

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

Selection of Contractor for
Facilities Maintenance Services (FMS)
Solicitation NNA08226867R

September 10, 2010

On September 3, 2010, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Board (SEB) Ex-Officio members, met with the SEB members appointed to evaluate the proposals for the procurement of Facilities Maintenance Services. During this meeting, the SEB presented the findings from its Evaluation Report. We discussed the relative merits of the proposals to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

I assessed the SEB'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 Proposals (RFP). In accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.308, this Source Selection Statement fully documents all significant evaluation findings and it reflects the thought process behind my selection. My selection decision is set forth below.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

This procurement is to provide Facilities Maintenance Services at NASA Ames Research Center (ARC). The Contractor shall provide all resources, other than those identified as provided by the Government, as necessary to provide Facilities Maintenance Services at ARC as prescribed in the RFP. The majority of work under this contract is firm fixed price (FFP). The FFP work consists of: (1) responding to trouble calls (TC), tracking, and documentation; (2) accomplishing recurring services such as preventive maintenance (PM) that involve routine periodic maintenance, incidental repair requirements associated with facilities, utility systems, dynamic equipment for which no specific operators are assigned, and performing Predictive Maintenance (PdM) that includes Testing and Inspection (PT&I) of equipment and systems and Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA); (3) operations that involve attendance type work requiring the presence of qualified person(s) during a specified time period; (4) maintenance engineering services; and (5) adverse weather condition response support. Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) work consists of Craft Hour Unit Price (CHUP) work that cannot be adequately quantified until a Contract Task Order (CTO) is issued, and then becomes a fixed price order once approved. Cost plus fixed fee (CPFF) work consists of Environmental and Emergency Support Services.

This procurement was conducted as a full and open competition and will result in one hybrid FFP, IDIQ and CPFF contract. The period of performance is five years with a three-year base period (including phase-in) and a two-year priced option.

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

As stated in the RFP, the Mission Suitability subfactors were rated by adjective and numerically scored, and the overall Mission Suitability Factor was numerically scored.

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	425
Technical Understanding	375
Small Business Utilization	100
Safety and Health Plan & Environmental Protection Summary	100
TOTAL	1000

The Mission Suitability subfactor adjectival ratings are: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

For each Offeror and its major subcontractors, the SEB assessed Past Performance and assigned a Level of Confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. 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." By reviewing information from a variety of sources for purposes of the Past Performance evaluation, including information provided by the Offerors in the proposals as well as customer questionnaires, the SEB evaluated each Offeror's ability to fulfill the requirements of this contract. The SEB evaluated the currency and relevance of the Past Performance information, the source of the information, the context of the data, and general trends in performance of the Offeror and major subcontractors.

For the Cost/Price Factor, the SEB performed a price analysis to determine price reasonableness and to assess the associated risks of doing business with an Offeror, based upon the Offeror's proposed approach for the proposed price. In addition, the SEB performed a cost realism analysis on the proposed cost, which resulted in an assessment of probable cost. The SEB 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 issuance of the formal RFP, in an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and improve communications, a pre-solicitation conference was held and a draft RFP was posted, requesting industry comments and recommendations on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach to satisfy these requirements. The comments received in response to these communications with industry were carefully evaluated and incorporated in the formal RFP as appropriate. The formal RFP was issued electronically and posted on the internet on June 12, 2009. Nine amendments were issued and posted on the internet for the benefit of all potential Offerors. Proposals were due August 12, 2009.

Seven proposals were received in response to the RFP by the specified closing time and date.

The Offerors' names and addresses (listed in random order) are as follows:

Call Henry, Inc.
308 Pine Street
Titusville, FL 32796

WSI-All Star Facility Services, L.L.C.
7121 Fairway Drive, Suite 301
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418

Jacobs Technology, Inc.
600 William Northern Blvd.
Tullahoma, TN 37388

IAP World Services, Inc.
7315 N. Atlantic Avenue
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

URS Federal Technical Services, Inc.
20501 Seneca Meadows Parkway, Suite 300
Germantown, MD 20876

C. Martin Company, Inc.
3395 W. Cheyenne Ave., Suite 102
North Las Vegas, NV 89032

EMCOR Government Services
320 23rd Street South, Suite #100
Arlington, VA 22202

Written proposals were received for Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Each Factor was submitted in a separate volume in accordance with Section L of the Solicitation and FAR Parts 15.101 and 15.306. A copy of each proposal was issued to each of the voting members of the SEB.

EVALUATION PROCESS

After receipt of proposals, the SEB members individually reviewed each proposal and met to discuss individual findings. None of the proposals were determined to be unacceptable and an evaluation of all proposals was conducted.

The SEB identified strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies for Mission Suitability for each proposal. In Mission Suitability, 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, weakness, and deficiency findings were used to establish adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability subfactor and the overall Mission Suitability numerical scores. No "Deficiencies" were identified in any of the Mission Suitability proposals. The SEB also identified strengths and weaknesses for the Past Performance Factor, based on a variety of information, including, but not limited to, the proposals and customer questionnaires. In Past Performance, the identified strengths and weaknesses were categorized either as a "Significant Strength" or "Significant Weakness" or, if not significant, as a "Strength" or "Weakness." No Offerors had Significant Weaknesses in Past Performance. During its evaluation, the SEB used these findings to establish Level of Confidence ratings for this Factor, in accordance with the NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). The SEB performed a price analysis to determine price reasonableness and to assess the associated risks of doing business with an Offeror, based upon the Offeror's proposed approach for the proposed price. In addition, the SEB performed a cost realism analysis on the proposed cost, which resulted in an assessment of probable cost. The SEB assigned a level of confidence of High, Medium, or Low in the probable cost assessment for each proposal.

DETERMINATION OF COMPETITIVE RANGE

The SEB's initial findings were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on June 8, 2010. I reviewed the SEB's findings of strengths and weaknesses for Mission Suitability and the resultant adjectival ratings and numerical scores. I reviewed the strengths, weaknesses, and the Level of Confidence ratings for Past Performance. I reviewed the Cost/Price analysis, including proposed prices, proposed costs and, with respect to proposed costs, the adjustments resulting in probable costs, the cost realism assessments, and confidence levels. I fully considered all of this information prior to deciding whether to award off of initial proposals or to establish a competitive range. After considering all of the information presented, the Contracting Officer and I decided that it was in the Government's best interest to hold discussions. Therefore, a Competitive Range Determination was made by the Contracting Officer, based on the evaluation findings for each proposal as determined by the SEB, all of which I concurred and adopted, filtered through the evaluation criteria contained in the solicitation.

The Competitive Range established was comprised of (in random order) Jacobs Technology, Inc. (JTI), IAP World Services, Inc. (IAP), and URS Federal Technical Services, Inc (URS). The Competitive Range included the proposals that had a reasonable chance of being selected for award.

Past Performance was not the determining factor preventing any Offeror from being included in the Competitive Range. Thus, in accordance with FAR 15.306(b), adverse past performance information was not shared with any of the Offerors prior to establishment of the Competitive Range.

DISCUSSIONS

Discussions were held, in writing, with all of the Offerors in the Competitive Range.

In accordance with FAR 15.306(d)(3), the Contracting Officer discussed with each Offeror the Significant Weaknesses and adverse past performance information to which Offerors had not yet had an opportunity to respond. In addition, the Contracting Officer discussed other aspects of the Offeror's proposal that could be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award; these aspects here included, among other things, all of the non-significant Weaknesses of the Offerors.

Discussions were concluded on July 26, 2010. Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) were requested and model contracts were sent to the three Offerors in the competitive range. FPRs were due August 9, 2010. FPRs were timely received from each of the three Offerors in the Competitive Range.

FINAL EVALUATION FINDINGS OF THE SEB **(in random order)**

Jacobs Technology, Inc.

JTI's Mission Suitability score was 887 out of 1000, which was lowest of the three Offerors in the Competitive Range. It received the following adjectival ratings for each Mission Suitability subfactor: Management Approach – Excellent; Technical Understanding – Very Good; Small Business Utilization – Very Good; Health & Safety Plan and Environmental Protection Summary – Very Good. Its Past Performance received a Level of Confidence rating of Very High. Its proposed Cost/Price was in the middle of the three Offerors, its probable cost with proposed price was in the middle of the three Offerors, and its probable cost received a confidence rating of High.

This Offeror had nine Significant Strengths and four other Strengths within all of the Mission Suitability subfactors. This Offeror's Significant Strengths were for its 1) business management system and innovative scheduling; 2) internal training, mentoring and career development and use of corporate resources and local personnel; 3) approach to upgrade, operate and manage the Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS); 4) approach to work control; 5) phase-in plan; 6) staffing approach for customer service and maintenance engineering; 7) approaches relating to Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM); 8) use of small business; and 9) safety program. This Offeror had no Significant Weaknesses within all of the Mission Suitability subfactors. It had one other Weakness.

In the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror's Past Performance had a Level of Confidence rating of Very High. Two Significant Strengths were cited for its 1) exceptionally effective overall performance on comparable requirements and 2) exceptional technical expertise and timeliness. It had no Weaknesses, Significant or otherwise, in Past Performance.

In the cost realism analysis, there was a minor difference between this Offeror's proposed and probable costs to account for CBA labor rate escalation.

IAP World Services, Inc.

IAP's Mission Suitability score was 895, which was in the middle of the three Offerors in the Competitive Range. It received the following adjectival ratings for each Mission Suitability subfactor: Management Approach – Excellent; Technical Understanding – Very Good; Small Business Utilization – Very Good; Health & Safety Plan and Environmental Protection Summary – Excellent. Its Past Performance received a Level of Confidence rating of High. Its proposed Cost/Price was the lowest of the three Offerors, its probable cost with proposed price was the lowest of the three Offerors, and its probable cost received a confidence rating of High.

This Offeror had seven Significant Strengths and five other Strengths within all of the Mission Suitability subfactors. This Offeror's Significant Strengths were for its 1) approach to the Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) database and auditing; 2) staffing approach for grounds maintenance, electrical services and IDIQ services; 3) response time to trouble calls, notification procedures and technology to facilitate communication; 4) technical approach to grounds maintenance and Integrated Pest Management (IPM); 5) tools to recognize and analyze hazards, root cause analysis processes and a safety training matrix; 6) ISO 14001 certified processes and procedures; and 7) use of electric vehicles. This Offeror had no Weaknesses, Significant or otherwise, within all of the Mission Suitability subfactors.

In the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror's Past Performance had a Level of Confidence rating of High. One Significant Strength was cited for an exceptional ability to interface with the customer. It had no Significant Weaknesses, one other Strength, and one other Weakness in Past Performance.

In the cost realism analysis, there was no difference between this Offeror's proposed and probable costs.

URS Federal Technical Services, Inc.

URS' Mission Suitability score was 898, which was highest of the three Offerors in the Competitive Range. It received the following adjectival ratings for each Mission Suitability subfactor: Management Approach – Excellent; Technical Understanding – Excellent; Small Business Utilization – Very Good; Health & Safety Plan and Environmental Protection Summary – Good. Its Past Performance received a Level of Confidence rating of High. Its proposed Cost/Price was highest of the three Offerors, its probable cost with proposed price was highest of the three Offerors, and its probable cost received a confidence rating of High.

This Offeror had six Significant Strengths and four other Strengths within all of the Mission Suitability subfactors. This Offeror's Significant Strengths were for its 1) staffing approach for electrical services and alarms systems; 2) adverse weather plan; 3) approach to Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM); 4) Predictive Testing & Inspection (PT&I) equipment for RCM; 5) approach to Facilities Maintenance and Control Systems (FMCS) and high voltage electrical systems; and 6) small business program. This Offeror had no Weaknesses, Significant or otherwise, within all of the Mission Suitability subfactors.

In the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror's Past Performance had a Level of Confidence rating of High. One Significant Strength was cited for its exceptional ability to interface with the Government. It had one other Strength, and no Weaknesses, Significant or otherwise, in Past Performance.

In the cost realism analysis, there was no difference between this Offeror's proposed and probable costs.

SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR FACILITIES MAINTENANCE SERVICES

The solicitation stated that, of the evaluation factors, Mission Suitability is somewhat more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is slightly more important than Cost/Price. Evaluation factors other than Cost/Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price.

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 SEB'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 a strength or weakness, and its relevance to this proposed effort, against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP.

Assessment of the SEB's findings:

I concur with all of the SEB's findings. As the Source Selection Authority, I hereby adopt all of the findings of the SEB without exception.

Selection Discussion:

Mission Suitability is the most important evaluation Factor and, therefore, I first considered the Mission Suitability findings for the three Offerors. The Mission Suitability scores for the three Offerors are, respectively, 887, 895, and 898, out of a possible 1,000 points. The close range of these three numerical scores accurately reflects the underlying Mission Suitability findings, all of which I carefully considered. Each of the three Offerors submitted an exceptional and compelling Mission Suitability proposal, with an array of outstanding Significant Strengths. I thus find no discriminator in the Mission Suitability Factor.

Past Performance is the second most important evaluation Factor and, therefore, I considered it next. JTI properly received a Very High Level of Confidence, based on two impressive Significant Strengths, which, in my opinion, exceeded the Past Performance of IAP and URS, each of which properly received a High Level of Confidence. I consider the superiority of JTI in Past Performance to be a discriminator in its favor.

Finally, I considered Cost/Price, which is slightly less important than Past Performance. URS proposed a Cost/Price that was substantially higher than both JTI and IAP. JTI proposed a

Cost/Price that was moderately higher than IAP. Thus, in Cost/Price, I find two discriminators: one in favor of IAP; the other against URS.

In my opinion, the URS proposal does not offer the best value to the Government and, therefore, I do not select URS for award. The discriminator in its disfavor – a Cost/Price that is substantially higher than its competition – is not off-set by the few extra points it received in Mission Suitability and/or its relative standing in Past Performance.

My decision thus is between IAP, which has a discriminator in Cost/Price, and JTI, which has a discriminator in Past Performance. JTI properly earned a Very High Level of Confidence rating in Past Performance, which exceeds the High Level of Confidence properly assigned to IAP. IAP proposed a Cost/Price that is moderately lower than JTI. Pursuant to the RFP, Past Performance is slightly more important than Cost/Price, and thus I gave the Past Performance discriminator slightly more weight than the Cost/Price discriminator. Nevertheless, in my opinion, this slight difference in the weight of the discriminators was off-set by the relative strengths of their content: i.e., the extra Level of Confidence in Past Performance properly reflected in one adjectival rating versus a moderate difference in Cost/Price that would save the Government millions of dollars. This was a difficult and close decision but, in my independent judgment, the best value here, consistent with the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP, lies with the IAP proposal.

I select IAP for award.


Deborah L. Feng
Source Selection Authority