

Selection of Award
RFP: NNS10338107R
Expansion of State Road 607
August 5, 2010

PROCUREMENT HISTORY:

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, John C. Stennis Space Center (SSC), has a need for the expansion of State Road 607 from a two-lane roadway to a four-lane divided roadway between Saturn Drive and Texas Flat Road, located in Hancock County, Mississippi. The length of the project is approximately four miles. The expansion will be accomplished by adding two lanes to the west of the existing two-lane roadway from Saturn Drive to the SSC north security gate and adding two lanes and a concrete bridge east of the existing roadway from the SSC north security gate to Texas Flat Road. A thirty foot depressed median without a barrier will be required. The roadway is classified as a multi-lane rural arterial.

A synopsis was posted May 5, 2010 on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOps) websites. The solicitation was issued May 20, 2010. Two amendments were issued, and the solicitation closed July 8, 2010.

FINDINGS:

A total of five proposals were received in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in the RFP, all offers were evaluated to determine if all required information was provided.

All five proposals were considered responsive and were forwarded to the evaluation team for evaluation under Step 2 of the evaluation process. During the initial phase of evaluation under Step 2, the technical personnel only received the offerors' past performance and relevant experience sections of the proposals, the safety personnel only received the safety sections, and the Small Business Specialist only received the small business utilization sections. The pricing portion was evaluated by procurement and technical personnel after completion of the initial technical evaluation in order to provide an unbiased (pricing perspective) technical review (e.g., so the technical evaluators would not potentially be influenced by having knowledge of the price before providing their technical reviews).

The evaluation team prepared a summary of their findings utilizing the best value process as described in the solicitation. As a result of the technical evaluation, it was determined the evaluation team clearly understood the offerors' proposals and there was no requirement for clarifications or discussions with regard to the technical evaluation.

In compliance with the past performance, relevant experience, small business utilization, and price analysis criteria established in the RFP, the evaluation team evaluated the proposals and the results are provided below. The table below represents an overview of the evaluation results and the ratings for each responsive proposal:

<u>Company</u>	<u>Past Perf.</u>	<u>Relevant Experience</u>	<u>SBU</u>	<u>Business Size</u>
NPD Resources, Inc.	Outstanding	Low Risk	High	HUBZone, SDB, 8(a), SDVOSB
Optimum Services, Inc.	Outstanding	Low Risk	Medium	HUBZone, SDB
T.L. Wallace Construction, Inc.	Outstanding	Low Risk	Medium	Large
Huey Stockstill, Inc.	Outstanding	Low Risk	Low	Large
Superior Asphalt, Inc.	Satisfactory	Low Risk	High	Small

PAST PERFORMANCE:

The solicitation required offerors to provide information on relevant past contracts, preferably with the Government listing contract number, contract value, agency name and point of contact, what the contract was for, and status of the contract. The solicitation also stated the evaluation would be based on information obtained from references provided by the offeror of relevant past contracts performed in the past three years, as well as other past performance information obtained from other sources known by the Government or any other source that may have useful and relevant information.

Each offeror’s past performance on similar projects was evaluated to determine the quality of work previously provided and to assess the relative capability of the offeror to effectively accomplish the requirements of this contract. Past performance information was used to assess the extent to which contract objectives (including technical, management, safety/quality control, cost, and small business subcontracting) have been achieved on related projects. The evaluation of past performance also assessed the overall safety program of the offeror during the performance of previous contracts utilizing the evaluation of the offeror’s safety plan (as outlined in the RFP and specifications), EMR, TRIR, and DART rates submitted by the offeror.

As stated in the solicitation, for newly formed businesses having little or no company experience, the past performance of a predecessor firm, the company’s principal owner(s) or corporate office(s) may be considered. The lack of a performance record may result in an unknown performance risk assessment which will neither be used to the advantage nor disadvantage of the offeror.

In accordance with the solicitation, the Past Performance Form (Attachment F of the RFP) and the Evaluation Form (Attachment G of the RFP) were used to collect and record information concerning each firm's past performance and any subcontractor and/or teaming partner.

The possible ratings for past performance were Outstanding, Above Average, Neutral, Satisfactory, Marginal, or Unsatisfactory. The results of each offeror's past performance evaluation are as follows:

Huey Stockstill, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding

Huey Stockstill's past performance references were reviewed. All projects consisted of work elements relevant to the State Road 607 project. Huey Stockstill had a proven past performance of managing projects of this size and complexity. In interviews with their past performance references, sources stated they consistently exceeded the base requirements, had entirely favorable past performance, and did not have any major breaches of safety. All sources contacted indicated they would willingly do business with this firm in the future and rated them highly. There were no indications of any major safety violations. Past performance references were also reviewed for their proposed subcontractor. Sources had nothing but high praise for the subcontractor's past performance and stated they would absolutely use them again in the future. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an Outstanding rating was warranted.

NPD Resources, Inc.: Past Performance Overall - Outstanding

NPD Resource's past performance references were reviewed. All projects consisted of work elements relevant to the State Road 607 project. All sources contacted gave an outstanding performance review and said they would use NPD Resources in the future without hesitation. Sources stated NPD Resource's management ability and coordination efforts were outstanding during their performance. NPD Resource's technical ability and quality control efforts were highly praised. NPD Resources provided past performance references for their proposed subcontractors for review. All sources contacted for one of their proposed subcontractors had entirely favorable past performance comments and rated them highly. Sources had nothing but high praise for the other proposed subcontractor's past performance and stated they would absolutely use them again in the future. There were no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an Outstanding rating was warranted for NPD Resources, Inc.

Optimum Services, Inc.: Past Performance Overall - Outstanding

Optimum Service's past performance references were reviewed. All projects consisted of work elements relevant to the State Road 607 project. All sources contacted were consistently firm in stating Optimum Service's performance was superior and they would unhesitatingly do business with them again. Many sources stated Optimum Services consistently exceeded the base requirements. Several sources commented on their ability to work with owners and stated they were very fair in pricing change orders for additional work. There were no indications of any major safety violations. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an Outstanding rating was warranted.

Superior Asphalt, Inc.: Past Performance Overall - Satisfactory

Superior Asphalt's past performance references were reviewed. All projects consisted of work elements relevant to the State Road 607 project. Two references contacted stated the work performed by Superior Asphalt had quality issues and personnel issues. Both references were hesitant in using Superior Asphalt in the future. Another reference contacted had very favorable comments and stated Superior Asphalt consistently exceeded the base requirements. The project referenced was finished ahead of schedule with no major safety violations. Sources of information were roughly divided over the quality of Superior Asphalt's performance. While one reference stated they would do business with Superior Asphalt again, the other two references were doubtful or would not do business with them again. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a Satisfactory rating is warranted.

T.L. Wallace Construction, Inc.: Past Performance Overall - Outstanding

T.L. Wallace's past performance references were reviewed. All projects consisted of work elements relevant to the State Road 607 project. In interviews of T.L. Wallace's past performance references, sources stated the firm consistently exceeded the base requirements, had entirely favorable past performance, and did not have any major safety violations. All past performance interviews for T. L. Wallace were rated highly. All sources stated they would absolutely use T. L. Wallace again for roadway construction. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an Outstanding rating is warranted.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE:

In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in Section M of the solicitation, relevant experience is the accomplishment of work that is comparable or related to the technical work required by this solicitation, and is of similar scope, size and complexity. The possible ratings for relevant experience were Low, Moderate, or High Risk. The results of each offeror's relevant experience evaluation are as follows:

Huey Stockstill, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk

Huey Stockstill submitted projects with work elements almost identical to State Road 607 work elements. One of the projects included asphalt paving and rigid paving of State Road 607/Trent Lott Parkway located at Stennis Space Center. Huey Stockstill's projects clearly showed they have extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Little doubt exists, based on their experience, that they could satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk was warranted.

NPD Resources, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk

NPD Resources demonstrated experience in managing projects involving removal of hazardous waste and earthwork, which are relevant requirements of this project. Their proposed subcontractors each have extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope and complexity to the State Road 607 project. With their combined experience, little doubt exists they could satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk was warranted.

Optimum Services, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk

Optimum Services submitted several projects which included heavy civil construction. They also proposed a subcontractor that would perform surface asphaltting and bridge construction. Their proposed subcontractor has many years of experience in roadway construction and bridge construction. Optimum Services with their proposed subcontractor represents extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope and complexity, and little doubt exists that they could satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk was warranted.

Superior Asphalt, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk

Superior Asphalt's projects included excavation and structural fill, asphalt paving and striping, which are all similar to the work elements included in the State Road 607 project. Their projects showed they have extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Little doubt exists, based on the offeror's experience, that they could satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk was warranted.

T.L. Wallace Construction, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk

T. L. Wallace's projects included all of the main work elements of roadway construction that are part of the State Road 607 project. Their projects also included bridge construction which is included in this project. T.L. Wallace demonstrated extensive experience in projects of similar size, scope and complexity, as all projects submitted were roadway construction projects very similar to this project. Little doubt exists, based on the offeror's experience, that they could satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk was warranted.

SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION:

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program applied to all offerors, except that Small Businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The Contracting Officer’s assessment of appropriate subcontracting goals for this acquisition, expressed as a percent of TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE (basic and all options combined), was as follows:

Small Businesses (SB)	25%
Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns (SDB) (Includes SDB’s in represented and under-represented areas)*	10%
Women Owned Small Business Concerns (WOSB)	5%
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)	
HUBZone Small Business Concerns (HBZ)	4%
Veteran Owned Small Business Concerns (VOSB)	4%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns (SDVOSB)	3%

The evaluation team reviewed the offerors’ proposals and assigned ratings of High, Medium or Low for Small Business Utilization based on the information provided by each offeror. A higher level of utilization resulted in a High rating which is more favorable.

Huey Stockstill, Inc.: Small Business Utilization – Low

Huey Stockstill is a Large Business. Therefore, they were required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Their Small Business Subcontracting Plan was reviewed, and except for proposing goals for Small Business and WOSB, none of the requirements of FAR Clause 52.219-9 Alternate II, paragraphs (d)(1) through (11)(vi) were submitted. Their proposed goals for Small Business and WOSB were higher than the NASA recommended goals, but they did not propose any goals for SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB or HUBZone Small Business concerns.

Under the “Commitment to the Small Business Program” section of Attachment H, Huey Stockstill identified Small Business subcontractors and the work they could perform on this project. They indicated the extent of their commitment for all of these subcontractors was enforceable. One of their Small Business subcontractors listed was verified as a large business during review.

Under the “SDB Participation” section of Attachment H, Huey Stockstill listed four SDB subcontractors and proposed targets for their participation on this project. Only two of the SDB subcontractors listed were verified as SDB’s. The other two subcontractors were a DoT Certified Disadvantaged Business and a large business.

Huey Stockstill’s Subcontracting Plan did not address the requirements in the FAR Clause stated above, their proposal provided little information to indicate a reasonable approach for utilization of Small Business Concerns, and their proposal showed little utilization of Small Businesses consistent with NASA goals. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a Low rating was warranted.

NPD Resources, Inc.: Small Business Utilization – High

NPD Resources is an SDB. While Small Businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan, they were required to indicate the amount of effort proposed to be done by a Small Business either at the prime level or at the first tier subcontract level in contract clause H.7. NPD Resources provided this information as required in clause H.7.

Under the “Commitment to the Small Business Program” section of Attachment H, NPD Resources identified Small Business subcontractors and the work they could perform on this project. They indicated the extent of their commitment for all of these subcontractors was enforceable.

Under the “SDB Participation” section of Attachment H, NPD Resources listed themselves as an SDB contractor as well as one SDB subcontractor and proposed targets for their participation on this project.

NPD Resources indicated a high utilization of Small Business Concerns which were consistent with the NASA goals, and their proposal included more than one enforceable commitment to Small Business subcontractors. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a High rating was warranted.

Optimum Services, Inc.: Small Business Utilization – Medium

Optimum Services is a Veteran-Owned, HUB Zone Small Business. While Small Businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan, they were required to indicate the amount of effort proposed to be done by a Small Business either at the prime level or at the first tier subcontract level in contract clause H.7. Optimum Services provided this information as required in clause H.7.

Under the “Commitment to the Small Business Program” section of Attachment H, Optimum Services identified a Small Business subcontractor and the work they could perform on this project. They indicated the extent of their commitment for this subcontractor was enforceable.

Under the “SDB Participation” section of Attachment H, Optimum Services did not list any SDB’s. However, the subcontractor they identified as enforceable in the previous section was verified as a SDB.

Optimum Services indicated a moderate utilization of Small Business Concerns which were only consistent with the NASA goals in some areas, and their proposal included one enforceable commitment to Small Business subcontractors. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a Medium rating was warranted.

Superior Asphalt, Inc.: Small Business Utilization – High

Superior Asphalt is a Small Business. Although they were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan, they provided a plan which indicated consistency with NASA goals along with more than one enforceable commitment to Small Business. They were required to indicate the amount of effort proposed to be done by a Small Business either at the prime level or at the first tier subcontract level in contract clause H.7, and they provided this information as required.

Under the “Commitment to the Small Business Program” section of Attachment H, Superior Asphalt identified Small Business subcontractors and the work they could perform on this project. They indicated the extent of their commitment for three of these subcontractors was enforceable and the others were non-enforceable.

Under the “SDB Participation” section of Attachment H, Superior Asphalt listed two SDB subcontractors and proposed targets for their participation on this project.

Superior Asphalt indicated a high utilization of Small Business Concerns which were consistent with the NASA goals, and their proposal included more than one enforceable commitment to Small Business subcontractors. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a High rating was warranted.

T.L. Wallace Construction, Inc.: Small Business Utilization – Medium

T.L. Wallace is a Large Business. Therefore, they were required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Their Small Business Subcontracting Plan was reviewed for compliance with the requirements of FAR Clause 52.219-9 Alternate II, paragraphs (d)(1) through (11)(vi). No dollar values or goals were included for SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB or HUBZone Small Businesses. However, one of the subcontractors listed under the “Commitment to the Small Business Program” section of Attachment H was verified as an SDB, VOSB and WOSB. Another subcontractor listed in the same section was verified as an SDB and WOSB, and another subcontractor as a WOSB and SDB. Furthermore, the solicitation included a NASA goal of 4% for HUBZone Small Businesses, and they neglected to include any goals for this business type.

Under the “Commitment to the Small Business Program” section of Attachment H, T.L. Wallace identified Small Business subcontractors and the work they could perform on this project. They indicated the extent of their commitment for all of these subcontractors were non-enforceable.

Under the “SDB Participation” section of Attachment H, T.L. Wallace listed six SDB subcontractors and proposed targets for their participation on this project.

T.L. Wallace indicated a moderate utilization of Small Business Concerns which were only consistent with the NASA goals in some areas, and their proposal included non-enforceable commitments to Small Business subcontractors. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, a Medium rating was warranted.

PRICE EVALUATION:

In accordance with the solicitation, all offerors were required to include a price for each item contained in Section B of the solicitation. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(a)(1), the Contracting Officer is responsible for evaluating the reasonableness of the offered prices. The analytical techniques and procedures described in subject reference were utilized during the price analysis evaluation. Specifically, FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(i), comparison of proposed prices received, were used to determine price reasonableness. During this review, a comparison was made of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation.

In accordance with FAR Clause 52.219-4 "Notice of Price Evaluation for HUBZone Small Business Concerns," offers were evaluated by adding a factor of 10% to the price of all offers, except HUBZone Small Businesses and otherwise successful offers from Small Business Concerns. NPD Resources Inc. and Optimum Services Inc. are both HUBZone Small Business concerns, and Superior Asphalt Inc. is a Small Business concern. Huey Stockstill Inc. and T.L. Wallace Construction Inc. are both Large Businesses; therefore, 10% was added to their proposal prices for evaluation purposes.

A total of five responsive proposals were received in response to the solicitation, and the evaluated price of all offers was compared in an effort to establish a basis for a fair and reasonable price. Evaluated prices ranged from the lowest price offer of \$12,460,903.38 to the highest price offer of \$17,626,400.00.

It was noted one of the five offers was considerably higher than the others, and the remaining four offers fell closely within range. Based on the proposals received in this competitive acquisition, these four offers were considered to be both fair and reasonable.

SELECTION DECISION:

This procurement is being conducted utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS), which seeks to select an offer based on the best combination of price and qualitative merit (including past performance, relevant experience, and small business utilization) of the offers submitted and reduce the administrative burden on the offerors and the Government. BVS predefines the value characteristics that will serve as the discriminators among offers and is based on the premise that, if all offers are of approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the offeror with the lowest evaluated price (fixed-price contracts). However, the Government will consider awarding to an offeror with higher qualitative merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value. Conversely, the Government will consider making award to an offeror whose offer has lower qualitative merit if the price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in Section M of the solicitation, the award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal is responsive and offers the best value to the Government. Best value will be determined based on an integrated assessment of each proposal in terms of past performance, relevant experience, small business utilization, and price.

Therefore, subjective judgment by the Government is implicit in the evaluation process. As defined in the solicitation: **As individual factors, past performance and relevant experience are significantly more important than small business utilization. When combined, these three factors (past performance, relevant experience, and small business utilization) are significantly more important than price.**

The highest rated offeror was NPD Resources, Inc., as they received an Outstanding past performance rating, a Low Risk relevant experience rating, and a High small business utilization rating. All other offerors received a lower rating in one or more areas. NPD Resources, Inc. also had the lowest evaluated price in the amount of \$12,460,903.38. Awarding to any offeror with a lower qualitative merit and/or higher evaluated price would not have been in the best interest of the Government. Therefore, the offer with highest ratings and lowest price, submitted by NPD Resources, Inc., represented the best value and was considered both fair and reasonable and in the best interest of the Government. As a result, award was made to NPD Resources, Inc. without discussions in the amount of \$12,460,903.38.



Jason Edge
Contracting Officer