

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Dryden Flight Research Center
P.O. Box 273
Edwards, California 93523-0273



Reply to Attn. of:

May 24, 2010

A/SLS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: A/Source Selection Authority

SUBJECT: Source Selection Statement under Request for Proposals (RFP) NND10328178R
Externally Mounted POD on Gulfstream G-III to House Synthetic Aperture Radar
and Supporting Hardware

This Source Selection Statement documents the decision and rationale of the Source Selection Authority (SSA) in selecting an offeror for contract award. It also provides a Procurement History, Findings by the SEC, and the Source Selection Decision. The evaluation of the offerors' proposals was performed by a Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed by the Chief, Acquisition Management Office. After the SEC concluded its evaluations, it presented its findings to the SSA for this procurement.

PROCUREMENT HISTORY

Procurement Description

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) and Dryden Flight Research Center (Dryden) have teamed to develop an airborne Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) that can be used worldwide to obtain geophysical and ecological measurements. The SAR instrument is housed in a cylindrical pod that is attached to the bottom of the Gulfstream G-III. NASA has identified the G-III and the long-range Global Hawk Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) to accomplish these missions. This project is part of NASA's Earth Science Technology Office (ESTO) that develops and deploys new technologies for Earth Science observations. Two SAR pods have been built under a previous contracts. Both have been flown on NASA's G-III (one at a time). ESTO is committed to developing the Global Hawk UAV to enable long-range SAR missions to regions of the Earth currently unreachable by any other type of aircraft currently in service. In addition to its long-range capability, the Global Hawk will be able to carry two pods. Using two pods will enable scientists to obtain detailed 3-dimensional forest structures and precision topographic measurements of polar regions in a single flight over the region of interest. Multiple topography flights will enable the study of ice dynamics. Unlike the Global Hawk, the G-III has an additional capability that enables the

aircraft to repeatedly fly the same flight path in the sky to very high precision. This enables scientists to monitor much smaller changes in ground surfaces, such as deformations resulting from subsurface volcanic activity and earthquakes, over time. Both the G-III and the Global Hawk aircraft require the SAR pods to meet current and on-going airborne science objectives. Hence, three pods are required in order to enable concurrent mission operations of the G-III and Global Hawk UAV. The objective of this Request for Proposal is to build a third SAR pod to the same design as the first two. After fabrication, this third pod will be flown on the Global Hawk.

The anticipated contract will be a Firm Fixed Price (FFP). To accomplish the work, the Contractor shall perform the requirement based on drawings, specifications and the contract document.

The acquisition plan was approved on December 14, 2009. Based on market research it was determined that this was not a commercial item; however adequate drawings and specifications were available so this requirement was set aside for small businesses. DFRC issued electronically via the Internet the Request for Proposal (RFP), No. NND10328178R on February 18, 2010. One amendment to the RFP was issued in the same manner as the RFP. This amendment revised the proposal due date and provided answers to the potential offerors' questions.

Proposals were received in response to the RFP from the following two offerors:

1. Flight Test Associates (FTA)
2. Total Aircraft Services (TAS)

Evaluation Procedures

Pursuant to the RFP paragraph M-1, the Government notified potential offerors that it "intends to award a contract without discussions with respective offerors. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest." This is a competitive source selection in which competing offerors' past performance will be evaluated on a basis significantly more important than price. Based on this approach, the SEC presented its evaluation results to the SSA.

The two evaluation factors specified in the RFP are Past Performance and Price. Past Performance Factor is significantly more important than the Price Factor. The SSA's decision is based on an integrated assessment of both factors and an evaluation of risks to the Government in accepting an offer.

The RFP stipulated that each offeror's Past Performance will be evaluated based on the relevance of prior work comparable to the effort required under this procurement. In addition, the SEC utilized responses to past performance questionnaires submitted by customers on behalf of the offerors, and information obtained from other sources, to assess Past Performance.

The RFP states that the price evaluation will document the reasonableness and affordability of the proposed evaluated price. The SEC reviewed each offeror's cost proposal for the following:

arithmetic errors by multiplying the quantities identified in CLIN's by the proposed unit price for each Contract Line Item Number to confirm the extended amount of each.

Evaluation Process

The SEC evaluated the proposals in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection," and the two evaluation factors specified in the RFP. A copy of each proposal was issued to the SEC. After the SEC had reviewed each proposal, the group met to discuss its individual findings and to assess overall risks, if any, with the proposed approach.

The SEC also identified Past Performance findings for each offeror using the solicitation definitions.

The SEC reviewed each offeror's Cost proposal to (1) verify that each offeror was in compliance with the RFP requirements, (2) correct any computational errors, and (3) analyze all cost elements. Adjustments were made, if needed.

Both proposals received were considered acceptable. As a result past performance reviews were conducted on both offerors.

FINDINGS BY THE SEC

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

TOTAL AIRCRAFT SERVICES(TAS), INC.

TAS Past Performance.

TAS received three (3) strengths under the Past Performance factor:

Strengths

- 1) Successful past performance in completing previous NASA contract to design and fabricate the existing two UAVSAR pods. TAS produced all as-built drawings, conducted stress analysis and loads testing, fabricated all parts with well-managed sub-contracts, and also designed and fabricated the pylon attachment and aircraft modifications required.

- 2) TAS has successfully and currently is managing other significant aircraft modifications including the Gulfstream-II GeoSAR and multiple radome and pod installations for commercial and military customers.
- 3) TAS's sub-contractor Trans FX, Inc will provide services for the development of the tooling and parts fabrication for the composite pod fairings and the SAR antenna radome. Trans FX has experience in the fabrication of the original two UAVSAR.

FLIGHT TEST ASSOCIATES (FTA) INC.

FTA Past Performance

FTA received one (1) strength and one (1) weaknesses under the Past Performance factor.

Strength

- 1) Significant past experience in designing and fabricating complex modifications to multiple aircraft.

Weakness

- 1) The reference gave a "guarded" recommendation with quality work but cost over runs and schedule slips. The customer is generally pleased with their work and has learned how to "calibrate" their schedule assumptions.

COST FACTOR

Below is a table summarizing the proposed for each offeror.

Offerors	CLIN 1	CLIN 2	Original Proposal	
TAS	\$557,346.00	\$38,658.00	\$595,914.00	
FTA	\$580,954.00	\$6,200.00	\$587,154.00	
Government Est	\$470,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$475,000.00	

Offerors	CLIN 1	CLIN 2	Final Proposal Revision	
TAS	\$587,652.00	\$4,450.00	\$592,102.00	
FTA	\$586,759.00	\$6,200.00	\$592,959.00	
Government Est	\$590,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$600,000.00	

Each offeror submitted a proposal in response to the RFP. Both offerors proposals were broken out in accordance with the CLIN structure included in Schedule B of the RFP. The proposal submitted by TAS included numerous comments concerning items that were not included in their proposal and items that they assumed would be provided by NASA. The proposal submitted by FTA did not contain statements that they were not providing items or that they were basing their proposal on NASA providing some of the requirements. It was determined that it was in the best interest of the Government to conduct discussions to ensure that the cost proposals submitted by both offerors were based on the same requirements. Prior to discussions it was determined that the Government had not included drawing 3321658 for the P-Band mock up assembly in the original RFP. This item should be included as part of the contractor's proposal.

FTA submitted a cost proposal based on the original RFP requirements on Mar 15, 2010. Based discussions on May 13, 2010, FTA would delete 332179-103 from their proposal and include the drawing 3321658 for the P-Band mock up assembly in their final proposal revision. FTA submitted a final proposal revision on May 21, 2010. The final proposal revision was the proposal used to evaluate cost. FTA proposed cost were broken out in accordance with the CLIN structure included as part of the RFP. FTA's proposed cost for CLIN 001 is considered reasonable based on competition and historical data available from previous contracts for the same or similar items. Based on CLIN 002 reporting cost proposed on other ARRA projects, FTA's proposed cost for reporting requirements is considered fair and reasonable.

TAS submitted a cost proposal based on the original RFP requirements on Mar 15, 2010. The proposal submitted by TAS included numerous comments concerning items that were not included in their proposal and items that they assumed would be provided by NASA. TAS cost for CLIN 002 was considered to be excessive based on comparison with other ARRA projects. During discussions the actual requirements for CLIN 002 were discussed and TAS stated they had included reporting requirements that are not required. Based discussions on May 17, 2010 TAS would include the drawing 3321658 for the P-Band mock up assembly in their final proposal revision and that CLIN 002 reporting would only include ARRA reporting requirements. TAS submitted a final proposal revision on May 21, 2010. The final proposal revision was the proposal used to evaluate cost. The final proposal cost for CLIN 001 is considered fair and reasonable based on historical data available on previous contracts for same or similar type work. The final proposal cost for CLIN 002 is considered fair and reasonable based reporting cost proposed on other ARRA projects.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

Selection is based on a comparative assessment of the proposals against all source evaluation factors contained in the RFP and discussions held with each offeror. Both offerors submitted proposals that were considered responsive to the RFP. Past performance was evaluated on both offerors. TAS past performance was considered relevant to this requirement. All past performance received for TAS was favorable. The past performance submitted by FTA was also considered to be somewhat relevant to this requirement. The past performance received on FTA was considered acceptable.

The price proposals submitted in response to the request for final proposal revision were used to evaluate price fair and reasonable. Two proposals were received in response to the RFP. Both proposals were determined to be fair and reasonable. It was determined that adequate price competition had been received. Price was evaluated using cost of building the two previous PODs(2million or roughly 1million each) and the close competition between the two offerors. The Government estimate was considered to be unrealistically low based on overhead and profit factors not being included in the Government estimate.

Based on past performance being significantly more important than price. TAS represents the most relevant past performance for this requirement. In addition, as a result of discussions and final proposal revision TAS also represents the lowest price proposal.

Trade-Off Analysis

No trade-off analysis is required. TAS had the most relevant past performance and the lowest price.

Conclusion

TAS's proposal with its lowest price and excellent past performance, represents the best value to the Government. Therefore, the proposal submitted by the TAS is selected for award.

Sarah L. Saunders 5/25/2010
Sarah L. Saunders
Source Selection Authority