

SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) Environmental Support Services Request For Proposal (RFP): NNL12429428R

On August 23, 2012, I, as the designated Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the subject acquisition, met with the Source Evaluation Team (SET) appointed to evaluate proposals for the LaRC Environmental Support Services (ESS) contract.

Procurement History

The NASA LaRC ESS contract will provide environmental support services for NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC). Work requirements include support in the areas of environmental compliance, management, conservation, and sustainability programs.

Market research was conducted in order to determine the existing small business capabilities and assess how well they compare with LaRC requirements. A sources-sought synopsis was issued on December 22, 2011 seeking capability statements from potential sources under NAICS code 541620, Environmental Consulting Services (\$14 million size standard). Based on the responses received, the Contracting Officer determined, with the concurrence of the Small Business Specialist and the Small Business Administration (SBA) Procurement Center Representative, that an adequate number of small business concerns existed to allow the LaRC contract to be conducted as a Total Small Business set aside with a NAICS code of 541620, with a single award contemplated.

An Acquisition Plan Strategy Meeting was held on March 15, 2012. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) appointed the LaRC SET on April 24, 2012 for the purpose of evaluating proposals received in response to the solicitation. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on June 15, 2012. Three amendments to the RFP were issued to respond to questions received from potential Offerors and to make minor corrections. A Pre-Proposal Conference was conducted on June 26, 2012.

The RFP contemplated the award of a fixed price contract with a potential period of performance of five years (base plus options). The contemplated contract includes an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity component and the use of the Government's Purchase Card to allow for the issuance of fixed priced task orders for additional services within the general scope of the contract.

Timely proposals were received on or before the due date of July 18, 2012 from the following seven Offerors (listed in alphabetical order):

- Engineering & Environment, Inc. (EEI)
 - Subcontractor - ERT, Inc.
- Integrated Science Solutions, Inc. (ISSi)
 - * Significant Subcontractor - XCEL Engineering, Inc.
 - Subcontractor - HDR EOC
- International Trade Bridge, Inc. (ITB)
- North Wind Services, LLC (North Wind)
 - Subcontractor - AECOM Technical Services

- Pacific Western Technologies (PWT)
- Reactives Management Corporation (RMC)
- Straughan Environmental, Inc. (Straughan)
 - * Significant Subcontractor - Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

* Significant Subcontractor is defined as subcontracts over \$450,000 annually in value, in accordance with RFP Section L.15.

Evaluation Factors and Process

This best value source selection was conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815. Initially, all voting members reviewed each proposal in sufficient depth to identify any proposals that were unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All proposals in accordance with RFP Section M.2(c), except ITB, were found to warrant a full evaluation. ITB was eliminated on August 1, 2012 as unacceptable in accordance with 1815.305-70(a)(1). ITB was properly notified and no further evaluation of their proposal was performed.

Following this review for unacceptable proposals, in accordance with RFP Section M.2(c) the five (5) lowest priced proposals were evaluated for technical acceptability based on the "Technical Considerations" set forth in the RFP. Pacific Western Technologies was ranked as the sixth lowest priced proposal and was not evaluated. Past performance and price factors were evaluated in accordance with the RFP. The evaluation was performed in accordance with the evaluation factors and instructions set forth in the solicitation.

The SET then reviewed, in depth, the five (5) lowest priced proposals, as set out below.

Evaluation of Technical Proposals (Technical Considerations): The SET members performed a detailed individual review of each Offeror's Technical Proposal against the Technical Acceptability requirements defined in the RFP to ensure the Offeror could satisfy certain minimum requirements. Technical evaluators rated the proposals as "acceptable," "reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable," or "unacceptable." This process was strictly followed throughout the evaluation process. All Offerors' Technical Proposals were rated by the SET as "Acceptable" based on the Technical Considerations set forth in the solicitation.

Factor 1 – Past Performance: Under the Past Performance factor the SET members individually evaluated each Offeror's recent record (including the record of any significant subcontractors) of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the ESS contract.

The SET members considered the degree of similarity in size (in dollars per year), content, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as the recency, and duration of the past performance with more recent and/or longer duration work being considered more pertinent. This evaluation included past performance of significant subcontractors. The RFP stated that each of the adjective ratings has a "performance" component and a "pertinence" component with the Offeror having to meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating. The RFP description of the past performance levels of confidence ratings is set out below:

In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2) past performance shall be evaluated for each Offeror using the following levels of confidence ratings:	
Very High Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
High Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Moderate Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.
Very Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral	In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)]. **NOTE: Neutral ratings will apply at the Offeror's overall performance record, not at the individual elements of the Past Performance evaluation.

The SET met and discussed all of the past performance findings of the individual voting members and used its collective judgment to develop consensus findings for the past performance factor and arrived at their consensus pertinence, performance, and level of confidence rating for each Offeror as set out in the table under the heading "Factor 1 – Past Performance," below.

Factor 2 - Price: The evaluation of the price factor was conducted in accordance with the RFP. In particular, the Government performed a price analysis (FAR 15.404-1(b)) that included a

comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation; comparison of proposed prices with the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE), and analysis of the pricing information provided by the Offerors.

The price analysis documented the reasonableness of the proposed total overall evaluated price (TOEP). The TOEP is the amount proposed in Part I, Section B.4, Pricing Schedule, "SUM OF TOTAL AMOUNTS -- BASE PLUS OPTIONS." Although not included in the TOEP, the Government also evaluated the reasonableness of the Offerors proposed rates for Section B, Clause B.5 "PRE-PRICED SCHEDULE OF RATES & LABOR CATEGORIES FOR IDIQ SUPPORT." The Price Proposal evaluation was not adjectivally rated or numerically scored.

The SET reported its findings to the SSA on August 23, 2012.

Evaluation Findings

The following is a summary of the results of the SET evaluation:

Offeror	Past Performance Level of Confidence	*Total Overall Evaluated Price
EEI	LLC	\$7,243,604
ISSi	HLC	\$7,682,252
North Wind	HLC	\$8,351,888
RMC	Neutral	\$8,667,969
Straughan	VHLC	\$8,093,894
Government Estimate		\$9.5M
*Includes CLIN 0002, Task Order/IDIQ Support, Maximum Value of \$1M		

VHLC – Very High Level of Confidence
HLC – High Level of Confidence
MLC – Moderate Level of Confidence

LLC – Low Level of Confidence
VLLC - Very Low Level of Confidence

Factor 1 - Past Performance

The SET evaluated the Offerors' past performance in accordance with RFP Section M.4(a) of the RFP and a confidence rating was assigned in accordance with NFS 1815.305. Set forth below is a summary of the Past Performance confidence ratings and findings for the five evaluated Offerors:

Offeror	Pertinence Rating	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
EEI	Somewhat Pertinent	Very Good	LLC
ISSi	Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	HLC
North Wind	Very Highly Pertinent	Very Good	HLC
RMC	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Straughan	Very Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	VHLC

North Wind and Straughan received a pertinence rating of “Very Highly Pertinent.” ISSi received a pertinence rating of “Highly Pertinent.” EEI received a pertinence rating of “Somewhat Pertinent.” RMC received a pertinence rating of “Neutral.” For the performance component, ISSi and Straughan received the highest rating of “Exceptional”; EEI and North Wind received the rating of “Very Good”; and RMC received the rating of “Neutral.” For the overall past performance confidence rating, Straughan received the highest rating of “Very High Level of Confidence”; ISSi and North Wind both received the rating of “High Level of Confidence”; EEI received the rating of “Low Level of Confidence,” and RMC received the rating of “Neutral.”

EEI:

The SET determined that there is a “Low Level of Confidence” that EEI would be able to successfully perform the requirements of the ESS contract based on its past performance. The Offeror proposed a subcontractor, however, the SET determined that the subcontractor was not a “significant subcontractor” as defined in RFP Section L.15 and its past performance was not considered in the Government’s assessment of the Past Performance factor for EEI. The SET determined that EEI demonstrated very good performance on contracts that were overall somewhat pertinent in terms of size, content and complexity to the ESS contract based on performance at Fort Jackson, SC, Army National Guard Bureau, and Fort Eustis, VA. EEI received a very good performance rating based on ratings that ranged from very good to exceptional, with no overall rating lower than very good. The SET determined the relevant experience to be recent and overall of a meaningful duration to judge performance. The SET’s assessment also considered feedback from past performance questionnaires. Positive comments from customers were noted and no persistent or recurring problems were evident. The SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Somewhat Pertinent based on the preponderance of somewhat pertinent ratings that EEI received for its work in the PWS elements relevant to the ESS contract. In accordance with the level of confidence definitions set forth in the RFP, an overall Level of Confidence of LLC was assigned.

The following is a summary of the SET’s ratings of EEI’s past performance factor.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
EEI	Somewhat Pertinent	Very Good	LLC

ISSi:

The SET determined that there is a “High Level of Confidence” that the ISSi team would be able to successfully perform the requirements of the ESS contract based on its past performance and that of its significant subcontractor. The Offeror proposed an additional subcontractor, however, the SET determined that the subcontractor was not a “significant subcontractor” as defined in RFP Section L.15 and its performance was not considered in the Government’s assessment of the Past Performance factor. The SET determined that the ISSi team demonstrated exceptional performance on contracts that were overall highly pertinent in terms of size, content and complexity to the ESS contract based on performance at NASA Ames Research Center, NASA Dryden Flight Center, US Army Corps of Engineers Louisville District, and other commercial customers. The ISSi team received an exceptional performance rating based on ratings that ranged from very good to exceptional, with no overall rating lower than very good. The SET determined the relevant experience to be recent and overall of a meaningful duration to judge performance. The SET’s assessment also considered feedback from past performance questionnaires and Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) reports. Positive comments from customers were noted and no persistent or recurring problems were evident. The SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent based on the preponderance of highly pertinent ratings that the ISSi team received for its work in the PWS elements relevant to the ESS contract. In accordance with the level of confidence definitions set forth in the RFP, an overall Level of Confidence of HLC was assigned.

The following is a summary of the SET ratings of ISSi’s past performance factor.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
ISSi	Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	HLC

North Wind:

The SET determined that there is a “High Level of Confidence” that North Wind would be able to successfully perform the requirements of the ESS contract based on its past performance. The Offeror proposed a subcontractor, however, the SET determined that the subcontractor was not a “significant subcontractor” as defined in RFP Section L.15 and its performance was not considered in the Government’s assessment of the Past Performance factor. The SET determined that North Wind demonstrated very good performance on contracts that were overall very highly pertinent in terms of size, content and complexity to the ESS contract based on performance at NASA White Sand Test Facility, US Army Corps of Engineers Savannah District, and a commercial customer. North Wind received a very good performance rating based on ratings that ranged from very good to exceptional, with no overall rating lower than very good. The SET determined the relevant experience to be recent and overall of a meaningful duration to judge performance. The SET’s assessment also considered feedback from past performance questionnaires and CPARS reports. Positive comments from customers were noted and no persistent or recurring problems were evident. The SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on the preponderance of very highly pertinent ratings that North Wind received for its work in the PWS elements relevant to the ESS contract. In accordance with the level of confidence definitions set forth in the RFP, an overall Level of Confidence of HLC was assigned.

The following is a summary of the SET ratings of North Wind's past performance factor.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
North Wind	Very Highly Pertinent	Very Good	HLC

RMC:

The SET rated RMC's past performance factor as "Neutral" because the Offeror did not have a record of relevant past performance in CPARS and we were unable to find any records of past performance. Therefore, the Offeror was not evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. In accordance with the level of confidence definitions set forth in the RFP, an overall Level of Confidence of Neutral was assigned.

The following is a summary of the SET ratings of RMC's past performance factor.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
RMC	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Straughan:

The SET determined that there is a "Very High Level of Confidence" that the Straughan team would be able to successfully perform the requirements of the ESS contract based on its past performance and that of its significant subcontractor. The SET determined that the Straughan team demonstrated exceptional performance on contracts that were overall very highly pertinent in terms of size, content and complexity to the ESS contract based on performance at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, Maryland Transportation Authority, NASA Glenn Research Center, NASA Langley Research Center, and US Army Corps of Engineers Mobile District. The Straughan team received an exceptional performance rating based on ratings that ranged from very good to exceptional, with no overall rating lower than very good. The SET determined the relevant experience to be recent and overall of a meaningful duration to judge performance. The SET's assessment also considered feedback from past performance questionnaires and CPARS reports. Positive comments from customers were noted and no persistent or recurring problems were evident. The SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on the preponderance of very highly pertinent ratings that the Straughan team received for its work in the PWS elements relevant to the ESS contract. In accordance with the level of confidence definitions set forth in the RFP, an overall Level of Confidence of VHLC was assigned.

The following is a summary of the SET ratings of Straughan's past performance factor.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
Straughan	Very Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	VHLC

Factor 2 - Price

The SET and Cost/Price Analyst performed an analysis of the price proposals to assess reasonableness and to determine whether the Offeror's proposal was realistic for the work to be performed and reflected a clear understanding of the ESS contract requirements. Offerors'

price proposals were evaluated in accordance with RFP Section M.4(b), Factor 2-Price, of the RFP. A summary of the TOEP is shown in the table below along with the IGCE:

Offeror	Total Overall Evaluated Price
EEl	\$7,243,604
ISSi	\$7,682,252
North Wind	\$8,351,888
RMC	\$8,667,969
Straughan	\$8,093,894
Government Estimate	\$9.5M

Based on the analysis and in accordance with FAR 15.402, the Contracting Officer has determined that the Offerors proposed prices are fair and reasonable based on the spread from the highest proposed price to the lowest proposed price, comparison of the proposed prices to the IGCE, the Cost/Price Analysis Report from the LaRC Office of Procurement (OP) Cost/Price Analyst, the SET evaluation, and the fact that adequate price competition was obtained. There was a \$1,424,365 difference between the highest priced Offeror and the lowest priced Offeror (this does not consider the two offers that were not evaluated). EEl had the lowest price, ISSi the second lowest price, Straughan the third lowest price, North Wind the fourth lowest price, and RMC with the highest price.

EEl:

EEl's proposed price of \$7,243,604 was lower than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the ESS contract requirements, and was consistent with the various elements of the technical proposal. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. EEl had the lowest TOEP among the five Offerors evaluated.

ISSi:

ISSi's proposed price of \$7,682,252 was lower than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the ESS contract requirements, and was consistent with the various elements of the technical proposal. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. ISSi had the second lowest TOEP among the five Offerors evaluated.

North Wind:

North Wind's proposed price of \$8,351,888 was lower than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the ESS contract requirements, and was consistent with the various elements of the technical proposal. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. North Wind had the fourth lowest TOEP among the five Offerors evaluated.

RMC:

RMC's proposed price of \$8,667,969 was lower than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the ESS contract requirements, and was consistent with the various elements of the technical proposal. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. RMC had the highest TOEP among the five Offerors evaluated.

Straughan:

Straughan's proposed price of \$8,093,894 was lower than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the ESS contract requirements, and was consistent with the various elements of the technical proposal. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. Straughan had the third lowest TOEP among the five Offerors evaluated.

BASIS FOR SELECTION

The SET presented its findings to me on August 23, 2012 and I am convinced that the SET conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation criteria in the RFP. I asked questions about specific aspects of the price and the past performance evaluations in order to enhance my understanding. After all questions were answered, I fully understood the SET's findings.

I comparatively assessed the proposals against the evaluation factors in the RFP. Given that the RFP states that the past performance and price factors are of approximately equal importance, I evaluated the offers using past performance and price as indicators of which Offeror provides the best value to the Government.

Starting with RMC, I noted that RMC was the highest priced Offeror and received a neutral past performance confidence rating, reflecting the Offeror is without a record of relevant past performance record. I considered the importance of price as being approximately equal to past performance and the rating of Neutral reflecting no identifiable relevant past performance record. With all other Offerors being lower in price, I determined that RMC did not represent the best value for award and I eliminated RMC from further consideration.

North Wind was the second highest priced Offeror with a lower past performance confidence rating compared to Straughan who was the third highest priced Offeror. North Wind and ISSi who was the second lowest Offeror have the same past performance confidence rating. Consequently, I determined that North Wind did not represent the best value for award and I eliminated them from further consideration.

EEl was the lowest priced Offeror and received a past performance confidence rating "Low Level of Confidence." At this point I had three offerors still under consideration. EEl at a price of \$7,243,604 and a "Low Level of Confidence" rating; ISSi at a price of \$7,682,252 and a "High Level of Confidence" rating; and Straughan at a price of \$8,093,894 and a "Very High Level of Confidence" rating. With price and past performance of approximately equal importance I considered whether the additional cost of the higher priced offers is worth the additional level of confidence. To move from a "Low Level of Confidence" to a "High Level of Confidence" has a cost of \$438,648 or just under \$87,730 per year. To move from a "High Level of Confidence" to a "Very High Level of Confidence" has a cost of \$411,642 or \$82,328 per year. It is my conclusion that the value of the additional levels of confidence is worth the additional cost. I believe that Straughan's superior rating for the past performance confidence factor is of substantial benefit to the Government. A higher degree of confidence of successful performance represents significant value because the financial, regulatory violations, employee hazards, and publicity risks to the Center are high should the environmental services contractor fail to properly perform its duties.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

As Source Selection Authority I fully understand and agree with the overall findings of the SET and relied on its findings in making my decision. In conclusion, Straughan's proposal provides the greater benefit to the Agency based on my integrated assessment against the specified evaluation criteria. First, Straughan's superior rated past performance factor is highly beneficial to the Center due to the reduced risk and higher confidence of successful performance. While ISSi and EEl both offered lower prices compared to Straughan's price, I considered the superior aspects of Straughan's higher rated past performance factor worth the additional cost. I also

note that Straughan's price is well below the Independent Government Cost Estimate. It is clear that the inherent nature of the environmental services required by this procurement carries substantial risk and liability for the Center and my confidence in their ability to successfully perform the contract is worth the relatively small additional price to the Government. Therefore, it is my decision that Straughan's proposal offers the best overall value to the Government and I select Straughan Environmental, Inc. for contract award.



C. Tom Weih
Source Selection Authority

8/27/12

Date