

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT  
STENNIS PROTECTIVE SERVICES CONTRACT  
RFP NNS11367739R**

On November 8, 2011, the John C. Stennis Space Center (SSC) Procurement Officer, Deputy Procurement Officer, and I met with the Contract Acquisition Team (CAT) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Stennis Protective Service Contract (SPSC). During this meeting, the CAT presented the findings resulting from the evaluation process. I discussed the relative merits of each proposal within the competitive range with the CAT members, as well as the other attendees, to assure I had a full understanding of the CAT's evaluation. This document summarizes the procurement, the evaluation process, the results of that process, and the basis of my selection of an offeror for award.

**Procurement Description**

The current security services contract provides security services and emergency operations support. The purpose of this procurement is to provide for a follow-on acquisition to the current security services contract. The successful offeror will be required to provide the following services: (1) Security Services: Armed Uniformed Security Operations, Identification Management, Badging, Access Control, Physical Security, Resource Protection, Personnel Security, Industrial Security, Security Investigations, Locksmith Services, International Visitor Coordination, Security Enforcement and Security Enforcement Training; and (2) Emergency Operations Support: Incident Management, Continuity of Operations, 911 Emergency Center Operations and Contingency Planning.

This contract will be a performance-based Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract. The base period of performance is eight months with four (4) one-year option periods. The option periods were evaluated and considered as part of the competition.

**Procurement History**

On November 15, 2010, Patrick E. Scheuermann, Center Director, appointed members to the CAT for the purpose of evaluating proposals received in response to the solicitation. The CAT included members from the Center Operations Directorate, Office of Safety and Mission Assurance, Office of Chief Financial Officer, and Office of Procurement, along with a Legal Advisor.

Prior to the issuance of the Request for Proposal (RFP), the CAT released a pre-solicitation informational synopsis/sources sought on December 9, 2010 on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOps)

websites. Market research was performed, which indicated significant interest in the requirement from small businesses. Based on the market research, the RFP was issued as a competitive 8(a) small business set-aside.

The RFP was issued via the NAIS and FedBizOps websites on May 18, 2011. Two site visits were conducted on May 25, 2011 and June 3, 2011, and included a briefing and tour. Eight amendments, which contained administrative or minor changes to the RFP in response to offeror questions, were posted to the NAIS and FedBizOps.

Proposals were due on June 28, 2011. The CAT received a total of seven proposals in response to the RFP. Proposals were received from the following offerors (listed in alphabetical order):

Alutiiq Diversified Services, LLC

3909 Arctic Blvd., Ste. 400

Anchorage, AK 99503

- Major Subcontractor: Wackenhut Services, Inc.

American Eagle Protective Service (AEPS)

7699 Chevy Chase Dr, Chase Park One, Ste. 229

Austin, TX 78751

Guardian Air Group

Promenade II

1230 Peachtree St. NE, 19th Floor

Atlanta, GA 30309

ISS Action, Inc

JFK Airport, Bldg. 151, Ste. 310A

Jamaica, NY 11430

- Major Subcontractor: Paragon Systems, Inc.

Security Walls, LLC

130 N. Martinwood Rd

Knoxville, TN 37923

Synergy Solutions, Inc

116 Milan Way, Ste. A

Oak Ridge, TN 37830

- Major Subcontractors: PAI Corporation  
Southeastern Protective Services, Inc.

The Whitestone Group, Inc  
4100 Regent St., Ste. C  
Columbus, OH 43219

- Major Subcontractor: SecTek, Inc.

Upon receipt of proposals, the CAT conducted an initial review to determine if all information had been provided and whether each offeror made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable proposal. All seven offerors were contacted for clarification purposes during the initial evaluation. Guardian Air Group's proposal failed to meet the requirement to be an eligible concern pursuant to the provisions of section 8(a) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 637(a)). Therefore, Guardian Air Group was notified that their proposal was determined to be non-responsive and would not be considered for award. The remaining six of the seven proposals were determined to be responsive and were evaluated in accordance with the criteria identified in the RFP.

On August 19, 2011, Procurement Information Circular (PIC) 11-05 was issued, stating that for all severable services contracts, the basic period shall not extend beyond the date of the availability of the funds initially obligated to the contract at time of award. In addition, the period of performance of any options on severable services contracts shall not extend beyond the availability of the funds. As a result of the PIC, Amendment 9 was issued via the NAIS and FedBizOps websites on August 23, 2011. The amendment restructured the contract periods of performance and aligned the contract years with the fiscal years. Offerors were requested to submit revisions to their proposal based on the changed periods of performance. Revised proposals were due on September 13, 2011, and all six offerors submitted their revision by the due date.

#### Evaluation Procedures

The CAT evaluated proposals in accordance with the criteria established in the RFP, including RFP addendum to Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) provision 52.212-1, "Instructions Regarding Submission of Offer," FAR provision 52.212-2, "Evaluation--Commercial Items," and addendum to FAR provision 52.212-2.

The evaluation characteristics as identified in the RFP were Management Approach, Relevant Experience, Past Performance & Safety, and Price. Management Approach, Relevant Experience, and Past Performance & Safety were approximately equal. When combined, these three value characteristics (Management Approach, Relevant Experience, and Past Performance & Safety) were significantly more important than Price.

As stated in the RFP, the Government will award a contract resulting from the solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, will be most advantageous to the Government. This procurement was conducted utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS), which seeks to make an award based on the best combination of price and non-price factors (Management Approach, Relevant Experience, and Past Performance & Safety). BVS predefines the value characteristics which serve as discriminators among proposals. BVS evaluation is based on the premise that, if all proposals 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 proposal has lower qualitative merit if the price differential between it and other offers warrants doing so. The four evaluation characteristics described in the RFP are as follows:

Management Approach:

Each proposal was evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the proposed Management Approach as outlined in the submission requirements. Offerors were required to provide/address five main areas in their Management Approach: 1) Phase-In Plan, 2) Safety, Health and Environmental (SHE) Plan, 3) Staffing Plan, 4) Teaming Arrangement, Joint Venture, Subcontracting Arrangement or Other Contractual Arrangement, if any, and 5) Organizational Chart. The CAT evaluated and assigned an adjectival efficiency rating of Highly Effective, Moderately Effective, or Ineffective for the overall Management Approach. The definitions for the adjectival ratings and the complete submission requirements can be found in the RFP.

Relevant Experience:

Relevant Experience was evaluated to determine if the offeror's accomplishment of work was comparable or related to the technical work required by the solicitation, and was of similar scope, size and complexity. At a minimum, offerors were required to provide experience in the following disciplines: Badging, Physical Security, Personnel Security, Locksmith Services, Investigations and Patrol Operations. The CAT assigned an adjectival risk rating of Low Risk, Moderate Risk, or High Risk for Relevant Experience. The definitions for the adjectival ratings and the complete submission requirements can be found in the RFP.

Past Performance & Safety:

Each offeror was required to submit Past Performance & Safety information as outlined in the submission requirements. Additionally, Past Performance information obtained from other sources known by the Government [i.e., Past Performance Information Retrieval System

(PPIRS)] were utilized and evaluated. An 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 management, technical management, quality control, safety program, and other) were achieved on comparable or related type work. The CAT assigned an adjectival rating of Outstanding, Above Average, Neutral, Satisfactory, Marginal, or Unsatisfactory based on the evaluation results. The definitions for the adjectival ratings and the complete submission requirements can be found in the RFP.

Price:

Each offeror's proposed price, including all options, was evaluated for reasonableness and realism and for determining best value to the Government. Price evaluation consisted of evaluation of the total price of the basic and all options, as well as each Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) encompassing each of the major cost elements (e.g., labor, overhead, subcontracts, other direct costs, indirect costs, profit, etc.). The labor element (for each CLIN separately) was evaluated for classifications, exempt or non-exempt status, Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) status, hourly rates, number of hours, salary related expenses and fringe benefits.

After evaluating the six proposals, it was determined that the proposals offered by Alutiiq Diversified Services (Alutiiq), AEPS, Synergy Solutions (Synergy), and The Whitestone Group (Whitestone) were clearly less attractive to the Government, and could not reasonably be addressed in a manner to materially enhance their potential for receiving award considering the value characteristics and price. ISS Action received the highest combined value characteristic ratings and was the second lowest priced offer; exchanges with ISS Action could result in improvements to their proposal allowing for a reasonable chance for award. Both Alutiiq and Synergy received the second highest combined value characteristic ratings; however, their prices were significantly higher than the highest rated second lowest priced offer (ISS Action). Security Walls' proposal was comparable to the second highest combined value characteristic ratings and was the overall lowest priced offer; exchanges with Security Walls could result in improvements to their proposal allowing for a reasonable chance for award. AEPS and Whitestone received the lowest combined value characteristic ratings. Exchanges with Alutiiq, Synergy, AEPS, and Whitestone would not result in significant improvements to their proposals allowing for a reasonable chance for award.

Of the six evaluated proposals, ISS Action and Security Walls were determined to be within the competitive range. On October 3, 2011, letters were sent to the two offerors within the competitive range, requesting written responses to questions and exchanges. Letters were also

sent to the other four offerors notifying them of their elimination from the competitive range. Written responses were received from ISS Action and Security Walls by the due date of October 17, 2011, and face-to-face discussions/negotiations were held October 18, 2011 and October 19, 2011. Following discussions/negotiations, these two offerors were provided an opportunity to submit Final Proposal Revisions, including a proposed, signed model contract, by October 31, 2011.

### **Findings**

The CAT reviewed the Final Proposal Revisions of each offeror within the competitive range and completed its evaluation of all factors. On November 8, 2011, the CAT presented the findings resulting from the evaluation to the SSA. Final findings were as follows:

#### **ISS Action, Inc.**

**Management Approach:** ISS Action's final proposal revision received a Highly Effective adjectival rating for its Management Approach. They had three strengths and no significant weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies under this evaluation factor. ISS Action addressed all five areas required in their Management Approach. The proposal received a strength for the proposed SHE Plan being very well organized along Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) lines and being thorough and goal oriented. The proposal also received a strength for the proposed Staffing Plan including an Operations Manager for the Government Printing Office (GPO) facility, which was above the minimum requirement. The third strength was for the proposed staffing (i.e., management team) having eighty combined years of experience providing security service to SSC.

**Relevant Experience:** ISS Action's final proposal revision received a Low Risk adjectival rating for Relevant Experience. They had one strength and no significant weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies under this evaluation factor. The proposal received a strength for demonstrating relevant experience in all required areas (i.e., badging, physical security, personnel security, locksmith services, investigations and patrol operations) for contracts of similar scope, size and complexity.

**Past Performance & Safety:** ISS Action's final proposal revision received an Outstanding adjectival rating for Past Performance & Safety. They had one significant strength, four strengths, two weaknesses and no significant weaknesses or deficiencies under this evaluation factor. The proposal received a significant strength for the proposed subcontractor continuing to provide security services under extremely difficult conditions in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. One strength was for a significant majority of sources consistently rating ISS Action and the proposed subcontractor's past performance as Outstanding and Exceptional. The

proposal also received a strength for the proposed subcontractor being recognized by NASA in June of 2010 for five years of sustained Safety Excellence at SSC. The proposal received a strength for ISS Action's Total Recordable Incident Rate (TRIR) and Days Away Restricted Transfer Rate (DART) being lower than the incidence rates for the designated North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code. The proposal also received a strength for the proposed subcontractor's Experience Modifier Rate (EMR). In addition, the proposed subcontractor's Days Away Restricted Transfer Rate (DART) was less than the incidence rates for the designated NAICS Industry Code. A weakness was given for ISS Action's EMR being greater than 1. A weakness was also given because the proposed subcontractor's TRIR could not be validated.

Price: ISS Action's final proposed price of \$25,983,189.44 was the lowest priced offer. Overall the pricing information submitted and the total proposed price showed an understanding of the work to be performed that was balanced and realistic as proposed.

### **Security Walls, LLC**

Management Approach: Security Walls' final proposal revision received a Highly Effective adjectival rating for its Management Approach. They had no significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies under this evaluation factor. Security Walls addressed all five areas required in their Management Approach.

Relevant Experience: Security Walls' final proposal revision received a Low Risk adjectival rating for Relevant Experience. They had one strength and no significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies under this evaluation factor. The proposal received a strength for demonstrating relevant experience in all required areas (i.e., badging, physical security, personnel security, locksmith services, investigations and patrol operations) for contracts of similar scope, size and complexity.

Past Performance & Safety: Security Walls' final proposal revision received an Above Average adjectival rating for Past Performance & Safety. They had one strength and no significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies under this evaluation factor. The proposal received a strength for Security Walls' TRIR and DART being less than the incidence rates for the designated NAICS code. In addition, their EMR was equal to 1.

Price: Security Walls' final proposed price was significantly higher than the lowest priced offer. Overall the pricing information submitted and the total proposed price showed an understanding of the work to be performed that was balanced and realistic as proposed.

## Selection Decision

At the conclusion of the CAT's presentation of its findings, I considered its evaluation of the proposals against the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP. During the presentation, the Procurement Officer, Deputy Procurement Officer, and I thoroughly questioned the CAT on a number of findings and were satisfied with the responses provided by the team. I concluded that the evaluation criteria were followed and the evaluation of the proposals was comprehensive, thorough and well-documented. As the SSA, I concurred with the findings of the CAT and adopted those findings without exception. I made my selection decision based on a detailed comparative assessment of the relative merits of the proposals against all source selection criteria stated in the RFP. I considered the potential impact of each strength and each weakness on the proposed effort. I then concluded that it is in the Government's best interest to award to ISS Action. The reasoning for my decision is outlined below.

The RFP states that Management Approach, Relevant Experience, and Past Performance & Safety are approximately equal. When combined, these three value characteristics are significantly more important than Price. In making the source selection decision, I carefully considered the CAT findings, the results of each evaluation factor, and used the evaluation factors as set forth in the RFP.

Under the Management Approach and Relevant Experience factors, ISS Action and Security Walls both received adjectival ratings of Highly Effective and Low Risk. Under the Past Performance factor, ISS Action received Outstanding and Security Walls received Above Average. Because both proposals were of high qualitative merit, I then looked at each offeror's price. ISS Action's proposed price was significantly lower than Security Wall's proposed price. At this point, my analysis revealed that the ISS Action proposal offered the best value to the Government.

Based on my considerations outlined above, I conclude that ISS Action's offer is clearly the most advantageous to the Government. The Highly Effective Management Approach rating, Low Risk Relevant Experience rating, and Outstanding Past Performance & Safety rating, coupled with its lower price, demonstrates ISS Action's ability to successfully perform the contract requirements while providing the overall best value to the Government. Accordingly, I select ISS Action, Inc. for award of the Protective Services Contract at the NASA John C. Stennis Space Center.



Mark V. Glorioso

Source Selection Authority