
**National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000**

**Selection of Contractor
For
Aircraft and Airfield Related Services
NNA09271317R**

February 26, 2010

On February 10, 2010, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) Ex-Officio members, met with the SEC members appointed to evaluate the proposals for the procurement of Aircraft and Airfield Related Services at NASA Ames Research Center (ARC) and Moffett Federal Airfield. During this meeting, the SEC presented the findings from its Initial Evaluation Report and we discussed those findings to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

I assessed the SEC's findings and evaluation of proposals. This Source Selection Statement reflects my independent judgment and is based upon a comparative assessment of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, considering the evaluation criteria prescribed in the Request for Proposal (RFP). My selection decision is set forth below.

Procurement Description

The purpose of this Aircraft and Airfield contract is to provide aircraft services for aircraft operations, maintenance and research at NASA Ames Research Center, as well as operation of the Moffett Federal Airfield. This procurement was conducted as a Full and Open Competition and will result in a single award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) Cost-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) contract. The period of performance will consist of a one-year base period followed by one, two-year option period and two, one-year option periods, if all options are exercised.

Evaluation Procedure

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Section M of the solicitation, at paragraph M.2 "Evaluation Approach", advised Offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on the initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each Offeror was to submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserved the right to hold discussions if award on initial offerors was determined not be in the Government's best interest.

The RFP identified three evaluation Factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Of the evaluation factors, Mission Suitability is somewhat more important than Past Performance is significantly more important Cost. Evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.

The Mission Suitability Factor consists of four Subfactors. The Subfactors are shown below with their respective point allocation, which signifies their weight.

MISSION SUITABILITY	
Subfactors	Assigned Weight
Management Approach Organizational Structure/Partnering Approach Key Personnel Staffing, Recruitment, Retention, and Training Phase-in Plan Total Compensation Plan Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan	300
Technical Understanding	500
Safety and Health Plan	150
Small Business Utilization	50
TOTAL	1000

The RFP stipulated that the overall Mission Suitability Factor will be numerically scored, and the Mission Suitability Subfactors will be rated by adjective and numerically scored. Potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings are: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

With regard to the Past Performance Factor, the RFP provided for evaluation by the use of the Level of Confidence ratings of "Very High Level of Confidence," "High Level of Confidence," "Moderate Level of Confidence," "Low Level of Confidence," "Very Low Level of Confidence," and "Neutral/Unknown Level of Confidence," depending on the SEC's assessment of each proposal in this area. For each Offeror and its major subcontractors, the SEC evaluated overall Past Performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition. This Factor provides an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services provided by the Offerors to the Government and other organizations as either a prime or subcontractor. The Past Performance evaluation was based on the information provided by the Offeror in its Past Performance Volume II, an assessment of customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of each Offeror and of its major subcontractors, and some independent investigation through the NASA Past Performance Data Base (PPDB), as allowed by the RFP.

For the Cost/Price Factor, the SEC performed a cost realism analysis on the proposed cost, which resulted in an assessment of probable cost. The SEC assigned a level of confidence of High, Medium, or Low in the probable cost assessment for each proposal.

Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals

Prior to the issuance of the formal RFP, in an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and improve communications, ARC issued Highlights Documents containing pertinent Aircraft and Airfield information and a draft RFP requesting industry comments and recommendations on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach to satisfy these requirements. Industry was encouraged to ask questions about the Aircraft and Airfield requirements and the procurement process. The comments and recommendations received in response to these communications with industry were carefully evaluated, answered, and incorporated, as appropriate, into the formal RFP. The formal RFP was issued electronically on the World Wide Web (WWW) on August 20, 2009. Five amendments thereafter were issued and placed on the WWW. Amendment One was posted August 21, 2009, Amendment Two was posted August 25, 2009, Amendment Three was posted August 31, 2009, Amendment Four was posted September 3, 2009, and Amendment Five was posted September 15, 2009. Proposals were due September 21, 2009.

Two proposals were received in response to the RFP by the specified closing time and date. The Offerors' names and addresses (listed alphabetically) are as follows:

Acretus, LLC
228 Hamilton Avenue-3rd Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94031

L-3 Vertex Aerospace
555 Industrial Drive South
Madison, MS 39110-9073

Oral presentation materials and written proposals were received from each Offeror. The oral presentation materials consisted of the slides to be used by each Offeror during its oral presentation. The written proposals consisted of three separate volumes, corresponding to the three respective evaluation Factors, in accordance with Section L of the Solicitation and FAR Parts 15.101 and 15.306. A copy of the oral presentation materials and the written proposals was issued to each of the five voting members of the SEC.

Evaluation Process

After receipt of the oral presentation materials and the written proposals, the SEC members individually reviewed those documents, and oral presentations were held, which completed the proposal submissions of the Offerors.

The SEC then met to discuss and develop individual findings for each Mission Suitability proposal, and identified Mission Suitability strengths and weaknesses for each proposal. The identified strengths and weaknesses were categorized either as a “Significant Strength” or “Significant Weakness” or, if not significant, as a “Strength” or “Weakness.” The strength and weakness findings were used to establish adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability Subfactor and a numerical score for the overall Mission Suitability Factor. No “Deficiencies” were identified in either of the Mission Suitability proposals.

The SEC also identified findings for the Past Performance Factor, based on the proposals and questionnaires completed by past and current customers. No adverse past performance information or weaknesses were identified for either of the Offerors in this Factor; only strengths were identified. Each identified strength was categorized as either a “Significant Strength” or, if not significant, as a “Strength.” During its evaluation, the SEC used these findings to establish Level of Confidence ratings for this Factor.

The SEC also evaluated cost realism for each proposal, performed a probable cost assessment, and assigned a level of confidence in the probable cost assessment.

I reviewed the SEC's findings, adjectival ratings, and numerical scores for Mission Suitability. I reviewed the findings and Level of Confidence ratings for Past Performance. I reviewed the Cost/Price evaluation results, including the proposed costs, the probable costs, and the confidence levels in the probable cost assessments. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision.

EVALUATION FINDINGS OF THE SEC

Mission Suitability Factor

The following addresses the Mission Suitability findings for both Offerors, and comments specifically on the assigned Significant Strengths, Strengths, Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses. There were no Deficiencies.

Acretus

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by Acretus received 450 points (out of a possible 1000) and the lower score.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, Acretus received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 165 (out of a possible 300). No Significant Strengths and one (1) Significant Weakness were identified. The Significant Weakness was assigned because the proposed organizational structure did not provide clear internal or external lines of authority nor did it specify how the work would be divided among the teaming partners, and did not include a clear plan to be used to manage the execution of multiple task orders, which therefore would increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. One (1) other Strength and no other Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned because the Offeror provided a comprehensive description of the overall approach to phase-in to ensure continuity of operations, which would ensure successful transition during the phase-in.

In the Technical Understanding Subfactor, Acretus received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 200 (out of a possible 500). No Significant Strengths and one (1) Significant Weakness were identified. The Significant Weakness was assigned because the Offeror's proposal failed to demonstrate its comprehension of all of the requirements of the SOW, and did not adequately address how the work would be accomplished in an integrated manner, which therefore would appreciably increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. No other Strengths or other Weaknesses were identified.

In the Safety and Health Plan Subfactor, Acretus received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 60 (out of a possible 150). No Significant Strengths and one (1) Significant Weakness were identified. The Significant Weakness was assigned because the Offeror did not submit a comprehensive safety and health plan, which therefore would appreciably increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. No other Strengths or other Weaknesses were identified.

In the Small Business Utilization Subfactor, Acretus received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 25 (out of a possible 50). No Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses were identified. No other Strengths and one (1) other Weakness were identified. The Weakness was assigned because the Offeror's proposal did not address many of the requirements of the Small Business Utilization Subfactor, which therefore would increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

L-3

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by L-3 received 800 points (out of a possible 1000) and the higher score.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, L-3 received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 240 (out of a possible 300). One (1) Significant Strength and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned because the Offeror's organizational structure, including its approach to key personnel

authority and responsibility, and the innovative solutions to the management of multiple task orders, contributed to a highly effective and efficient approach for managing a contract of this nature, which would greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance. No other Strengths or other Weaknesses were identified.

In the Technical Understanding Subfactor, L-3 received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 425 (out of a possible 500). One (1) Significant Strength and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned because the Offeror demonstrated an exceptionally thorough and comprehensive understanding of all the requirements of SOW Sections C.2.3 through C.5.1, which would ensure successful contract performance. One (1) other Strength and no other Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned because the Offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the technical requirements through its sound approach to identify then mitigate relevant technical risk areas of each SOW Section, which would enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

In the Safety and Health Plan Subfactor, L-3 received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 105 (out of a possible 150). No Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses were identified. One (1) other Strength and no other Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned because the Offeror proposed an effective approach to ensuring a safe work environment and clearly demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the requirement, which would ensure successful contract performance.

In the Small Business Utilization Subfactor, the L-3 received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 30 (out of a possible 50). No Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses were identified. No other Strengths or other Weaknesses were identified.

Past Performance Factor

The following addresses the Past Performance findings for each Offeror. No weaknesses were identified.

Acretus

The Past Performance evaluation of Acretus resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. No Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses were identified. No other Strengths or other Weaknesses were identified.

L-3

The Past Performance evaluation of L-3 resulted in a High Level of Confidence. One (1) Significant Strength and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned because the Offeror demonstrated exceptional work as the Prime

contractor on two relevant contracts in which one of the relevant contracts was highly pertinent in size, scope and complexity to the Aircraft and Airfield effort. No other Strengths or other Weaknesses were identified.

Cost/Price Factor

The SEC evaluated each Offeror's Cost proposal. This included verifying that each Offeror is in compliance with the RFP requirements; evaluating the reasonableness of the proposed rates for fringe benefits, overhead, and G&A; and ascertaining that proposed labor rates are reasonable for the labor market in which the contract will be performed. The cost elements were analyzed, including subcontractors' costs, proposed labor rates and skill mix, indirect rates and fee. A probable cost determination was completed for each of the Offerors, and each of the Offerors received a confidence level rating reflecting the Government's confidence that the Offeror's probable costs are realistic for the work to be performed and consistent with the various elements of the Offeror's technical proposal.

Acretus had the lower total proposed cost, and the lower probable cost with a Low confidence rating.

L-3 had the higher total proposed cost, and the higher probable cost with a Medium confidence rating.

The difference between the Offerors in proposed cost was moderate. The difference in probable cost was slight.

SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR AIRCRAFT AND AIRFIELD RELATED SERVICES

Introduction: FAR Part 15.308 "Source Selection Decision" states: "The source selection authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The source selection decision shall be documented, and the documentation shall include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs. Although the rationale for the selection decision must be documented, that documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the decision."

My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEC's findings to ensure a full understanding thereof. I did not simply count and compare the numbers of strengths and weaknesses; rather, I considered the potential impact of significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, and weaknesses, and its relevance to this proposed effort, against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP.

Assessment of the SEC's findings:

I carefully studied all of the findings of the SEC. Further, prior to the February 10, 2010 meeting with the SEC, I chose to review personally, on January 21, 2010 and February 3, 2010, both of the proposals. As the Source Selection Authority, I hereby concur with all of the findings of the SEC, and I adopt those findings without exception.

Selection:

To reiterate, of the evaluation factors, Mission Suitability is somewhat more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is significantly more important Cost. Evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.

Acretus had the weaker Mission Suitability proposal, which rightfully received the lower Mission Suitability score. It had no deficiencies, and there were both strengths and weaknesses, but the weaknesses outbalanced the strengths. Acretus received three Significant Weaknesses, including a Significant Weakness in the Technical Understanding Subfactor because of its failure to demonstrate a comprehension of all of the requirements of the SOW, which would appreciably increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance by Acretus.

L-3 had the stronger Mission Suitability proposal, which rightfully received the higher Mission Suitability score. It also had no deficiencies, but, unlike Acretus, it also had no weaknesses whatsoever – only Significant Strengths and other Strengths. In my opinion, the one Significant Strength and the one other Strength under the Technical Understanding Subfactor are particularly impressive and critical to my selection decision. The Significant Strength, for the exceptionally sound understanding and approach proposed by L-3 to all of the requirements of SOW Sections C.2.3 through C.5.1, and the other Strength, for its thorough and sound approach to technical risk identification and mitigation for each SOW Section, are very noteworthy and superb aspects of the L-3 Mission Suitability proposal, and would greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

It is here, in the Technical Understanding Subfactor of Mission Suitability – the most important Subfactor within the most important Factor – where I find the primary discriminator that leads to my selection decision. The proposed Technical Understanding of L-3 was significantly superior to that of Acretus. The difference in Technical Understanding – between, respectively, the Significant Weakness and absence of strengths of Acretus, compared to the Significant Strength and other Strength and absence of weaknesses of L-3 – is clear, compelling and critical, and is the foundation of my selection decision. L-3 also was stronger in each of the other Mission Suitability Subfactors, leading to an overall superior Mission Suitability proposal.

I find another discriminator in Past Performance, the second most important Factor. L-3 has a higher Level of Confidence rating in Past Performance than Acretus, based on its exceptional work as the Prime contractor on two relevant contracts, one of which highly pertinent here in size, scope and complexity.

In the Cost/Price Factor, Acretus did have a lower proposed and probable cost. However, (1) after the cost realism analysis, the difference between the probable costs of the Offerors was slight, (2) the confidence rating in the probable cost of Acretus was Low, versus the rating of Medium assigned to the probable cost of L-3, and (3) the Cost/Price Factor is, as prescribed by the RFP, significantly less important than the other Factors, both individually and in combination. Therefore, in my independent judgment, the significant superiority of L-3 in Mission Suitability, together with its stronger Past Performance, guides my following selection decision:

I select L-3 for contract award.



Jill Willard
Source Selection Authority