

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
John H. Glenn Research Center
Lewis Field
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191



Source Selection Statement

NASA Glenn Protective Services

NNC11ZCH007R

BACKGROUND

The NASA Glenn Research Center has a requirement for Protective Services. The requirement provides for support in a variety of areas including: Emergency Management, Dispatch Operations, National Security Protection, Medical First Responders, Badge Management, Traffic and Gate Control, Locksmith Services, Patrol Operations, Physical Security, Personnel Security, and Security Incident Response. The requirement is a follow-on to contract NAS3-03063 with Knight Protective Services.

To support acquisition planning, a Request for Information (RFI) was issued on December 14, 2010. Seventeen potential offerors responded to the RFI. After evaluation, it was determined that the acquisition approach would be to issue the solicitation as a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business set-aside under NAICS Code 561612. The contract type would be Firm-Fixed Price, with an Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) portion. The contract would provide for a base period and option periods and not exceed five years.

The RFP was issued August 29, 2011. Proposals were received on October 14, 2011, from the following six firms:

Frontline Security Services, LLC
Whitestone Group, Inc.
Universal Strategy Group, Inc.
Millennium Security Services, LLC
LINXX Global Solutions, Inc.
Phair Security Solutions, Inc.

The offers were evaluated against the Statement of Work and the Evaluation Factors of the RFP. As indicated in the RFP, the Evaluation Factors were: Mission Suitability, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Price.

In accordance with the RFP, the Mission Suitability Factor would receive a numerical score. The Mission Suitability Subfactors would receive an adjectival rating and a numerical score. The RFP provided for Mission Suitability Subfactors adjectival ratings of *Excellent*, *Very Good*, *Good*, *Fair*, and *Poor*. Within the Mission Suitability Factor, the maximum numerical score each subfactor may receive was as follows:

A. Understanding of Requirements	225 pts.
B. Management Plan	300 pts.
C. Phase-In Plan and Key Personnel	200 pts.
D. Master Training Plan	<u>275 pts.</u>
	1,000 pts.

The Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor would receive a Level of Confidence rating. These ratings included: *Very High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral.*

The Price Factor would not receive a numerical score or adjectival rating. The Government would compare the proposal price among all offerors; compare the proposed prices with the Independent Government Cost Estimate; and review the pricing information looking for errors, omissions, and unbalanced pricing.

The RFP provided that in the relative importance of the Factors, the Mission Suitability Factor is approximately equal to the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor, which is approximately equal to the Price Factor. The Mission Suitability Factor plus Price Factor, when combined, are significantly more important than the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor.

A Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) was appointed to evaluate offers received in response to the RFP. The SEC met over an extended period to evaluate the submitted offers. Committee members reviewed each proposal and evaluated it against the information requested in Section L of the RFP and the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M of the RFP. The SEC, as a group, considered individual member's findings and then discussed consensus findings for each offeror for each Mission Suitability Subfactor. Consensus findings, corresponding consensus ratings, and numerical scoring was reached for each Mission Suitability subfactor. The Subfactor numerical scores were then totaled into a single summary Mission Suitability numerical score.

In a similar manner, consensus findings and a consensus rating were also reached for the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor.

The initial evaluation summary results are indicated below:

Offeror	Mission Suitability Score	Relevant Experience and Past Performance	Price
Frontline Security Services	135	Moderate Level of Confidence	\$31,429,595
Whitestone Group, Inc.	285	Moderate Level of Confidence	\$29,045,769
Universal Strategy Group	346	Moderate Level of Confidence	\$40,491,259
Millennium Security Services	594	Low Level of Confidence	\$28,434,072
LINXX Global Solutions	643	Very High Level of Confidence	\$31,040,221
Phair Security Solutions	850	Moderate Level of Confidence	\$36,202,055

On December 16, 2011, a competitive range determination meeting was held with the Source Selection Authority (SSA) and key management officials. The overall findings and capabilities of the offerors were discussed in detail.

Of the six proposals received, Millennium Security Services, LINXX Global Solutions, and Phair Security Solutions were considered to have provided the best overall responses to the solicitation. These proposals provided the best solutions in the Mission Suitability Factor, a key Factor in assessing capability to perform the contract effort. The three lowest-rated offerors in this Factor (Frontline, Whitestone, Universal) failed to demonstrate that they fully understood the overall Mission Suitability requirements and, based on their proposals, presented a significant risk of not being capable of successfully performing the stated requirements.

In reviewing the Relative Experience and Past Performance and Price Factors, the lowest Mission Suitability rated proposals provided no sufficient advantages over the three highest rated proposals to offset their very low Mission Suitability scores. In most cases, their Relevant Experience and Past Performance ratings and Pricing were similar to that of the highest rated proposals. In those instances in which a lower-rated proposal had an advantage in Relevant Experience or Price, it was insufficient to offset the disproportionately large differential in Mission Suitability.

Overall, Millennium Security Services, LINXX Global Solutions and Phair Security Solutions were considered to be the highest rated offerors and therefore included in the Competitive Range.

DISCUSSIONS

On January 3, 2012, the Government entered into discussions with the three above stated firms. The offerors were provided their individual weaknesses, questions, concerns and comments relative to their proposals with the follow-up opportunities to discuss these items. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror was provided an opportunity to provide an updated proposal. Interim Proposals were requested on January 13, 2012, and were then reviewed by the SEC members. On February 10, 2012, the Government re-opened discussions and again provided firms with a list of concerns, any adverse past performance information that had not been addressed previously, and any remaining weaknesses.

Discussions were closed and Final Proposals were received by February 17, 2012. The Government reviewed the final proposal submissions. The Government's final evaluation results are included in the Findings section below.

FINDINGS

The Final Findings are indicated below.

Millennium Security Services, LLC

Mission Suitability Evaluation

Mission Suitability Score: 552 / 1,000

Understanding of Requirements was rated as "Poor." No strengths were identified. The offeror had one Deficiency: The offeror failed to address GRC SOW items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.10, 3.11, 3.13, 3.14, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21, 3.25, 3.26, and 3.27. The information provided by the offeror

demonstrated a total lack of understanding of the SOW requirements, increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. No additional weaknesses were identified.

Management Plan was rated as "Very Good." The offeror had one significant strength and one strength. The significant strength: The offeror provided a very detailed and comprehensive Health and Safety Plan, Drug Testing Policy, Physical Fitness Plan, Standards of Conduct, and Recall System. The strength: The offeror provided a detailed discussion of the Program Manager's local authority and operational control.

Phase-In and Key Personnel was rated as "Good." No strengths or weaknesses were identified.

Master Training Plan was rated as "Good." The offeror received one strength: (1) The offeror's Master Training Plan included a detailed approach and a well defined methodology to ensure a fully-trained, qualified, properly certified, and medically/physically fit staff throughout the life of the contract. No weaknesses were identified.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Evaluation

Relevant Experience and Past Performance was rated "Moderate Level of Confidence."

The proposals received one strength: The Millennium team has prior contracts to some extent relevant to this contract effort. Millennium has performed uniformed, armed and access control on contracts at Department of Defense / U.S. Army Central Command Headquarters (\$1.8M) and HHS/FDA (\$2.7M.) No weaknesses were identified.

Price Evaluation

Millennium submitted a final proposed price of \$27,470,041.

LINXX Global Solutions, Inc.

Mission Suitability Evaluation

Mission Suitability Score: 643 / 1,000

Understanding of Requirements was rated as "Good." The offeror had three strengths: (1) The offeror provided a detailed discussion illustrating an understanding of the needs and requirements of the SOW and a more than effective approach to handling major incidents and emergencies. (2) The offeror provided an efficient and detailed process by which they can ensure a fully-qualified workforce throughout the length of the contract. (3) The offeror provided a thorough and extensive discussion of their approach to improving efficiency and operational effectiveness through the use of specific tools and processes. No weaknesses were identified.

Management Plan was rated as "Good." The offeror had one strength: The offeror provided a detailed discussion of their management policies, procedures and techniques that are specifically tailored to the needs and requirements of GRC. No weaknesses were identified.

Phase-In and Key Personnel was rated as "Good." The offeror had one strength: The offeror provided a detailed discussion of the planned phase-in which included explicit task responsibilities assigned to identified personnel. No weaknesses were identified.

Master Training Plan was rated as "Good." No strengths or weaknesses were identified.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Evaluation

Relevant Experience and Past Performance was rated “Very High Level of Confidence.”

The proposal received one significant strength. The LINXX team has performed on contracts directly relevant to this contract effort. LINXX has performed uniformed and armed guard services at the US Navy Center for Security Forces (\$27M) and as a subcontractor for the US Army / ARINC (\$10M). Knight currently is performing protective services at GRC for a period of nine years. Knight is responsible for the full range of armed and technical program support functions. The proposal received one strength: The LINXX team has displayed successful contract performance. Eighty percent of the responses were rated at “Meets” or “Exceed” established performance requirements. There were no responses indicating that the offeror “Failed to Meet” established performance requirements.

No weaknesses were identified.

Price Evaluation

LINXX submitted a final proposed price of \$29,574,802.

Phair Security Solutions, Inc.

Mission Suitability Evaluation

Mission Suitability Score: 850 / 1,000

Understanding of Requirements was rated as “Very Good.” The offeror had two significant strengths and one strength. The two significant strengths: (1) The offeror provided a complete and comprehensive discussion of their approach to improve services, deliverables, and program efficiency. The offeror described several tools, policies, and procedures that will significantly increase the quality and timeliness of contract deliverables. The offeror described several means to improve services, deliverables, and program efficiency. (2) The offeror provided a complete and comprehensive quality assurance plan. The offeror also discussed specific tools and procedures that will greatly enhance the quality of their services. The strength: The offeror provided a detailed discussion of their approach to accomplish all SOW requirements, including their approach in handling major incidents and emergencies. No weaknesses were identified.

Management Plan was rated as “Excellent.” The offeror had two significant strengths. (1) The offeror demonstrated a complete and comprehensive approach to effectively staff the organization including staffing size, skill mix, and sources of personnel. (2) The offeror provided a comprehensive approach to effectively deal with local unions specifically addressing the CBA negotiations that will help achieve program effectiveness and lower overall costs to the Government. No weaknesses were identified.

Phase-In and Key Personnel was rated as “Very Good.” The offeror had one significant strength and two strengths. The significant strength: The offeror provided a comprehensive phase-in plan with a detailed sequence of events, stated phase-in expertise, identification of key individuals, with appropriate levels of authority, who are responsible for the successful completion of each phase-in event. The strengths: (1) The offeror’s phase-in plan will explicitly minimize disruptions, as well as identify and improve current operations and leverage current efficiencies. (2) The offeror proposed incumbent personnel for key positions with knowledge of GRC facilities and operations. No weaknesses were identified.

Master Training Plan was rated as “Good.” There were no strengths or weaknesses identified.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Evaluation

Relevant Experience and Past Performance was rated “Moderate Level of Confidence.”

The Proposal received two strengths: (1) The Phair team has performed on a prior and current contract to some extent relevant to this contract effort. Phair has performed primarily guard services at the Department of Homeland Security / Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (\$2M). (2) The Phair team’s performance has been successful with only limited performance issues with the subcontractor (SecureState). The response indicated 88 percent of the elements of the questionnaire “Exceeded” the established performance requirements (\$2M). There were no elements in the response indicating that the offeror “Failed to Meet” established performance requirements. SecureState is currently performing critical technical program security at a satisfactory level. No weaknesses were identified.

Price Evaluation

Phair submitted a final proposed price of \$32,403,679.

SSA PRESENTATION

On March 6, 2012, the SEC met with the Source Selection Authority to review the overall findings. Present at the meeting was the SEC plus key management officials. During the meeting, the findings were presented to the SSA. The SSA carefully considered the Findings, questioned the SEC in various areas, and requested the SEC to reconsider the wording of some findings to ensure consistency between the findings and the summary statements. The wording revisions were editorial in nature and did not affect the overall scoring. The meeting concluded without a final decision and a follow-up session was planned.

On March 9, 2012, a follow-up discussion was held with key SEC members and the SSA. The findings were again reviewed and editorial wording changes were highlighted.

DECISION

Based on the information presented, I understand the process used by the SEC and, with one qualification set forth below, accept the March 9, 2012, final findings. In making my selection decision, I considered the relative weighting of the evaluation Factors as set forth in the RFP, with Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price all receiving approximately equal weight.

Under the Mission Suitability Factor, I note that Phair was the highest rated proposal. Phair received “very good” and “excellent” in the key subfactors of Understanding of Requirements and Management Plan. The proposal received a number of significant strengths in these subfactors indicating a very good understanding of the work effort and an effective management approach. I further note a “very good” rating for Phase-In with a plan to retain incumbent personnel. Based on the Findings, I consider the proposal to be comprehensive, fully addressing the requirements of the RFP, and a strong indicator of successful contract performance.

LINXX was the next rated offeror. LINXX received a “good” in all Mission Suitability subfactors receiving a number of strengths. In discussions with the Committee, I understand that LINXX displayed a good understanding of the work effort, provided some operational efficiencies, and a capable workforce.

I note that the LINXX Team included the current incumbent contractor, Knight Protective Services, which will provide a good basis to understand the operations of GRC. I consider LINXX to be capable of successfully performing the work effort, but its Mission Suitability proposal was not as comprehensive as Phair's.

Millennium was the lowest rated offeror in this Factor. Millennium received a "poor" in Understanding of Requirements. I specifically note a finding of a Deficiency in Understanding of Requirements. In discussions with the Committee, Millennium's response in this key subfactor was considered inadequate throughout the subfactor and was considered to constitute a material failure to meet the Government's requirements. I consider this finding to be critical and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

To summarize the Mission Suitability Factor, it was clear from the responses that Phair had a distinct advantage over the other offerors. The proposal fully addressed the RFP requirements and clearly indicated their ability to successfully perform the contract effort. The LINXX proposal, while not as comprehensive as Phair, also displayed the ability to successfully perform the contract effort. The Millennium proposal, with its Deficiency in Understanding of Requirements, did not display the ability to successfully perform the contract effort. I find Phair to have an advantage in this Factor.

In the area of Relevant Experience and Past Performance, I note that LINXX received a "Very High Level of Confidence." The LINXX team had a significant strength for contract relevancy. This was due to the relevant experience of both the prime and major subcontractor, Knight, which has direct relevant experience at GRC. I also note that LINXX received a strength for past performance. I understand that Knight has had recent administrative issues relating to its financial capability and that Knight's subcontractor has had some limited performance issues at GRC. I understand that the offeror provided information mitigating the recent administrative and performance issues and it was fully considered by the Committee. I discussed these issues and the information supplied during discussions with the SEC. While I agree that LINXX's response fully addressed the second tier subcontractor performance issues, I still have a concern relative to the financial stability of the subcontractor. I am, however, convinced that LINXX, as prime contractor, would be fully committed to and have the financial capability to address any subcontractor financial capability issue that might arise during contract performance. Because of this, my concern is not enough to lower LINXX's "Very High Level of Confidence" rating.

I note Phair received a Moderate Level of Confidence rating with a strength for both relevant experience and performance. I gave full credit to the relevant experience of Phair's subcontractor SecureState. The difference between LINXX's and Phair's ratings reflects the fact that the LINXX team had significantly more relevant experience than did Phair as was reflected in the relevancy finding under which LINXX received a significant strength and a Phair received a strength.

I note that Millennium also receive a Moderate Level of Confidence with only a single strength. I further understand their past performance issues were identified and mitigating information was supplied by Millennium. However, the identified performance issues raise a concern and I don't believe the stated mitigation negates the fact the issues happened in the first place.

In summary, I consider LINXX to have an advantage in this Factor. The relevant experience of both the Prime and subcontractor provides an advantage over the other offerors. Even with the recent administrative and performance issues of Knight at GRC, I find that LINXX has an advantage in that its major subcontractor has successfully performed at GRC and understands the operations of the Center.

In the area of Price, Millennium was the lowest at \$27,470,041, followed by LINXX at \$29,574,802, and Phair \$32,403,679. I understand that these prices are lower than the Government estimate of \$35M, but I

also understand that the Government estimate was based on prior contract history at a slightly higher staffing level which is not reflective of future contract activity.

In making my decision, I note that Phair had the highest Mission Suitability rating which indicates their strong response to the RFP. However, I also note that LINXX had the second highest Mission Suitability rating with "Good" ratings in all the subfactors. While the LINXX proposal was not as comprehensive as Phair, these ratings indicated an understanding of the requirements and a management approach to successfully perform the effort. I further note that Phair received a Moderate Level of Confidence rating in the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor while the LINXX Team received a Very High Level of Confidence Rating and their team included the current contractor, Knight Protective Services. I believe the inclusion of the incumbent contractor will help to assure a smooth transition and the knowledge of GRC operations will be greatly beneficial during normal contract performance. With all three Factors receiving approximately equal weight, I find that these two Factors somewhat offset each other with an advantage to Phair in Mission Suitability and an advantage to LINXX in Relevant Experience and Past Performance.

In the Price Factor, Phair had the highest Price at \$32.4M. LINXX is approximately \$2.9M lower in Price at \$29.5M. Given that I believe LINXX can successfully perform the contract effort, I find the \$2.9M lower Price to offer a meaningful advantage to LINXX over Phair.

In consideration of Millennium, I find the overall Mission Suitability and specifically the Deficiency in Understanding the Requirements to be a very great concern. Their ability to successfully perform the contract effort has not been effectively conveyed in their proposal and I find no technical advantages in their proposal sufficient to offset this grave deficiency. In the area of Relevant Experience and Past Performance, I note the Moderate Level of Confidence rating but also note only one strength, that being in the area of contract relevancy. I find no advantages for Millennium in this area and consider them behind the other two offerors. I do note Millennium with the lowest Price amongst the remaining offerors. Millennium does have an advantage in Price at \$2.1M below LINXX. However, I consider their lower Mission Suitability score and specifically the Deficiency in Understanding of Requirements to offset the lower proposed Price. An attractive price offers no advantage to the Government if the contract effort cannot be successfully performed.

I believe the combination of a Mission Suitability rating of 643 with all the subfactors being rated "good", a Very High Level of Confidence rating in Relative Experience and Past Performance with the incumbent contractor being proposed as a major subcontractor, and a midrange price of \$29.5M, provides the overall best value to the Government. I therefore select LINXX Global Solutions to perform the Protective Service Requirements.


James M. Free
Deputy Director, NASA Glenn Research Center
Source Selection Authority

17 Mar 2012
Date

Concurrence:


Bradley J. Baker
Procurement Officer

3/16/2012
Date