

**Selection of Award**  
**RFP: NNS11361855R**  
**B-Stand Liquid Hydrogen (LH) Barge Dock Restoration (Phase I)**  
**February 24, 2011**

**PROCUREMENT HISTORY:**

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, John C. Stennis Space Center (SSC), has a need for the restoration of the B Test Stand Liquid Hydrogen (LH) Barge Dock. This project was set-aside 100 percent for HUB Zone small business concerns. The work to be performed under this project consists of completing structural restoration of selected steel H-piles supporting the barge dock. The steel H-piles supporting the dock are corroded and in a weakened state, having lost as much as 99 percent of their original section or capacity. Qualified commercial divers will be required to enter the SSC Main Access Canal to clean piles by high-pressure water blasting, install reinforcing steel, and encase the assembly with underwater (UW) grout by means of a fiberglass jacket. Pile encasement will extend from two feet below the mud line to the underside of the pile cap.

A synopsis was posted October 28, 2010 on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOps) websites. The solicitation was issued November 15, 2010. Two amendments were issued, and the solicitation closed December 29, 2010.

**FINDINGS:**

A total of nine 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.

Two of the nine proposals were considered non-responsive as noted below:

The proposal submitted by DivCon, LLC failed to include a bid bond as required by NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Clause 1852.228-73. In accordance with NFS Clause 1852.228-73, each offeror shall submit a bid bond in the amount of twenty percent of the proposed price, or \$3 million, whichever is the lower amount. Failure to furnish a proper bid bond prior to the time set for submission of proposals rendered the proposal as non-responsive. In addition, this procurement was set-aside 100 percent for HUB Zone small business concerns. DivCon appeared to be a large business in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. Therefore, this firm did not qualify for this procurement.

The proposal submitted by Truston Technologies, Inc. failed to acknowledge Amendment 2 dated December 16, 2010, as required by Section L.14 of the solicitation. Failure to acknowledge all amendments of the solicitation rendered the proposal as non-responsive.

The remaining seven offerors submitted all required documentation and were forwarded to the technical evaluation team for evaluation under Step Two of the evaluation process outlined in the solicitation. 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 and the safety personnel only received the safety 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 did not require clarifications or discussions with regard to the technical evaluation.

In compliance with the past performance, relevant experience, 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 Performance</u>	<u>Relevant Experience</u>	<u>Business Size</u>
Coastal Environmental Group, Inc.	Above Average	Moderate Risk	HUB Zone, SDB, 8(a)
Gulf Pacific Contracting, LLC	Outstanding	Low Risk	HUB Zone, SDB, 8(a)
Inland Construction & Equipment, Inc.	Outstanding	Low Risk	HUB Zone, SDB
Innovative Builders, Inc.	Outstanding	Low Risk	HUB Zone, SDB, VOSB
Kostmayer Construction, LLC	Outstanding	Low Risk	HUB Zone
McClain Contracting Company, Inc.	Satisfactory	Moderate Risk	HUB Zone, SDB, WOSB
Pavkov Contracting Co. Inc.	Above Average	Moderate Risk	HUB Zone

**PAST PERFORMANCE:**

The solicitation required offerors to provide information on relevant past contracts performed within the past three years, 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) were 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:

**Coastal Environmental Group, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

Coastal's past performance references were reviewed. References said the quality of their work has been good. One reference indicated Coastal recommended solutions to problems as they arose and were very flexible in settling issues. Another reference said they have been somewhat flexible but an issue caused conflict in respect to work to be performed in a modification. Each reference indicated there were no safety issues involved with their work and they would willingly do business with them again. No major safety breaches in the past three years were found. No subcontractors were listed or proposed for this project. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Above Average is warranted.

**Gulf Pacific Contracting, LLC: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Gulf Pacific's past performance references were reviewed. All references said the quality of work performed was excellent. References indicated Gulf Pacific was very proactive and flexible when issues arose. References also indicated there were no safety incidents regarding the work of the contractor and they would unhesitatingly do business with them again. No major safety breaches in the past three years were found. The technical proposal included a complete approach and sequence of how the project was to be performed as well as a schedule. No subcontractor information was provided. The offeror acknowledged that diving operations and their diving personnel would be performing the work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Outstanding is warranted.

### **Inland Construction & Equipment, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Inland Construction's past performance references were reviewed. References stated they were great to work with. The quality of work was noted as excellent and they were attentive to solving problems. All sources indicated Inland Construction was flexible to field changes and modifications with the exception of the initial interpretation of the specifications on one project. After the specifications interpretation was resolved the project proceeded with no issues. All sources stated they completed all work and punch list items with no problems. All sources also stated Inland Construction's performance was superior and they would willingly do business with them again. References noted there were no safety issues on their projects, and no major safety breaches in the past three years were found. No subcontractors were listed or proposed for this project. A subcontractor was used in a previous project for diving operations. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Outstanding is warranted.

### **Innovative Builders, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Innovative Builders' past performance was reviewed. They provided one past performance for this project, and this reference was for a very similar project completed at SSC in 2008. The contractor performed flawlessly on the refurbishment of mooring dolphin pilings throughout the test complex. They were responsive to changing operations requirements, worked through issues with the Government well, and performed excellent. Additional past performance information was obtained from other sources known by the Government, which included other projects performed at SSC. These sources had outstanding comments about the contractor's ability to work at SSC and stated the offeror's performance was excellent and they would unhesitatingly do business with them again. In the past three years a safety incident resulted in days away and an increase in safety incident rates. The safety incident was not major and there is no doubt Innovative Builders could perform this project safely. The offeror proposed a subcontractor for this project. This subcontractor is the same diving company used on the mooring dolphin piling construction project at SSC. They performed excellent work with Innovative Builders during this project and had no safety issues. Based on this information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Outstanding is warranted.

### **Kostmayer Construction, LLC: Past Performance Overall – Outstanding**

Kostmayer's past performance references were reviewed. All references contacted had good things to say about the offeror. They all noted that Kostmayer was responsive to issues and was proactive in providing solutions and ensuring the work was completed. Complaints from references were nonexistent. References indicated there were no safety issues, and all stated they would work with this company again in the future. In the past three years a safety incident resulted in a discrepancy between DART/TRIR and OSHA forms. However, this incident did not involve any lost time and it is believed Kostmayer can safely perform this project. The contractor provided a technical proposal that was complete and described the approach and sequence of performing the project. In previous projects Kostmayer subcontracted diving. They acknowledged that diving operations would be required for this project but did not specify who the diving subcontractor would be. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Outstanding is warranted.

### **McClain Contracting Company, Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Satisfactory**

McClain's past performance references were reviewed. They have performed a wide variety of construction projects. Sources contacted were evenly split on the quality of work performed. All references stated any change orders were higher than expected but they were able to negotiate with the contractor. One reference stated they were very satisfied with their work. McClain was awarded several task orders and their owner involvement was excellent. The quality of this work was very good and the contractor was proactive in resolving issues during the work. Another reference stated that working with the contractor had not been good. They stated McClain had poor management of their subcontractors, they were slow to respond to inquiries, and their pricing on modifications was frequently high. This reference further stated they would not recommend them for any future projects. Sources of information were roughly divided over McClain's performance. All sources indicated there was no safety issues involved. In the past three years one lost time injury was reported and resulted in one day away. One source indicated diving operations were subcontracted but no subcontractors were listed or proposed for this project. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Satisfactory is warranted.

### **Pavkov Contracting Co. Inc.: Past Performance Overall – Above Average**

Pavkov's past performance references were reviewed. After numerous attempts, the majority of the references could not be reached. References that were reached all had good comments about the offeror. They noted Pavkov was really good to work with and was accommodating to working issues. References also noted the quality of work was good and they managed their subcontractors very well. References indicated there were no safety issues, and all stated they would work with this company again in the future. No major safety breaches in the past three years were found. No subcontractors were listed or proposed for this project. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall past performance evaluation rating of Above Average 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:

### **Coastal Environmental Group, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Moderate Risk**

The references provided show Coastal has experience in marine operations projects similar in size and scope. The jobs performed include construction of overflow weirs, reinforcement of a dike/roadway, and the restoration of a breakwater. Although the referenced jobs involve marine operations, there was no indication that any of them involved diving or pile restoration which is a major task of this project. Because Coastal did not provide prior experience in diving operations or underwater piling restoration, some doubt exists based on their experience that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Moderate Risk is warranted.

### **Gulf Pacific Contracting, LLC: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

Many of the references provided were relevant in the marine operations field and included diving operations. Gulf Pacific used in-house divers rather than subcontracting them out. The jobs performed included installation of grouted pile jackets, removal and repair of unsound concrete on a wharf, and demolition and replacement of a wooden dock. Gulf Pacific has extensive experience in projects similar in size, scope and complexity. Little doubt exists, based on their experience, that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk is warranted.

### **Inland Construction & Equipment, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

The references provided are all related to work in the marine environment. Inland Construction has extensive experience in projects similar in size, scope and complexity. They have performed dock repairs, pile installation, and piling repairs that are directly related to this project. They have also worked with diving operations in the past, which is a vital portion of this project. Little doubt exists, based on their experience, that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk is warranted.

### **Innovative Builders, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

Innovative Builders has extensive experience in managing projects of similar size, scope and complexity. They have performed many marine operations projects. The project referenced in their proposal involves the restoration of mooring dolphin piles at SSC, and the work required for this project is very similar as it involves performing underwater restoration of steel pilings on the B-stand LH dock. Little doubt exists, based on their experience, that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk is warranted.

### **Kostmayer Construction, LLC: Relevant Experience – Low Risk**

All references provided were for projects in the marine operations field and had subcontracted diving in previous projects. The jobs performed included repairing a barge dock with welding on capture dolphins, repairing sheet pile cells on the Mississippi River, a pile encasement project, and repairing a floodgate. Kostmayer has extensive experience in projects similar in size, scope and complexity, specifically the pile encasement project which is directly related to this project. Little doubt exists, based on their experience, that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Low Risk is warranted.

### **McClain Contracting Company, Inc.: Relevant Experience – Moderate Risk**

The references provided showed McClain mainly has experience in general contracting work. Diving and marine operations will be a major portion of this project, and they only provided one reference showing experience in marine operations and diving, indicating limited experience in projects of similar size and scope. Some doubt exists, based on their experience, that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Moderate Risk is warranted.

### **Pavkov Contracting Co. Inc.: Relevant Experience – Moderate Risk**

Pavkov's proposal notes several projects in the marine operations field, however none of the references provided for marine type work could be reached after numerous attempts. There was no indication that they have experience in diving, which will be a major task in this project. They worked on numerous federal government contracts and provided copies of evaluations for some contracts, but no direct information could be obtained for this type of project. Some doubt exists, based on their experience, that they can satisfactorily perform this kind of work. Based on the above information, and in accordance with the solicitation criteria, an overall relevant experience evaluation of Moderate Risk is 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 was used to determine price reasonableness. During this review, a comparison was made of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation.

A total of seven responsive proposals were received in response to the solicitation, and the prices 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 \$364,180.84 to the highest price offer of \$956,375.44.

It was noted three of the seven 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 and relevant experience) 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 warrants 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, and price. Therefore, subjective judgment by the Government is implicit in the evaluation process. As defined in the solicitation: **Past performance is of equal importance to relevant experience, but when combined, these factors are significantly more important than price.**

The highest rated offerors were Gulf Pacific Contracting LLC, Inland Construction & Equipment Inc., Innovative Builders Inc., and Kostmayer Construction LLC, as they all received an Outstanding past performance rating and a Low Risk relevant experience rating. All other offerors received a lower rating in one or more areas. Out of these four highest rated offerors, Inland Construction & Equipment, Inc. had the lowest price in the amount of \$364,180.84. Awarding to any offeror with a lower qualitative merit and/or higher price would not be in the best interest of the Government. Therefore, the offeror with highest ratings and lowest price, submitted by Inland Construction & Equipment, Inc., represents the best value and is considered both fair and reasonable and in the best interest of the Government. As a result, award shall be made to Inland Construction & Equipment, Inc. without discussions in the amount of \$364,180.84.



Jason Edge  
Contracting Officer