor used Representative Final Price for Construction Work (Exhibit 1) to establish proposal price. IDIQ labor rates and Overhead, Profit, and Commission rates were evaluated for completeness and reasonableness. Pursuant to provision M.4 of the solicitation, the Representative Final Price for Construction Work under Exhibit 1 along with the rates proposed in Attachments B and E were presented to the Source Selection Authority.

DETAILED RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation results for each of the thirteen (13) Offerors, based on the order of Mission Suitability ratings/scores for each Offeror, are as follows:

Grimberg/Amatea Joint Venture (JV) (Grimberg)

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Grimberg/Amatea received an Excellent rating with one (1) Significant Strength and two (2) Strengths in subfactor A.

Significant Strength #1: Grimberg's Quality Control Plan approach includes a very comprehensive set of project close-out initiatives . Grimberg proposes to perform commissioning on projects with complex mechanical or electrical systems. This checklist approach to ensuring that control systems perform exactly as intended greatly enhances the potential of success with little or no warranty work and no hidden problems passed on to the Operations & Maintenance (O&M) team. Grimberg plans to compile the O&M Manuals during the submittal period (early in construction), with information added during the construction period as opposed to waiting until project completion before assembling the manuals. This helps to ensure a timely closeout and acceptance period and benefits the O&M technicians by providing them with this crucial information early. This Quality Control Plan approach significantly enhances the potential for Grimberg to exceed contract requirements and provides additional value to the Government.

Strength #1: Grimberg's plan for recovering slippage and mitigating impacts, including ten hour work days, multiple crews and multiple shift work and "What If" scenarios enhances the potential to minimize schedule slips. Grimberg also plans to supplement non-performing subcontractors with self-performing capabilities as a way of recovering schedule slippage. This plan and approach would be expected to achieve the quickest schedule recovery, which reduces the chance of schedule delays and increases the likelihood of a successful project. This plan demonstrates Grimberg's understanding that NASA's schedule is sometimes the most important factor in successful completion of a project and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: Grimberg proposes the Critical Path Management (CPM) methodology in managing schedules for its projects, supplemented by bar charts and other visual devices. By proposing CPM for schedule management, Grimberg reduces the risk of schedule slippage and focuses attention on the critical activities that affect the timely completion of the project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using the CPM method, Grimberg increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while ensuring timely schedule completion and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Grimberg/Amatea received a Very Good rating with one (1) Significant Strength and one (1) Strength in subfactor B.

Significant Strength #1: Grimberg's corporate capabilities include over 20 construction managers, all of whom have been certified under the Army Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management for Contractors training program. Additionally, these Construction Managers have an average of 27 years experience. This high level of overall construction experience and the specialized quality control training may result in better managed projects, significantly exceeding the Government's requirements. Additionally, Grimberg's organization consists of 65 superintendents and 250 tradespersons, giving Grimberg the ability to respond quickly and efficiently with the right cadre of tradesmen and supervisors to ensure the timely completion of projects. This relatively large number of employees also helps to ensure that extra manpower is always available for spikes in the workload. These corporate capabilities may greatly enhance the potential for successful performance and contribute toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #1: Grimberg will always determine if a subcontractor's unsolicited change order request is valid and within the scope of the task and that the pricing is in-line with current industry standard cost data. This may enable the change order process to operate more efficiently and ensure that the Government receives fair and reasonable pricing on change orders without incurring the burden of evaluating subcontractor's change order requests. Additionally, Grimberg's proposal to offer reasonable solutions and not just identify problems when design deficiencies are noted may enhance the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Grimberg/Amatea received a Good rating with one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness in subfactor C.

Strength #1: Grimberg includes a strong training program to certify every employee in the OSHA 30 hour course. This program also includes an incentive clause that rewards employees with cash incentives and a safety jacket. Employees also receive an incentive award for completing a project with no lost time. This program may increase the level of safety on projects and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Grimberg presents an approach to a health and safety plan but it does not provide sufficient detail in most areas that demonstrates compliance with applicable federal, state and regulatory requirements as well as compliance with NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". Instead, Grimberg outlines key elements of the safety programs listed in the RFP. The information provided in the Safety and Health Plan is not sufficient to verify that Grimberg's safety programs comply with Federal, State, and NASA requirements. Failure to comply with safety requirements increases the risk of accidents, work stoppages, and unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Grimberg/Amatea proposed the sixth lowest price of thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Grimberg/Amatea's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of eight (8) past performance references: Five (5) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant and three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant. Questionnaires were received on seven (7) of these projects and Grimberg demonstrated very high performance on 7 of the 8 projects. Grimberg received all Very High performance ratings on primarily Very Highly relevant projects. Five commendation letters were included in the volume, using wording such as "outstanding, "exceeding expectations", "extreme satisfaction" in describing Grimberg's performance on these projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, Grimberg's Past Performance Volume, and its Safety record, the Government has a Very High level of confidence in its ability to successfully perform the required effort.

North Island/ Centennial Contractors (NICC) JV

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

NICC received an Excellent rating with one (1) Significant Strength and three (3) Strengths in Subfactor A.

Significant Strength #1: NICC proposes a comprehensive, all inclusive Quality Control Plan that exceeds the contract requirements and greatly enhances the probability of successful contract completion. By proposing to rotate Quality Inspectors to and from other jobs sites for a short time to provide a fresh insight and a new outlook, NICC will ensure impartiality and enhance the quality of the work being inspected. This increases the potential for NICC to successfully meet the quality requirements of the contract and provide additional value to the Government. This Quality Control Plan includes 100% inspection of all work, conducting deficiency trends, performing root cause analysis on deficiencies found and implementing corrective actions to get at root causes and prevent re-occurrences. The Quality Control Manager notifies responsible individuals within one day and corrective actions are required within two days. Similar requirements are imposed on NICC's subcontractors. By concentrating on the detection, analysis

and correction of deficiencies' root causes, problems can be identified and corrected before they become insurmountable. This may reduce the recurrence of problems, schedule delays and unbudgeted costs, greatly enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #1: NICC proposes the CPM method of managing schedules for its projects. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using the CPM method, NICC increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while ensuring timely schedule completion. NICC's major subcontractors will participate in schedule development as well. NICC has a very detailed understanding and discussion of all construction elements that would impact schedule, including a three week look-ahead schedule to anticipate and make adjustments when needed, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: NICC includes a comprehensive plan for monitoring the schedule for progress, and has a multifaceted approach for reducing the chance of slippage. If schedule slippage does occur, NICC will bring on additional subcontractors, add shifts, or work around the clock to ensure that the project remains on schedule, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #3: NICC states that all quality control personnel and all members of the project team have been certified as having completed the Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management for Contractors training course. The Construction Quality Control requirements for this contract as specified in Sections 01450 and 01451 are modeled after the Corps of Engineers program. The training may ensure that the task order procedures and requirements are fully understood from the beginning and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

NICC received a Good rating with four (4) Strengths in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: NICC's corporate capabilities include the use of a specialized information management and reporting system to meet the unique management needs of managing major construction projects. This provides integrated, live operations information and financial data that can be shared across the company in real time through a simple network platform. This information system has extensive reporting and trend tracking capability and can be used for sharing schedules, meeting minutes, product submittals, etc. This would allow the instantaneous passing of time critical documents from NICC to the Government, thereby enhancing the potential for project timeliness and success and enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: NICC's corporate capabilities also include a comprehensive onsite training program for its employees that includes HAZMAT, OSHA, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), Construction Management and numerous other relevant courses. This training is also provided to NICC's Government partners. This may enhance the quality of work being

performed and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #3: NICC's Senior Construction Manager has the complete autonomy and authority to make decisions, sign subcontracts, negotiate purchase orders, hire and terminate personnel, and accept task order modifications. The stated independence and autonomy of the Senior Construction Manager, the interaction of the Senior Construction Manager with Corporate resources, and the authority of the Senior Construction Manager to control resources and manage conflict provide additional value to the Government and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #4: NICC has a strong plan for ensuring that the Government receives fair and reasonable prices on change orders. NICC commits to include additional General Conditions costs only on changes that involve a time extension. This means that no additional costs, associated with Construction Manager hours, Quality Control hours, Safety, etc., will be included unless the duration of the task is extended, and only then with sufficient justification. This may help to control costs on Government directed non-competitive change orders and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

NICC JV received a Very Good rating with one (1) Significant Strength in Subfactor C.

Significant Strength #1: NICC proposes a comprehensive Safety and Health Plan that stresses worker education and compliance. NICC proposes to establish a worksite Visitor Safety Orientation Program to brief visitors on the worksite safety requirements. Assignment of a hard hat sticker signifies training completion. This program will ensure visitors meet safety requirements and greatly enhances the likelihood of safe, successful contract completion. NICC's entire staff of workers receives 160 hours of safety training annually. Recognizing that its subcontractors frequently don't have the resources to conduct or attend training, NICC's comprehensive training plan includes a safety training program to assist subcontractor employees in attaining safety certifications. NICC's corporate safety personnel are full-time safety professionals and certified instructors for OSHA Safety and Health course. This approach reduces the likelihood of work stoppages due to non-compliance with regulations. NICC has established an incentive plan to recognize employees for safe work. This plan includes corporate, individual and subcontractor level recognition. This plan may help reduce safety problems and increases the likelihood of successful completion of the contract. Furthermore, NICC has the capability to conduct its safety training in both English and Spanish when necessary. This may ensure that safety training is better understood by workers whose primary language is Spanish and not English. A better understanding of safety by the workers and subcontractors may decrease the likelihood of safety problems and greatly enhances the potential for successful completion of the contract.

Price

NICC JV proposed the eighth lowest price of thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing NICC JV's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Four (4) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant, one (1) project was considered Moderately Relevant, and two (2) projects were considered of Low Relevance. Questionnaires were received on ten (10) projects. NICC's reported performance ratings were primarily Very High with some High scores on projects that were considered to be Very High and Highly relevant to the MAC contract. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, NICC's Past Performance Volume, and its safety record, the Government has a Very High level of confidence in NICC's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Meltech Corp.

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Meltech received a Good rating with three (3) Strengths in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: By proposing a project specific Quality Control Plan for complex and high profile projects, Meltech reduces the risk of quality control problems during construction. Meltech will develop a project specific Quality Control Program for complex or high profile projects in addition to the mandated contract wide Quality Control Plan to ensure that the work conforms to contract requirements. A project specific Quality Control Plan includes identified definable features of work and discusses the quality requirements for them at the preparatory phase meeting. A project specific plan for complex and high profile projects may result in a reduction of schedule delays, rework and quality control issues and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: By proposing multiple methods of monitoring and identifying problems coupled with root cause analysis, Meltech will reduce the risk of problem recurrence. Root cause analysis may ensure the causes of problems are dealt with and corrected, reducing the likelihood of repeat problems. Meltech proposes to use a six step corrective action management plan to identify, evaluate and correct problems. This corrective action plan may ensure that problems are detected early, reducing their effect on the project and mitigating their impact on the schedule. Additionally, the use of root cause analysis may ensure that the cause of the problem is discovered and corrected, as opposed to correcting the symptoms of the problem. This six step corrective action management plan will also extend to subcontractors. This corrective action plan will emphasize planning and proactive steps to prevent quality issues, and the root-cause analysis emphasizes cause determination and the prevention of recurrences to achieve a quality project, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #3: Meltech proposes the CPM methodology in managing schedules for its projects, supplemented by bar charts and other visual devices. By proposing CPM for schedule management, Meltech reduces the risk of schedule slippage and focuses attention on the critical

activities that affect the timely completion of the project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using the Critical Path Method, Meltech increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while ensuring timely schedule completion, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Meltech received a Very Good with one (1) Significant Strength in Subfactor B.

Significant Strength #1: By dedicating key corporate capabilities to the MAC contract such as highly qualified key personnel, effective project management software, and a subcontractor database with over 200 companies, Meltech will have the ability to seamlessly manage all aspects of the contract reducing the likelihood of problems and delays. Meltech proposes two key positions at the program level and two key positions at the project level. Both members of the program and project level have more than 25 years of related construction experience. The Senior Construction Manager is trained in Quality Assurance/Quality Control, CPR/First Aid, and OSHA Level 30 Construction Certification. Meltech proposes using project management software, such as Primavera and Timberline, that will be utilized under the contract. Meltech has an in-house database of over 200 pre-qualified and/or previously employed personnel that are ready to support surges in requirements. The corporate capabilities proposed may allow Meltech to handle multiple projects and numerous task orders in a timely manner without conflict, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Meltech received a Very Good with one (1) Significant Strength and one (1) Strength in Subfactor C.

Significant Strength #1: Meltech's Safety Programs address all RFP requirements in a thorough and professional manner. Meltech has developed a corporate safety and health manual which incorporates Federal, State and Local statutory and regulatory standards. Their safety team is comprised of experienced personnel from the Government sector familiar with occupational and public safety. All Meltech and subcontract employees participate in safety teams and receive rigorous training before beginning work on a project. This indicates that Meltech has the knowledge and ability to prepare and implement proactive accident prevention plans for each of the construction projects that could be awarded. Additionally, Meltech's Safety and Health Plan addresses all the requirements included in the Appendix E of NPR 8715.3 (Sample Safety and Health Plan). Compliance with NASA safety requirements reduces the likelihood of accident related work stoppages while greatly enhancing the potential for successful performance and significantly contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #1: Meltech's Safety and Health Plan establishes the OSHA 30 Hours Construction Certification Course as a minimum training requirement for Project Managers, Site Safety Officers, and Superintendents. Additionally, Meltech's Safety and Health Plan establishes the OSHA 10 Hours Construction Certification Course as a minimum training requirement for all

employees during their probation period. This approach increases the likelihood of compliance with safety requirements and enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Price

Meltech's proposed price is tied for third lowest of thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Meltech's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Four (4) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, two (2) projects were considered Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and one (1) project was considered of Low Relevance. Meltech demonstrated Moderate to Very High performance scores on 7 of the 10 projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, Meltech's Past Performance Volume, Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and its safety record, the Government has a High level of confidence in Meltech's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Biscayne Contractors

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Biscayne received a Good rating with four (4) Strengths in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: The designated Biscayne Project Manager and the designated Superintendent have both been certified as having completed the Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management for Contractors training course. (Note for this and other similar strengths: The Construction Quality Control requirements for this contract as specified in Sections 01450 and 01451 are modeled after the Corps of Engineers program.) This training may ensure that the task order procedures and requirements are fully understood and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: Biscayne has an effective plan for meeting the schedule, recovering from possible slippage, and mitigating impacts of slippage and schedule delays. Biscayne will comprehensively manage the completion of milestones by diligent implementation of the project schedule. Corrective action plans, if necessary, will include additional shift work, weekend scheduling or supplemental forces. These actions reduce the risk of not completing projects on time and mitigate the impact of schedule changes to the Government, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #3: Biscayne will develop a project specific Quality Control Program for each task awarded under this contract in addition to the mandated contract wide Quality Control Plan to ensure that the work conforms to contract requirements. A project specific Quality Control Plan includes identified definable features of work and discusses the quality requirements for them at

the preparatory phase meeting. A project specific quality plan may result in a reduction of schedule delays, rework and quality control issues and may enhance the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #4: Biscayne proposes the CPM methodology in managing schedules for its projects, supplemented by bar charts and other visual devices. By proposing CPM for schedule management, Biscayne reduces the risk of schedule slippage and focuses attention on the critical activities that affect the timely completion of the project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using the CPM method, Biscayne increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while ensuring timely schedule completion and enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Biscayne received a Good rating with one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: Biscayne demonstrates a thorough understanding of the change order process and proposes an effective approach to pricing the work. Biscayne plans to prepare independent cost estimates for proposed change orders on subcontracted work. It will then review the subcontractor proposal before submission to NASA. This approach by Biscayne will help to ensure that only reasonable change order price proposals are submitted, thereby allowing the work to be awarded and proceed more quickly. Biscayne's comprehensive process for reviewing change orders ensures the Government receives fair and reasonable pricing on Government issued change orders and support through "value engineering options" and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Biscayne lacks adequate discussion concerning the depth of total corporate resources that might be available to the Construction Manager. The Request for Proposal (RFP) requested information on corporate capabilities such as services, facilities, project management software, training, and personnel, however Biscayne did not adequately address these items. Additionally, the organizational chart mentioned a "self-performed capabilities" box for which there was a lack of supporting narrative to explain what this was and whether it was a corporate service available to support the MAC contract. By not adequately addressing its corporate capabilities, Biscayne increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance because the Government is unsure if Biscayne is capable of responding quickly to the Government's complex project requirements.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Biscayne received a Good rating with one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor C.

Strength #1: Biscayne has established an incentive plan to recognize employees for safe work. This plan includes on the spot recognition and a quarterly team award for no reportable injuries. This plan may help reduce safety problems, increases the likelihood of successful completion of the contract, enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Biscayne's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion of its approach to address NASA policies and procedures included in NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". While Biscayne outlines key elements of the safety programs listed in the RFP, the information provided in the Safety and Health Plan is not sufficient to verify that the safety programs comply with the requirements of Section M of the RFP. This lack of understanding of NASA specific safety requirements increases the risk of accident related work stoppages, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Biscayne proposed the tenth lowest price of thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Biscayne's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Five projects were considered Very Highly relevant and five projects were considered Highly relevant. Biscayne demonstrated primarily Very High performance on 5 of the 10 projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, the Past Performance Volume, PPIRS, and its safety record, the Government has a Very High level of confidence in Biscayne's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Beltsville Industrial Group (BIG)

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

BIG received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: BIG proposes to use a CPM methodology of schedule management, including such activities as purchase of long lead items, and approval of submittals. Additionally, it will produce 15 day look-ahead schedules. By proposing CPM for schedule management, BIG reduces the risk of schedule slippage and focuses attention on the critical activities that affect the timely completion of the project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using CPM, BIG increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while ensuring timely schedule completion, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: All of BIG's Project Managers and Superintendents have been certified as having completed the Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management for Contractors training course. The Construction Quality Control requirements for this contract as specified in Sections 01450 and 01451 are modeled after the Corps of Engineers program. The training may ensure that the task order procedures and requirements are fully understood from the beginning and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

BIG received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: BIG has given full autonomy and independence to its Project Manager, including authority to make required decisions and to take action necessary to satisfactorily execute and meet all other contract requirements. Corporate resources are clearly identified. This may allow for rapid task order modifications and timely conflict resolutions and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: BIG has developed an extensive selection process that rates each subcontractor on past performance, credit, quality, pricing, safety record, and employee turnover in order to determine the best subcontractor for selection. BIG has access to over 125 active subcontractors and vendors, with an additional 510 subcontractors in its database. The evaluation process for selecting subcontractors may ensure that quality subcontractors are selected and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: There are ambiguities and inconsistencies between the described key positions and the organizational chart. While there is a sufficient explanation of the duties of key personnel, these personnel are not represented on the organizational chart. The text describes the Project Executive, General Manager, Project Manager and Project/Site Superintendent, none of which are displayed on the organizational chart. These inconsistencies may reduce the ability to resolve conflicts and prevent delays and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

BIG received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths and two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor C.

Strength #1: BIG's Safety and Health Plan includes documented daily toolbox safety talks by foremen/supervisor. BIG's Safety and Health Plan also establishes the OSHA 30 Hours Construction Certification Course, CPR, and First Aid as a minimum training requirement for Project Managers, Site Safety Officers, Foremen, Supervisors, and Superintendents. Other employees are required to pass an orientation period and be trained on the specific tasks they perform. The plan establishes 80% minimum passing score for all safety training courses. This approach increases the likelihood of employee understanding of safety requirements and enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Strength #2: BIG's Safety and Health Plan includes documented daily safety and health inspections by the Site Safety Officer, Quality Assurance, or the Superintendent. This approach increases the likelihood of compliance with requirements, the identification of hazardous conditions and behaviors, and prevention of accidents and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: BIG's Safety and Health Plan includes detailed information addressing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Standard EM 385-1-1. While some Federal Agencies utilize this standard, NASA policies and procedures included in NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements" go beyond this USACE standard and imposes additional requirements the Offeror did not sufficiently address. A lack of sufficient discussion of NASA requirements increases the risk of accident related work stoppages and unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: BIG's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion concerning their plan for requiring subcontractors to conform to NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". These requirements can either "Flow-Down" from BIG's Safety and Health Plan or the subcontractor must submit a conforming Safety and Health Plan. BIG requires its subcontractors to provide a written Safety and Health Plan that complies with the US Army Corps of Engineers safety requirements, not NASA specific safety requirements. This may lead to accident related work stoppages due to the subcontractor's lack of understanding of NASA specific safety requirements and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

BIG proposed the fifth lowest price of thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing BIG's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: One project was considered Very Highly relevant, three projects were considered Highly relevant, two projects were considered Moderately relevant, and four projects were considered of Low or Very Low relevance. BIG demonstrated very high performance on 5 of the 10 projects. Although BIG received Very High performance scores, 4 of the 5 projects they received performance scores on were considered Moderate to Very Low in relevance. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, PPIRS, BIG's Past Performance Volume, and its safety record, the Government has a Moderate level of confidence in BIG's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Allen and Shariff Corporation

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Allen and Shariff received a Good rating with three (3) Strengths in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: Allen & Shariff proposes the Critical Path Management (CPM) methodology in creating and managing schedules for its projects. By proposing CPM for schedule management, the Offeror reduces the risk of schedule slippage and focuses attention on the critical activities that affect the timely completion of the project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. This approach should allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while ensuring timely schedule completion. By using the CPM method, Allen & Shariff enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: Allen & Shariff propose an effective plan to prevent slippage and if necessary to recover and mitigate issues arising from schedule slippage. Its recovery plan consists of a resource-loaded schedule on any project for which it begins to fall behind. This schedule will be loaded in either Primavera or MS Project and will enable the Offeror to immediately determine if the necessary manpower is on the job to enable the project to get back on schedule. This may

decrease the risk of not finishing on time. By proposing a comprehensive recovery plan, Allen & Shariff enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #3: By proposing a project specific Quality Control Plan for each task awarded under this contract, Allen & Shariff reduces the risk of quality control problems during construction. Allen & Shariff will develop a project specific Quality Control Program for each task awarded under this contract in addition to the mandated contract wide Quality Control Plan to ensure that the work conforms to contract requirements. A project specific Quality Control Plan includes identified definable features of work and discusses the quality requirements for them at the preparatory phase meeting. A project specific quality plan may result in a reduction of schedule delays, rework and quality control issues and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Allen and Shariff received a Fair rating with one (1) Strength and two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: Allen & Shariff will prepare independent cost estimates for change orders, for use in determining the reasonableness of the subcontractor's proposal. It will solicit additional quotes if the subcontractor's pricing is determined to be unreasonable. This process may help to ensure that the Government is charged fair prices for changes as these costs are non-competitive. Allen & Shariff's plan for ensuring fair and reasonable pricing on Government initiated change orders may reduce costs and administrative burden on the Government, enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: There was insufficient discussion regarding the Project Manager's access to corporate resources or what independence and autonomy might be delegated to the Project Manager. The proposal lacks adequate discussion or identification of a process by which the Project Manager could resolve conflicts without resorting to corporate assistance. The Government is unsure what authorities and resources are available to the Project Manager in the field which could impact decision making and execution of project schedules and management costs, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: Allen & Shariff lacks adequate discussion on its corporate capabilities and whether such capabilities will be available to support the Multiple Award Contract. By not addressing its corporate capabilities, Allen and Shariff increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance because the Government is unsure if Allen & Shariff is capable of responding quickly to the Government's complex project requirements.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Allen and Shariff received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: Allen and Shariff's Safety and Health Plan establishes the OSHA 30 Hours Construction Certification Course as a minimum training requirement for Project Managers, Site Safety Officers, and Superintendents. Allen and Shariff has also established an incentive plan to

recognize employees for safe work. A bonus is also awarded to the Safety Supervisor of the Quarter. Additionally, Allen and Shariff mandates a Corps of Engineers Safety and Health Requirements Manual training course immediately upon hire for all project personnel. This training may help reduce the incidence of safety problems, increase the likelihood of compliance with safety requirements, and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: Allen and Shariff's Safety and Health Plan includes documented daily safety and health inspections by Quality Assurance, the Site Safety Officer, or the Superintendent. This approach increases the likelihood of compliance with requirements, the timely identification of hazardous conditions and behaviors, and prevention of accidents. This approach enhances the potential for accident free contract performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Allen and Shariff's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion of their approach to address NASA policies and procedures included in NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". While Allen and Shariff outlines key elements of the safety programs listed in the RFP, the information provided in the Safety and Health Plan is not sufficient to verify that the safety programs comply with the requirements of Section M of the RFP. This lack of understanding of NASA specific safety requirements increases the risk of accident related work stoppages, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Allen and Shariff proposed the twelfth lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Allen and Shariff's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: One project was considered Very Highly relevant, four projects were considered Highly relevant, two projects were considered Moderately relevant, and three projects were considered of Low relevance. Allen & Shariff demonstrated Very High and High performance on 8 of the 10 projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, PPIRS, Allen and Shariff's Past Performance Volume, and its safety record, the Government has a High level of confidence in Allen and Shariff's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

CJW/Desbuild JV (CJW/DB)

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

CJW/DB received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: CJW/DB proposes to use the CPM methodology for schedule management, including such activities as purchase of long lead items, and approval of submittals. Additionally, it will produce 15 day look-ahead schedules. By proposing CPM for schedule management,

CJW/DB reduces the risk of schedule delays and focuses attention on the critical activities that affect the timely completion of the project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using CPM, CJW/DB increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks, ensuring timely schedule completion and enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: CJW/DB states that all of its Project Managers and Superintendents have been certified as having completed the Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management for Contractors training course. The Construction Quality Control requirements for this contract as specified in Sections 01450 and 01451 are modeled after the Corps of Engineers program. The training may ensure that the task order procedures and requirements are fully understood at the start of the contract, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: CJW/DB lacks adequate discussion of a program or process to recover or mitigate slippage when it does occur. This increases the risk of schedule overruns and increased costs and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

CJW/DB received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: The CJW/DB proposal states that the Project Manager has signatory authority for all aspects of the IDIQ contract. He will have authority to negotiate schedule and cost. This may reduce delays and enhance the potential for timely execution of the contract, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: CJW/DB will create an in-house estimate to compare to the subcontractor's proposed price to determine its reasonableness before submission to the Government. If the subcontractor's price is not reasonable, CJW/DB will negotiate with the subcontractor or CJW/DB will self perform the work. This may ensure fair and reasonable prices for change orders, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: CJW/DB's organization structure lacks adequate alignment with what is written in the narrative. For example, the appointment letter for the Quality Control (QC) manager position lists a certain individual in this role, yet the organizational chart lists this individual as a General Manager. The narrative also says that the Superintendent reports to the assigned Project Manager, yet the organizational chart shows the Superintendents and the Project Managers in separate branches under the Senior Project Managers. Additionally, in the narrative portion of the proposal, CJW/DB states that it will self-perform several trades of work (demolition, finishes, concrete, etc). However, on the organizational chart, there is no indication of tradespersons employed with the company. This ambiguity leads to the Government's uncertainty about CJW/DB's capability to self-perform work on the contract, increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract completion.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

CJW/DB received a Fair rating with one (1) Weakness in Subfactor C.

Weakness #1: CJW/DB's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion of their approach to address NASA policies and procedures included in NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". While CJW/DB outlines key elements of the safety programs listed in the RFP, it does not provide the detail needed to ensure that the safety and health plan will meet the requirements. The information provided in the Safety and Health Plan is not sufficient to verify that the safety programs comply with the requirements of Section M of the RFP. This lack of understanding of NASA specific safety requirements increases the risk of accident related work stoppages, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

The CJW/Desbuild JV proposed price is tied for the third lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing CJW/DB's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Two (2) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant, two (2) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and three (3) projects were considered of Low Relevance. CJW/DB demonstrated primarily very high performance on 5 of the 10 projects. The Government did not receive questionnaires on 5 of CJW/DB's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, its Past Performance Volume, and its safety record, the Government has a High level of confidence in CJW/Desbuild's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Stella May Contracting

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Stella May received a Fair rating with one (1) Strength and two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: Stella May proposes a comprehensive program for identifying deficiencies, including documentation and corrective action. Stella May also conveys this requirement upon its subcontractors and insists on corrective actions within two days. Once deficiencies are discovered, Stella May utilizes root cause analysis to ensure that the cause of the problem is identified and corrected, thus preventing a recurrence of similar problems. This approach may ensure timely detection and correction of deficiencies, better maintenance of costs on the job site, and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Stella May's Quality Control Plan does not accept responsibility for the action of its subcontractors pertaining to the installation of unapproved materials requiring submittals. The Quality Control Plan states "Any materials requiring submittals installed without approval will be at the contractor's [subcontractor's] risk; Stella May Contracting will NOT be liable for any unapproved materials installed." Failure to accept responsibility for the actions of its subcontractors may result in the potential for contract disputes and accountability, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: Stella May lacks adequate discussion concerning the issues of recovering schedule slippage or mitigating the impacts of schedule slippage. This increases the risk of schedule overruns and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Stella May received a Good rating with one (1) Weakness in Subfactor B.

Weakness #1: Stella May lacks adequate discussion on plans and procedures to ensure fair pricing on construction change orders. Stella May discusses the procedures for changes and the roles and responsibilities of personnel involved but has failed to describe any plans or procedures to ensure fair prices on changes. This omission increases the risk of submitting unreasonable pricing and causing delays to the work while the Government determines fair and reasonable prices, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Stella May received a Good rating with one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor C.

Strength #1: Stella May has created a safety conscious workforce by providing incentives for safe work based on reductions in accidents, safety suggestions and other criteria. Employees are awarded with a luncheon and a $500 gift card. This may help reduce accidents and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Stella May presents an "approach" to a health and safety plan but it does not provide sufficient detail in most areas that demonstrates compliance specifically with NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". Failure to comply with NASA specific safety requirements increases the risk of accidents, work stoppages, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Stella May Contracting proposed the thirteenth lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Stella May's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of eight (8) past performance references: Two (2) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and three (3) projects were considered of Low Relevance. Stella May demonstrated primarily very high performance on 4 of the 8 projects. The Government did not receive questionnaires on 4 of Stella May's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, its Past Performance

Volume, PPIRS, and Safety record, the Government has a Moderate level of confidence in Stella May's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Construction Development Services Inc (CDSI)

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

CDSI received a Good rating with two (2) Strengths in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: All of the Project Managers and Superintendents have completed the US Army Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management training certification course. The Construction Quality Control requirements for this contract are specified in Sections 01450 and 01451 and modeled after the Corps of Engineers program. The training may ensure that task order procedures and requirements are fully understood and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2: CDSI proposes using the CPM methodology of contract schedule management. CDSI proposes to use the Primavera scheduling software supplemented by Microsoft project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using the CPM method, CDSI increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks while enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

CDSI received a Fair rating with two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor B.

Weakness #1: CDSI lacks adequate discussion concerning a complete process for evaluating, qualifying, selecting and managing subcontractors. While it has established relationships with subcontractors, no mention is made of how subcontractors' qualifications are determined and how they are screened and selected for particular contracts. This presents a risk of selecting subcontractors with subpar performance or qualifications, which may result in an increased risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: CDSI presented an organizational structure that lacks important details. Project Managers do not appear to have authority over subcontractors. Additionally, the organizational chart does not clearly show what corporate resources will be available to support this contract. The Project Manager's autonomy and lines of authority and his control over resources is not clearly shown. CDSI does not clearly identify the position of Construction Quality Control Manager and his or her lines of responsibility or authority in the organizational chart. This ambiguity may have a negative effect on the quality of work being performed and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

CDSI received a Good rating with one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor C.

Strength #1: CDSI's Safety Programs addressing RFP requirements were very thorough in specific areas such as Lock Out/Tag Out (LOTO) program and Critical Lift Programs. This indicates that CDSI has the knowledge and ability to prepare and implement proactive accident prevention plans for each phase of the projects that could be awarded, increasing the likelihood of accident free contract completion, enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: CDSI's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion of its approach to address NASA policies and procedures included in NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". Instead, CDSI's plan includes detailed information addressing the Army Corps of Engineers Standard EM 385-1-1. This lack of understanding of NASA specific safety requirements increases the risk of accident related work stoppages, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

CDSI proposed the second lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing CDSI's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Four (4) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant, two (2) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and one (1) project was considered of Low Relevance. CDSI demonstrated primarily high performance on 5 of the 10 projects. The Government did not receive questionnaires on 5 of CDSI's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, its Past Performance Volume and PPIRS, and its safety record, the Government has a High level of confidence in CDSI's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Specialty Construction Management Inc. (SCM)

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

SCM received a Fair rating with two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor A.

Weakness #1: SCM lacks adequate discussion concerning its methods for schedule management at the individual project level and at a program level when administering simultaneous multiple construction projects. SCC lacks adequate discussion concerning methods for assessing schedule feasibility, sequencing scheduled task orders and durations. The failure to address schedule management at the individual project level and at a program level increases the potential for schedule delays and slippage and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: SCM lacks adequate discussion concerning the issues of recovering schedule slippage or mitigating the impacts of schedule slippage. This increases the risk of schedule overruns and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

SCM received a Fair rating with one (1) Strength, one (1) Significant Weakness and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: SCM has given full autonomy to its Construction Manager, including authority to negotiate and sign task orders. Corporate resources are clearly identified. Additionally, the site superintendent is authorized to accept "no cost" field changes. This may allow for rapid task order modifications and timely conflict resolutions, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Significant Weakness #1: SCM lacks adequate discussion concerning its corporate structure and where this contract falls within its corporate structure. The organizational chart presented is very confusing and is inconsistent with the roles and responsibilities listed for management personnel. For example, the senior construction manager is shown on the organization chart as being responsible for quality control, while under the roles and responsibilities narrative the General Superintendent is responsible for quality control procedures. The lines of authority are not clear, and the chart fails to clearly identify which functions report to which supervisors. SCM states that the responsibilities of the General Superintendent include being the company's safety officer. The scope of the responsibilities of superintendent, quality control, and safety are so broad that one person would have difficulty performing these three roles. This gives the appearance of a conflict of interest among the three roles. These flaws and ambiguities in the organizational structure appreciably increase the likelihood of confusion, communication failures, and potential safety issues and appreciably increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #1: SCM lacks adequate discussion concerning the thoroughness and effectiveness of plans and procedures to ensure the Government receives fair and reasonable prices on change orders. This omission increases the risk of SCM submitting unreasonable pricing and causing delays to the work while the Government determines fair and reasonable prices and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

SCM received a Poor rating with one (1) Significant Weakness and two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor C.

Significant Weakness #1: The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion concerning its approach to compliance with NASA policies and procedures relative to safety and occupational health, NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 8715.3, appendix E, "NASA General Safety Program Requirements", which requires detailed information related to:

- Management Leadership and Employee Participation.
- Workplace Analysis.
- Mishap Investigation and Record Analysis.

- Hazard Prevention and Control.
- Emergency Response.
- Job Hazard Analysis.
- Safety and Health Training.

Failure to comply with NASA requirements significantly increases the risk of work stoppages and accidents, and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #1: SCM's Safety and Health Plan indicates that the General Foreman is the person responsible for implementing the Safety Plan. However, that person will not be sufficiently separated from operations to ensure objectivity and safety oversight. Failure to objectively manage safety may lead to work accidents and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: SCM's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion concerning provisions to flow-down the safety and health program requirements to subcontractors. Failure to flow-down NASA approved safety requirements, may lead to accidents due to subcontractor's ignorance of NASA, and GSFC specific safety requirements, increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

SCM proposed the seventh lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing SCM's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and four (4) projects were considered of low to very Low Relevance. SCM demonstrated primarily high and very high performance on 5 of the 10 projects. The Government did not receive questionnaires on 5 of SCM's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires and SCM's Past Performance Volume, and their safety record, the Government has a Moderate level of confidence in SCM's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Facility Site Contractors, Inc (Fascon)

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Fascon received a Fair rating with one (1) Strength, and one (1) Significant Weakness in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: All of Fascon's site Superintendents and Quality Control Inspectors have been certified as having completed the Corps of Engineers Construction Quality Management for Contractors training course. The Construction Quality Control requirements for this contract as

specified in Sections 01450 and 01451 are modeled after the Corps of Engineers program. The training may ensure that the task order procedures and requirements are fully understood from the beginning, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Significant Weakness #1: Fascon lacks adequate discussion concerning how it would manage multiple projects except to assign separate quality personnel to each. The proposal lacks adequate discussion of Critical Path Management (CPM) software or any other aids that would help Fascon in the execution of multiple major construction tasks. Additionally, Fascon lacks adequate discussion concerning its methods for schedule management at the individual project level and at a program level when administering simultaneous multiple construction projects. Fascon further lacks adequate discussion concerning methods for assessing schedule feasibility, sequencing scheduled task orders and durations. Fascon also lacks adequate discussion concerning specific, measureable means for preventing and mitigating impacts from slippage. The lack of adequate discussion appreciably increases the risk of project and program scheduling deficiencies and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Fascon received a Fair rating with one (1) Significant Weakness in Subfactor B.

Significant Weakness #1: Fascon lacks adequate discussion concerning what corporate resources might be available to assist in dealing with resource constraints in the field. Fascon lacks adequate discussion concerning what corporate resources the Construction Manager could draw upon or what authority and autonomy the Construction Manager would have in the field to resolve conflicts. Fascon lacks adequate discussion concerning the type of resources that would be necessary for quickly responding to problems in the field such as drawing upon a crafts labor force at corporate that could be allocated to help expedite a project. The lack of discussion to clearly delineate corporate resources and identify which resources are available for the multiple award contract appreciably reduce the Government's confidence in Fascon's ability to successfully complete this contract and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Fascon received a Good rating with one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor C.

Strength #1: Fascon's Safety and Health Plan addresses all the relevant OSHA safety programs, including, but not limited to, scaffolding, fall protection, excavation, crane safety and corporate standing safety regulations. This demonstrates an understanding of and appreciation for general safety requirements enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Weakness #1: Fascon's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion of their approach to address NASA policies and procedures included in NPR 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements". While Fascon outlines key elements of the safety programs listed in the RFP, the information provided in the Safety and Health Plan is not sufficient to verify that the safety programs comply with the requirements of Section M of the RFP. This lack of understanding of

NASA specific safety requirements increases the risk of accident related work stoppages, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Fascon proposed the eleventh lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Fascon's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Two (2) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant, Four (4) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and one (1) project was considered of Low Relevance. FASCON demonstrated very high, high, and moderate performance on 9 of the 10 projects. The Government did not receive a NASA past performance questionnaire on 1 of FASCON's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires, its Past Performance Volume, PPIRS, and its safety record, the Government has a High level of confidence in Fascon's ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Grunley/Goel JV

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Grunley Grunley/Goel received a Poor rating with one (1) Strength, one (1) Significant Weakness and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor A.

Strength #1: Grunley/Goel proposes using the CPM methodology of contract schedule management. Grunley/Goel proposes to use the Primavera scheduling software supplemented by Microsoft project. Critical tasks that may affect the scheduling of the project will receive more attention than routine tasks. By using the CPM method, Grunley/Goel increases the likelihood of finishing projects on time. This approach may allow the most flexibility for scheduling and monitoring tasks, ensuring timely schedule completion and enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Significant Weakness #1: Grunley/Goel lacks adequate discussion of its Quality Control Plan approach as it pertains to the requirements in the specifications. Additionally, Grunley/Goel lacks adequate discussion concerning the specific requirements of Goddard's Quality Control Specification; there is very little mention, if any, about quality control plans. There was inadequate discussion of quality control methods other than inference on page six to troubleshooting and the brief descriptions of the Submittal and RFI processes. There was inadequate discussion of the preparatory, initial, or final inspection method of quality control surveillance, and inadequate discussion of monitoring, identifying and correcting deficiencies. These omissions appreciably increase the risk that Grunley/Goel may not have an effective Quality Control Program which may result in the potential for poor quality workmanship,

schedule delays and rework and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #1: Grunley/Goel did not adequately address or make any reference to the issues of recovering schedule slippage or mitigating the impacts of schedule slippage. This increases the risk of schedule overruns and increased costs and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Grunley/Goel received a Fair rating with two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor B.

Weakness #1: Grunley/Goel lacks adequate discussion concerning the Project Manager's interaction with corporate personnel as well as corporate resources. In addition, the Offeror lacks adequate discussion concerning corporate resources such as training, equipment, and back-up personnel. This ambiguity indicates potential inefficiencies in overall management of contract tasks which increases the risk of negative cost and schedule implications to the Government and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: Grunley/Goel lacks adequate discussion to clearly identify its corporate structure and where this contract falls within the corporate structure. The organization chart includes a box for self-performed work, but there is no discussion on the number of tradespersons or their skill set. This leads to the Government's confusion and uncertainty regarding the Offeror's corporate capabilities available to support this contract which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Grunley/Goel received a Poor rating with one (1) Significant Weakness and one (1) Weakness in Subfactor C.

Significant Weakness #1: Grunley/Goel's Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion concerning its approach to compliance with NASA policies and procedures relative to safety and occupational health, NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 8715.3, appendix E, "NASA General Safety Program Requirements", which requires detailed information related to:

- Management Leadership and Employee Participation.
- Workplace Analysis.
- Mishap Investigation and Record Analysis.
- Hazard Prevention and Control.
- Emergency Response.
- Safety and Health Training.

Failure to comply with NASA requirements significantly increases the risk of work stoppages and accidents, and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #1: Grunley/Goel's Safety and Health plan lacks adequate discussion concerning the duties and responsibilities of the Quality Control Superintendent and the Project Superintendent.

The plan states that the Project Superintendent is responsible for day to day administration of the job specific safety plan, while the paragraph refers to the Quality Control Superintendent. This safety management approach does not ensure that NASA approved Safety and Health Programs will be implemented or who will be responsible for their implementation. Failure to clearly identify responsibilities of safety management may lead to safety issues or accidents due to subcontractor's lack of adherence to NASA, and GSFC specific safety requirements and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Grunley/Goel JV proposed the lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Grunley/Goel's overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of ten (10) past performance references: Two (2) projects were considered Very Highly Relevant, three (3) projects were considered Highly Relevant, Four (4) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and one (1) project was considered of Low Relevance. Grunley/Goel demonstrated primarily very high and high performance on 4 of the 10 projects. The Government did not receive a NASA past performance questionnaire on 6 of Grunley/Goel's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires and Grunley's Past Performance Volume, and their safety record, the Government has a High level of confidence in its ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Nastos Construction Inc.

Mission Suitability

Subfactor A: Understanding Key Requirements

Nastos received a Poor rating with two (2) Significant Weaknesses in Subfactor A.

Significant Weakness #1: Nastos does not demonstrate an understanding of the basic quality requirements of the Goddard Construction Specifications nor the level of attention required during the initial stages of project planning. By not recognizing the need for daily reports, tracking deficiencies and construction submittals defined by the Goddard Specifications, the Government does not have confidence in Nastos' reliance upon a quality control plan. This jeopardizes Nastos' ability to complete projects problem-free and on-time, appreciably increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness #2: Nastos has a significant weakness in the effectiveness of its schedule management at the project and program level. Nastos does not clearly define its approach for assessing schedule feasibility, sequencing task orders and durations, monitoring progress, recovering slippage, and mitigating impacts. This appreciably jeopardizes Nastos' ability to meet the project schedule in a timely manner and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Nastos received a Poor rating with one (1) Strength, two (2) Significant Weaknesses and two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor B.

Strength #1: Nastos has the corporate capabilities to utilize over 100 in house crewmembers, drawn from eight different skilled craft divisions, and an existing fleet of vehicles, equipment and tools. Nastos demonstrates that it has the ability to quickly and flexibly respond to the needs of the Government, enhancing the potential for successful performance and contributing toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Significant Weakness #1: Nastos lacks adequate discussion concerning the duties and responsibilities of the Construction Manager. Specifically, the proposal lacks adequate discussion concerning the degree of independence and autonomy of the Construction Manager, the relationship between the Construction Manager and corporate management, the Construction Manager's access to or control of corporate resources and the Construction Manager's authority to resolve priority conflicts. Nastos states that the Construction Manager (CM) is ultimately responsible for contract performance but fails to make clear whether or not the CM does indeed have the authority within the organizational structure to ensure the successful completion of contract requirements. Without knowing the authority and autonomy of the Construction Manager, the ability to resolve conflicts and negotiate change orders is unknown and appreciably increases the risk of schedule delays, sub-quality performance and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness #2: Nastos has a significant weakness in its organizational structure. Nastos proposes that the majority of tasks on this contract can be completed by a two-man field team. This approach indicates that Nastos considers the contract requirements as primarily small maintenance or rehabilitation work rather than new and possibly challenging construction. This is further reinforced by its description of a two-man team as consisting of a specialized tradesperson and their apprentice/assistant. This appreciably increases the risk of quality issues and significant schedule slips as Nastos adjusts to the complexity of the work detailed in the statement of work (SOW), appreciably increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #1: Nastos lacks adequate discussion concerning plans or procedures to ensure fair and reasonable prices on Government issued change orders. This could result in Nastos proposing unfair, unreasonable and excessive charges for Government issued change orders, causing extra effort for the Government to refute unreasonable charges that should not have been proposed and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: Nastos makes reference to a Technical Services Manager and a Business Manager/Subcontractor Administrator but neither of these positions are identified on the Organizational Chart. Nastos describes the responsibilities of the Technical Services Manager to include "specification and approval of materials" among other things. It is unclear who this person reports to and where in the organization this responsibility resides. This role of approving materials and preparing product submittals to NASA is key to both the quality of the end product and to maintaining schedule. This uncertainty in Nastos' organizational structure increases the risk that the Construction Manager may not have the necessary influence over the Technical Services Manager to complete the project in a timely manner and with established quality. The role of the Business Manager - Subcontract Administrator is discussed but it is not clear whether or not this position resides in the "Project Construction Management Division." By not clearly

defining the position's line of authority with the Construction Managers poses uncertainty as to the effectiveness of the change order process with subcontractors, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Safety and Health Plan

Nastos received a Poor rating with one (1) Strength, one (1) Significant Weakness and two (2) Weaknesses in Subfactor C.

Strength #1: Nastos conducts all of its training lectures in both English and Spanish. This may ensure that safety training is better understood by workers whose primary language is Spanish and not English. A better understanding of safety by the workers may decrease the likelihood of safety problems, increase the potential for successful completion of the contract, and enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Significant Weakness #1: Nastos' Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion concerning its approach to compliance with NASA policies and procedures relative to safety and occupational health, NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 8715.3, appendix E, "NASA General Safety Program Requirements", which requires detailed information related to:

- Management Leadership and Employee Participation.
- Workplace Analysis.
- Mishap Investigation and Record Analysis.
- Hazard Prevention and Control.
- Emergency Response.
- Safety and Health Training.

Failure to comply with NASA requirements significantly increases the risk of work stoppages and accidents, and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #1: Nastos' Safety and Health Plan lacks adequate discussion concerning provisions to flow-down NASA-approved safety and health plan requirements to subcontractors. Failure to flow-down NASA safety requirements may lead to work stoppages or accidents due to subcontractor's failure to be aware of Prime Contractor, NASA, and GSFC specific safety requirements and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2: Nastos' example of project specific Safety and Health Plan does not include an Activity Hazard Analysis indicating the specific hazards to which Nastos' employees or its subcontractors could be exposed during the performance of their work and the hazard control measures required for each job. This plan also fails to identify the specific training requirements for the employees performing the tasks. Failure to conduct a hazard analysis may lead to failures to establish hazard controls and consequently employee exposures and injuries and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Price

Nastos proposed the ninth lowest price among the thirteen Offerors.

Past Performance

In assessing Nastos' overall past performance rating, the SEB considered a total of eleven (11) past performance references: One (1) project was considered Very Highly Relevant, one (1) project was considered Highly Relevant, six (6) projects were considered Moderately Relevant, and three (3) projects were considered of Low Relevance. NASTOS demonstrated Low to Very High performance on 3 of the 11 projects. The Government did not receive a NASA past performance questionnaire on 8 of NASTOS's projects. Based on the past history of relevance and performance gathered through questionnaires and Nastos' Past Performance Volume, and their safety record, the Government has a Moderate level of confidence in their ability to successfully perform the required effort.

Source Selection Decision

I have carefully reviewed the SEB's findings documentation entitled "Multiple Award Construction Contract Presentation to Source Selection Authority." I accept the findings from the SEB. In determining which proposals offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP:

> The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Price Factor is equal to the Mission Suitability Factor, and also equal to the Past Performance Factor.

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the source selection factors, recognizing that all the factors were of equal weight.

The following chart depicts the evaluation of the offerors broken out by evaluation factor. The offerors highlighted in green indicate the offerors that ranked in the top third on two of the three evaluation factors.

Offeror	Mission Suitability Total Score	Pricing Ranking	Past Performance
Allen & Shariff	572	12	High
BIG	591	5	Moderate
Biscayne	626	10	Very High
CDSI	475	2	High
CJW/Desbuild	554	3	High
Fascon	353	11	High
Grimberg/Amatea	866	6	Very High
Grunley/Goel	269	1	High
Meltech	720	3	High
Nastos	180	9	Moderate
NICC JV	820	8	Very High
SCM	359	7	Moderate
Stella May	485	13	Moderate

As all three factors were equally weighted, it was important to me to select the highest rated proposals in the three areas. No proposal placed in the top third in all three factors. However, four proposals placed in the top third for two of the three factors.

Allen & Shariff demonstrated a high past performance confidence rating; however, it did not offer one of the top rated mission suitability proposals and offered the twelfth lowest price

proposal. It failed to rate in the top third of proposals under any of the factors. Therefore Allen & Shariff was not selected for award.

Despite BIG demonstrating a Very High past performance record, it did not demonstrate the content and/or complexity required by the Request for Proposal (RFP) and that resulted in an overall Moderate past performance level of confidence rating. BIG did not offer one of the top rated mission suitability proposals and offered the fifth lowest price. It failed to rate in the top third of proposals under any of the factors. BIG was not one of the top rated proposals in mission suitability, price, or past performance. Therefore, BIG was not selected for award.

Biscayne presented one of the highest rated Mission Suitability proposals. It also received a Very High past performance level of confidence rating which was the highest rating awarded to any offeror. I noted that its price was one of the highest presented but this was outweighed by the fact that its proposal was in the top third of proposals for the other two factors. Therefore, I selected Biscayne for award of one of the contracts.

CDSI presented one of the lowest price proposals. It received a High past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the middle of the ranking for this factor. However, its proposal was in the bottom third of the proposals for the Mission Suitability factor. While CDSI offered one of the lowest price proposals, this one factor did not out weight its ranking and scoring in Mission Suitability and past performance. Therefore, CDSI was not selected for award.

CJW/Desbuild presented one of the lowest price proposals. It received a High past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the middle of the ranking for this factor. However, its proposal was in the bottom third of the proposals for the Mission Suitability factor. While CJW/Desbuild offered one of the lowest price proposals, this one factor did not outweigh its ranking and scoring in Mission Suitability and past performance. Therefore, CJW/Desbuild was not selected for award.

Fascon demonstrated a High past performance level of confidence rating; however, it did not offer one of the top rated Mission Suitability proposals and offered the eleventh lowest price proposal. It failed to rate in the top third of proposals under any of the factors. Therefore Fascon was not selected for award.

Grimberg/Amatea presented the highest rated Mission Suitability proposal. It also received a Very High past performance level of confidence rating which was the highest rating awarded to any offeror. I noted that its price was not one of the lowest, ranking 6 out of 13, but this was outweighed by the fact that its proposal was in the top third of proposals for the other two factors. Therefore, I selected Grimberg/Amatea for award of one of the contracts.

Grunley/Goel presented the lowest price proposal. It received a High past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the middle of the ranking for this factor. However, its proposal was in the bottom third of the proposals for the Mission Suitability factor. While Grunley/Goel offered the lowest price proposal, this one factor did not outweigh its ranking and

scoring in Mission Suitability and past performance. Therefore, Grunley/Goel was not selected for award.

Meltech presented one of the highest rated Mission Suitability proposals and offered the third lowest price. It received a High past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the middle of the ranking for this factor. Its proposal was rated in the top third of all proposals in two of the three factors. Therefore, I selected Meltech for award of one of the contracts.

Nastos received the lowest Mission Suitability score. It had the ninth lowest price placing it in the lower third of all proposals received. It received a Moderate past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the bottom third of proposals in this factor as well. Therefore, Nastos was not selected for award.

NICC JV presented the second highest rated Mission Suitability proposals. It also received a Very High past performance level of confidence rating which was the highest rating awarded to any offeror. I noted that its price was not one of the lowest, ranking 8 out of 13, but this was outweighed by the fact that its' proposal was in the top third of proposals for the other two factors. Therefore, I selected NICC JV for award of one of the contracts.

SCM received the third lowest Mission Suitability score. It had the seventh lowest price placing it in the middle of all proposals received. It received a Moderate past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the bottom third of proposals in this factor as well. Therefore, SCM was not selected for award.

Stella May received one of the lowest scores in Mission Suitability placing it in the bottom third in this factor. It offered the highest priced proposal and it received a Moderate past performance level of confidence rating which placed it in the bottom third of proposals in this factor as well. Therefore, Stella May was not selected for award.

Based upon the above, I determined that four offerors presented proposals that offered the best value to the Government. These four proposals received the top ratings in two of the three factors. No offeror scored in the top third in all three factors. Four offerors rated in the top third of all proposals in two factors. Therefore, I selected Grimberg, NICC, Meltech, and Biscayne for the award of MAC contracts, as the offerors providing the best value to the Government.

Thomas Paprocki
MAC Source Selection Authority

1/3/14
Date