



**John H. Glenn Research Center**  
**Lewis Field**  
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191

## Source Selection Statement

Construction Management, Inspection, Surveillance, and Testing  
(CMIST)

NNC12ZFD011R

### Procurement History/Description

This procurement provides construction project management, construction management, construction inspection, building and life safety code compliance, surveying and testing support to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Glenn Research Center (GRC). The type of support includes:

- Construction Project Management
- Construction Management
- Construction Inspection
- Building and Life Safety Code Compliance
- Surveying
- Testing

Services will primarily be performed at the GRC's Lewis Field located in Cleveland, Ohio, its Plum Brook Station located in Sandusky, Ohio. This procurement is the follow-on to contracts NNC08BA02B – Task 200 and NNC08BA03B for similar types of services.

To accomplish this requirement, the Government anticipates a contract consisting of a base work effort plus an indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) effort. The base work effort and the IDIQ effort will be Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF). The total period of performance will not exceed 5 years with the actual periods coinciding with the Government fiscal years.

A sources sought notice was issued on March 27, 2012. A draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on June 11, 2012. On June 14, 2012, an Industry Day was held with 21 potential offerors in attendance. The Final RFP was issued on July 18, 2012, as a Small Business Administration 8(a) set-aside.

Six (6) proposals were received by September 5, 2012. After an initial review, all were considered acceptable and included in the formal evaluation process. Proposals were submitted by:

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| - Barr & Prevost        | - Coast & Harbor                             |
| - EdArch Partners       | - Engineering Design Build International Inc |
| - Frontier-Arrowhead JV | - Suhail / RW Armstrong Mentor-Protégé JV    |

## **Evaluation Procedures**

All proposals were evaluated by a designated Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 – Source Selection, NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3 – Source Selection, and the evaluation criteria included in the RFP.

The RFP evaluation criteria consisted of the following factors: Technical Capability, Cost/Price, and Relevant Experience and Past Performance.

The Technical Capability was evaluated and a numerical rating established. The subfactor weighting is indicated below:

### **Technical Capability (1,000 points TOTAL)**

#### **A. Understanding the Requirements (UR) (450 points)**

- UR1 – Construction Project Management
- UR2 – Surveying
- UR3 – Building & Life Safety Code Compliance
- UR4 – IDIQ Tasks
- UR5 – IDIQ Sample Task

#### **B. Management Approach (MA) (250 points)**

- MA1 – Risk Management Plan
- MA2 – Task Order Control Process (Management System)
- MA3 – Contract Execution Plan / Organizational Structure
- MA4 – Safety and Health Plan
- MA5 – Phase-In Plan

#### **C. Key Personnel and Staffing (300 points)**

- KPS1 – Key Personnel
- KPS2 – Initial Staffing to meet SOW Requirements
- KPS3 – Recruitment, Retention, Staffing and Compensation

The Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was not numerically scored but was evaluated using the Level of Confidence ratings as outlined in Section M.4 of the RFP.

The Cost/Price Factor was not numerically scored. The proposed costs were evaluated and a probable cost analysis and adjustment was performed as outlined in Section M.3 of the RFP.

Of the evaluation factors identified above, Section M.7 of the RFP stated that Technical Capability is approximately equal to Relevant Experience and Past Performance, which is approximately equal to Cost/Price. Technical Capability plus Relevant Experience and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price.

The SEC voting members individually reviewed the proposals and then established SEC consensus findings. The SEC then assigned an adjectival rating and numerical score for each subfactor.

The Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was evaluated by the Relevant Experience and Past Performance subcommittee. In accordance with the evaluation criteria in

the RFP, the subcommittee members individually evaluated the proposals and then caucused as a group, to establish consensus findings. The findings were reported to the SEC voting members. The SEC voting members individually reviewed the proposals, considered the subcommittee findings, and then established SEC consensus findings. The SEC then assigned a level of confidence rating to each Offeror's Relevant Experience and Past Performance.

The Cost/Price Factor was evaluated by the price analysts. The proposal costs were reviewed for compliance with the RFP instructions, consistency with the technical approach, mathematical errors, and overall cost reasonableness. Field pricing support was requested from the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) and Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). An analysis was performed to establish the probable cost for each proposal.

The Government had developed an Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) prior to the release of the RFP.

The initial findings are indicated below:

	<b>Frontier-Arrowhead JV</b>	<b>Suhail / RW Armstrong JV</b>	<b>Barr &amp; Prevost</b>	<b>Coast &amp; Harbor</b>	<b>EDB Int'l</b>	<b>EdArch Partners JV</b>
<b>Technical Capability (1000)</b>	766	555	493	398	236	163
<b>Past Performance</b>	Very High	Moderate	Moderate	Very High	High	Moderate
<b>Probable Cost</b>	\$33,914,324	\$45,085,291	\$39,618,316	\$39,395,434	\$34,531,827	\$34,235,673

**Findings**

Findings are indicated below.

**Frontier-Arrowhead JV**

*Technical Capability Factor – 766 Points*

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was rated "Good." The proposal contained two strengths and one weakness for this Subfactor. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal had a strength in understanding Facilities Construction Project Management for its detailed and thorough understanding of the Statement of Work (SOW), documented project knowledge using NASA-delivery methods, and an innovation that would improve the quality of project delivery; and a strength in Building and Life Safety Code Compliance for its detailed understanding of the technical requirements of the SOW in safety, environmental and occupational health support and an innovation of providing hazardous material sampling. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal contained a weakness in understanding IDIQ

Discrete Tasks for not giving sufficient detail to determine the probability of successful implementation of IDIQ tasks by not mentioning specific subcontractors or subcontractor qualifications for IDIQ work not performed by the prime contractor or proposed subcontractors.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was rated "Excellent." The proposal contained two significant strengths and one strength. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal had a significant strength in Risk Management for a highly effective process to manage risks, including an innovation for developing lessons learned; a significant strength in Phase-In for providing an exceptional phase-in plan that detailed minimal burden to NASA thereby reducing disruption to the Government and ensuring a smooth transition. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal had a strength in Task Order Control for a highly effective process for monitoring and predicting required resources in its task order control system. The proposal contained no weaknesses.

In the Key Personnel and Staffing Subfactor, Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was rated "Very Good." The proposal contained one significant strength and one weakness for this Subfactor. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal had a significant strength in Initial Staffing for demonstration of exceptional understanding of the skills and knowledge required for initial staffing, including having signed letters of commitment from many individuals whose qualifications exceeded the minimum requirements of the SOW. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal had a weakness in this Subfactor in Recruitment and Retention for failing to provide sufficient details regarding compensation and benefits for a major subcontractor.

*Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "Very High Level of Confidence."*

Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal contained one significant strength for contract relevance and two strengths in performance in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. There were no weaknesses identified. Frontier-Arrowhead had multiple prior contracts considered highly relevant or relevant to the CMIST contract; was rated "Exceeded" (40.28%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires; and was rated satisfactory to excellent by the majority of clients in the Government Past Performance Database.

*Cost/Price Factor.*

The proposal cost was \$33,914,324. A probable cost analysis was performed and no adjustments were made to the Frontier-Arrowhead proposal.

**Suhail / RW Armstrong Mentor-Protégé JV**

*Technical Capability Factor – 555 Points*

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal was rated "Fair." The proposal contained no strengths and one weakness. Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal contained one weakness in understanding Facilities Construction Project Management for not providing sufficient detail to demonstrate how it would meet the requirements.

In the Management Plan Subfactor, Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal was rated "Good." The proposal contained one significant strength, one strength, and one significant weakness. Suhail

/ RW Armstrong's proposal had a significant strength in Phase-In for an exceptionally detailed and through approach to phase-in, including training and orientation, which exceeded the requirements of the RFP. The proposal had a strength in Task Order Control and Contract Execution for a detailed and innovative approach to managing task orders using a web-based software. The proposal contained one significant weakness in Risk Management for not providing an Organizational and Personal Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan.

In the Key Personnel and Staffing Subfactor, Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal was rated "Good." The proposal contained two strengths and one significant weakness. Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal had a strength in Key Personnel for proposing key personnel having qualifications, which exceeded the requirements of the SOW and planning to cross-train back-ups to ensure continued services during short-term absences; a strength in Recruitment and Retention for offering an innovative approach to ensure its staff will be well trained during the life of the contract. Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal contained one significant weakness in recruitment and retention for failing to provide compensation details for its joint venture within its submitted Technical Volume, only providing a summary of benefits for RW Armstrong, and failing to detail how it would maintain certification requirements for each labor category.

*Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "Moderate."*

Suhail / RW Armstrong's proposal contained one strength in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. There were no weaknesses identified. Suhail / RW Armstrong had prior contracts considered relevant to the CMIST contract and was rated "Exceeded" (21%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires.

#### *Cost/Price Factor*

The proposal cost was \$46,536,563. A probable cost analysis was performed and a downward adjustment of \$1,451,272 was made, which represented a revision of the productive effort hours calculation, removing overtime, and removing cost of money. The final probable cost was \$45,085,291.

### **Barr & Prevost**

#### *Technical Capability Factor – 493 Points*

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, Barr & Prevost's proposal was rated "Good." The proposal contained one significant strength, two strengths, and two significant weaknesses. The proposal contained a significant strength in Facilities Construction Project Management for a thorough and detailed understanding of the requirements, including an innovative approach to construction management; a strength in Surveying for an innovation to increase the accuracy of the underground record drawings; a strength in Building and Life Safety Code Compliance for a detailed and thorough approach. Barr & Prevost's proposal contained two significant weaknesses for not sufficiently detailing how the requirements of either Surveying or the IDIQ Discrete Tasks would be met.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, Barr & Prevost's proposal was rated "Fair." The proposal contained two strengths and two significant weaknesses. Barr & Prevost's proposal

had a strength in Risk Management for a thorough and innovative approach to risk management; a strength in Health and Safety Plan for a detailed and thorough approach. The proposal also contained two significant weaknesses in this Subfactor. One significant weakness was in Risk Management for an organizational structure that lacked sufficient detail and explanation to determine its effectiveness for the CMIST contract; the second significant weakness in Contract Execution Plan/Organizational Structure for not clearly conforming to all the requirements regarding organizational conflict of interest.

In the Key Personnel and Staffing Subfactor, Barr & Prevost's proposal was rated "Fair." The proposal contained no strengths and one weakness. The proposal contained a weakness in Recruitment and Retention for insufficient detail to complete an evaluation of the compensation to be provided.

*Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "Moderate."*

Barr & Prevost's proposal contained three strengths in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. There were no weaknesses identified. Barr & Prevost had multiple contracts considered Relevant or Somewhat Relevant to the CMIST contract, was rated "Exceeded" (40.43%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires, and was consistently rated "Outstanding" or "Exceptional" by the majority of clients in the Government Past Performance Database.

#### *Cost/Price Factor*

The proposal cost was \$38,674,625. A probable cost analysis was performed and an upward adjustment of \$943,691 was made, which represented the removal of the proposed unsubstantiated reductions in proposed indirect rates as compared to calculated and forecasted indirect rates for Barr & Prevost and subcontractor Hill International, a rate adjustment for uncompensated overtime for Barr & Prevost and subcontractor Crawford Consulting Services, removal of overtime for subcontractor Terracon, and a WYE increase for Barr & Prevost. The final probable cost was \$39,618,316.

### **Coast & Harbor**

#### *Technical Capability Factor – 398 Points*

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, Coast & Harbor's proposal was rated "Good." Coast & Harbor's proposal contained two strengths and two weaknesses. The proposal had a strength in Surveying for a detailed understanding of the requirements and for proposing an innovative plan; a strength in IDIQ Discrete Tasks for a detailed and comprehensive approach to providing all of the IDIQ services. The proposal contained two weaknesses. Coast & Harbor's proposal had a weakness in Facilities Construction Project Management for not demonstrating an understanding of the required duties and functions of the Facility Project Manager and Construction Manager and a weakness in Building and Life Safety Code Compliance for lack of understanding of how to support projects with regard to safety, environmental and occupational health.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, Coast & Harbor's proposal was rated "Poor." Coast & Harbor's proposal contained no strengths and had three significant weaknesses. The proposal had a significant weaknesses in Risk Management for insufficient detail of its risk management plan and a lack of understanding on how to address sensitive information, a significant weakness in Contract Execution Plan/Organization Structure for insufficient detail on how it would effectively manage the work of the contract, incorporate lessons learned, or suggest improvements, and a significant weakness in Health and Safety Plan for insufficiently addressing hazards related to work on active construction sites.

In the Key Personnel Subfactor, Coast & Harbor's proposal was rated "Poor." The proposal contained no strengths and one significant weakness in Recruitment and Retention for insufficient detail on the compensation and benefits provided.

*Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "Very High Level of Confidence."*

Coast & Harbor's proposal contained one significant strength, for performance, and two strengths, one for contract relevance and one for performance, in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. There were no weaknesses identified. Coast & Harbor had multiple contracts considered Relevant or Somewhat Relevant to the CMIST contract, was rated "Exceeded" (51.19%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires, and was consistently rated "Very Good" by the majority of clients in the Government Past Performance Database.

#### *Cost/Price Factor*

The proposal cost was \$38,118,847. A probable cost analysis was performed and an upward adjustment of \$1,276,587 was made which represented an adjustment of indirect rates to calculated rates for Coast & Harbor, subcontractor Resource International Inc., and subcontractor m.a.c.Paran. The final probable cost was \$39,395,434.

### **Engineering Design Build International Inc. (EDB)**

#### *Technical Capability Factor – 236 Points*

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, EDB's proposal was rated "Poor." The proposal contained three significant weaknesses, one weakness, and no strengths. EDB's proposal contained a significant weakness in Facilities Construction Project Management for not demonstrating an understanding of the required duties and the importance of these roles to the success of GRC facility projects, a significant weakness in Surveying for insufficient detail on how it would meet the requirements, and a significant weakness in Building and Life Safety Code Compliance for insufficient detail to demonstrate an understanding of the requirements or functions. The proposal contained a weakness in IDIQ Discrete Tasks for not providing sufficient detail as to how IDIQ tasks would be managed.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, EDB's proposal was rated "Poor." The proposal contained no strengths and three significant weaknesses. EDB's proposal contained a significant weakness in Risk Management for insufficient detail of its risk management plan and not addressing its role in the identification and mitigation of organizational conflicts of interest, a significant weakness in Contract Execution Plan/Organizational Structure for a lack of a clear

and detailed management structure or detailed methods to ensure efficient management of work under the contract, and a significant weakness in Phase-In for a lack of detail in its phase-in plan to ensure a full staff with necessary training and orientation by the end of the phase-in period.

In the Key Personnel and Staffing Subfactor, EDB's proposal was rated "Poor." The proposal contained no strengths and two significant weaknesses. EDB's proposal had a significant weakness in Initial Staffing for no clear indication of the number of WYE's needed to staff each labor category within the technical proposal demonstrating a lack of understanding of each labor function and a significant weakness in Recruitment and Retention for insufficient detail to complete an evaluation of the compensation and benefits provided.

*Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "High Level of Confidence."*

EDB's proposal contained one significant strength and one strength in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. There were no weaknesses identified. EDB had multiple contracts considered Highly Relevant, Relevant or Somewhat Relevant to the CMIST contract and was rated "Exceeded" (48.33%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires.

#### *Cost/Price Factor*

The proposal cost was \$36,372,981. A probable cost analysis was performed and a downward adjustment of \$1,841,154 was made which represented an adjustment for unsubstantiated indirect rates for subcontractors Schooley Caldwell Associates and Peterman Associates, removal of overtime, and removal of cost of money. The final probable cost was \$34,531,827.

### **EdArch Partners JV**

#### *Technical Capability Factor – 163 Points*

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, EdArch Partners' proposal was rated "Poor." EdArch's proposal contained no strengths, three significant weaknesses, and one weakness. The proposal contained a significant weakness in Facilities Construction Project Management for failing to demonstrate a detailed understanding of the construction management and construction inspection functions, a significant weakness in Building and Life Safety Compliance Code for not clearly addressing how to meet the requirement for Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) support and Safety, Environmental, and Occupational Health (SEOH) support, and a significant weakness in Surveying for not adequately addressing the requirements. The proposal had a weakness in IDIQ Discrete tasks for not adequately addressing all requirements.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, EdArch Partners' proposal was rated "Poor." The proposal contained no strengths, three significant weaknesses, and one weakness. EdArch's proposal contained a significant weakness in Risk Management for an insufficient Organizational and Personal Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan and Risk Management Plan, a significant weakness in Contract Execution Plan/Organizational Structure for an insufficient detailed organizational structure or method for managing subcontractors, and a significant weakness in Phase-In for insufficient detail. The proposal contained a weakness in Task Order

Control for no detailed method to manage multiple task orders, costs, or labor hours of CMIST personnel.

In the Key Personnel and Staffing Subfactor, EdArch Partners' proposal was rated "Poor." The proposal contained no strengths, two significant weaknesses, and one weakness. EdArch's proposal contained a significant weakness in Initial Staffing for a significant reduction of WYE's without a clear description of how service levels would be maintained demonstrating a lack of understanding of contract requirements and a significant weakness in Recruitment and Retention for insufficient information to determine qualifications of identified personnel, and insufficient detail to complete an evaluation of benefits. EdArch's proposal contained a weakness in Key Personnel for insufficient information.

*Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "Moderate."*

EdArch Partners' proposal contained one strength in Relevant Experience and Past Performance. There were not weaknesses identified. EdArch Partners was rated "Exceeded" (56.94%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires, primarily for team member Solar Testing Labs.

#### *Cost/Price Factor*

The proposal cost was \$33,537,720. A probable cost analysis was performed and an upward adjustment of \$697,953 was made which represented removal of the proposed unsubstantiated reductions in proposed indirect rates as compared to calculated and forecasted indirect rates, an increase of WYEs, removal of overtime, correction of an error in the first and final contract years, and removal of duplicate ODC costs. The final probable cost was \$34,235,637.

### **Selection Decision**

Based on the information presented, I fully understand the evaluation process, the SEC findings, and concur with the overall SEC results. I understand that the three Evaluation Factors, Technical Capability, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Cost were approximately equal in weighting but that Technical Capability plus Relevant Experience and Past Performance, when combined, were significantly more important than Cost and considered that in my decision.

In making my decision, I first note and agree with the SEC's findings that in the area of Technical Capability, Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was clearly superior to all of the other offerors. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was 211 points higher than the next highest offeror, Suhail / RW Armstrong. According to the SEC's analysis, Frontier-Arrowhead's detailed management approach received a rating of "Excellent." In discussions with the committee, I was particularly impressed that the proposal had a significant strength for its risk management approach and another significant strength for an exceptional phase-in plan that would minimize the burden to the Government. I further note a strength for plans to manage task orders, particularly with regards to forecasting necessary resources. Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was also rated "Very Good" and "Good" in the remaining subfactors, which included a significant strength for the initial staffing plan, hiring a number of employees, including many incumbents, with qualifications that exceed the requirements established in the SOW. Additionally, I found that the two strengths Frontier-Arrowhead had within the Understanding the Requirements subfactor established that Frontier-Arrowhead understands the requirements of the SOW,

particularly with regard to Facilities Construction Project Management and Building and Life Safety Code Compliance.

I do however note that Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal has a weakness in the Understanding the Requirements subfactor. Its proposal did not sufficiently detail who would perform a number of the IDIQ tasks that are not performed by the offeror or the major subcontractor. I note an additional weakness in its the Key Personnel and Staffing subfactor, relative to Recruitment and Retention, due to lack of detail regarding compensation and benefits plans for its major subcontractor, SAIC. Although I agree with these findings, I conclude that these weaknesses can readily be corrected and will not significantly impact overall contract operations.

Despite the above weaknesses, I conclude that the overall Technical Capability findings indicated Frontier-Arrowhead is fully capable of performing the work effort with an experienced team, a sound management approach and organizational structure, a thorough understanding of the work required, and a high-intended incumbent employee capture rate.

Relative to Suhail / RW Armstrong, I understood and agreed with the SEC's rating of the Suhail / RW Armstrong proposal. The proposal was rated "Good" in two of the subfactors and a "Fair" in the remaining subfactor. The Suhail / RW Armstrong proposal had a significant strength for an exceptional and well-detailed plan for phase-in, and also two strengths in the Key Personnel and Staffing subfactor for well-qualified key personnel and a detailed plan for recruiting and retaining qualified staff, and another strength for task order control and contract execution. I do, however, note that the proposal also had a weakness in the Understanding the Requirements subfactor for not clearly demonstrating knowledge of the requirements of the SOW with regards to Facility Project Management. The Suhail / RW Armstrong proposal also had two significant weaknesses, one significant weakness for the lack of an Organizational and Personal Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan OCI plan, and the other significant weakness for only including benefit information for part of the team. I found that although the findings indicated Suhail/ RW Armstrong is capable of performing the work effort with a well-qualified team, a sound approach to task order management, and phase-in, I have concerns regarding whether Suhail / RW Armstrong fully understands the Facilities Project Management work and organizational conflict of interest risk, thereby increasing the risk to the Government of overall unsuccessful contract performance.

With regards to Barr & Prevost, I agreed with the SEC's rating of "Good" for the Barr & Prevost proposal in the Understanding the Requirements subfactor. Barr & Prevost had a significant strength and two strengths. Barr & Prevost demonstrated that it clearly understood the requirements of the SOW with regards to Facilities Project Management, including innovations for prioritizing issues and managing and monitoring milestone issues. Additionally, Barr & Prevost's proposal had strengths for plans for building and life safety code compliance and the approach to surveying work using ground penetrating radar for underground record drawings. However, the Barr & Prevost proposal did receive a significant weakness for not fully demonstrating an understanding of the requirements of the Surveying section of the SOW, relative to the GMS Administrator and the requirements for GMS Design, and another significant weakness in understanding IDIQ Discrete Tasks by failing to address many of the task order work areas in the SOW.

The Barr & Prevost proposal was rated "Fair" in the remaining two sections with strengths for risk management and the approach to health and safety plans. However, the proposal also had two significant weaknesses and one weakness. The proposal had a significant weakness for failure to address the requirements of NFS Clause 1852.209-71, Limitation on Future

available, I understand the team received a number of "Exceeded" ratings on the Past Performance Questionnaires.

I have reviewed the Relevant Experience and Past Performance findings for Suhail / RW Armstrong, Barr & Prevost, and EdArch Partners and note they all were rated a "Moderate" level of confidence and find they offer no advantage over the highest rated offerors in this subfactor. offeror.

In the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor, I found that the Frontier-Arrowhead Team has direct relevant contract experience with the work anticipated under the CMIST contract. The Coast & Harbor Team's relevant contract experience is not to the overall level of Frontier-Arrowhead Team but is still noteworthy. I also find that the overall performance of both offerors has also been noteworthy with the Coast & Harbor Team ratings from Past Performance Questionnaires being a significant number of "Exceeded" ratings across a larger number of contracts than Frontier-Arrowhead. The Frontier-Arrowhead Team and Coast & Harbor Team both received high marks in the Government's Past Performance Database. In considering the findings across the scope of the Factor, I consider Frontier-Arrowhead and Coast & Harbor to be substantially equal, and both significantly higher than all other offers.

In the area of Cost/Price, for the highest rated offerors I note that EdArch Partners proposed a cost of \$33,537,720, had a total upward adjustment by the SEC of \$697,953, and therefore a final probable cost of \$34,235,673. I understand cost adjustments were due to adjusting the Indirect and G&A rates to calculated levels rather than a fixed dollar amount, removal of overtime which was evaluated as unnecessary by the SEC, increasing the staff levels to be commensurate with the work level described, adjusting the first and last contract years to six months instead of the contractor calculated 9 months, and removal of ODC costs that the SEC evaluated as duplicative.

For Frontier-Arrowhead, I note it proposed a cost of \$33,914,324, had no cost adjustments, and therefore a final probable cost of \$33,914,324.

For EDB International, I note it proposed a cost of \$36,372,981, had a total downward adjustment of \$1,841,154, and therefore a final probable cost of \$34,531,827. I understand cost adjustments were made for unsubstantiated indirect labor rates for Schooley Caldwell Associates and Peterman Associates Incorporated, removal of overtime that was evaluated as unnecessary by the SEC, and removal of cost of money.

I have reviewed the Cost/Price findings for Coast & Harbor, Barr & Prevost, and Suhail / RW Armstrong and feel that their costs offer no competitive advantages over the other offerors.

In the Cost/Price Factor, I find Frontier-Arrowhead to be the lowest overall probable cost to the Government, followed closely by EdArch Partners and then EDB International.

Therefore, in making my selection decision, I have given all factors approximately the same weight, taking into account that Technical Capability plus Relevant Experience and Past Performance, when combined, were significantly more important than Cost in weighting in accordance with the published evaluation scheme of the RFP. I find that Frontier-Arrowhead submitted a qualitatively and quantitatively technically superior proposal to all other offerors because of its superior technical understanding, management approach, and approach to staffing of the contract. Additionally, I agreed with the confidence level of "very high" given to Frontier-Arrowhead for its relevant experience and past performance, particularly because of

Contracting, and a significant weakness for not clearly describing all the information required by the RFP for the contractor's organizational structure and how the organizational structure conforms with FAR Clause 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting. Although I was somewhat impressed with some of the innovations Barr & Prevost proposed throughout the Technical Capability Factor, I was overall not confident that it could perform the work under the contract without risk to the Government based on the various weaknesses and significant weaknesses it had throughout its proposal.

I have thoroughly reviewed the Technical Capability findings for the proposals from Coast & Harbor, EDB International, and EdArch Partners and note the prevalence of weaknesses and significance weaknesses throughout each of their proposals. Such prevalence of significant weaknesses and weaknesses depreciably lessened my degree of confidence that these offerors could even successfully perform the contract without major risk to the Government and therefore I will not address their findings here.

In the Technical Capability Factor, I consider Frontier-Arrowhead to have submitted a superior proposal particularly for its organizational approach to staffing, including a very high incumbent capture rate assuring the continuity of the day-to-day work, which I consider important. Frontier-Arrowhead has detailed an understanding of the work required under the CMIST RFP and has proposed highly qualified personnel, both capable and experienced. Although Suhail / RW Armstrong and Barr & Prevost both demonstrated strengths in Technical Capability, I was concerned with the several weaknesses and significant weaknesses findings for both Suhail / RW Armstrong and Barr & Prevost, particularly in both offerors' ability to understand the requirements. I concluded that Frontier-Arrowhead's demonstrated understanding of the requirements and excellent management approach is a key discriminator for selection because it results in a more balanced approach with less risk and a better likelihood of successful contract performance for the Government.

In the area of Relevant Experience and Past Performance, I note that Frontier-Arrowhead Team received a "Very High" level of confidence. Frontier-Arrowhead had a significant strength in contract relevancy, and two strengths for overall contract performance. I understand the Frontier-Arrowhead's major subcontractor SAIC has direct relevant contract experience with the current GRC EMASS contract and that Frontier-Arrowhead has direct relevancy to the services under CMIST as well on other contracts considered relevant to the anticipated effort. In reviewing the overall performance information available, I understand the team received a number of "Exceeded" ratings on the Past Performance Questionnaires and a number of "Excellent" ratings in the Government's Past Performance Database.

Relative to the Coast & Harbor Team, I note that the team received a "Very High" level of confidence. The Coast & Harbor Team had a strength for contract relevancy and a significant strength and a strength for overall contact performance. I understand that the Coast & Harbor Team had various contracts considered relevant to this effort. In reviewing the overall performance information available, I understand that the performance ratings were consistently in the "Exceeded" range for the majority of the responses to the Past Performance Questionnaire and a number of "Very Good" ratings in the Government's Past Performance Database.

Relative to the EDB International Team, I note the team received a "High" level of confidence. The EDB International Team had a strength for contract relevancy and a significant strength for overall contact performance. I understand that the EDB International Team had various contracts considered relevant to this effort. In reviewing the overall performance information

the type of work it has done and that relevancy to the work for this CMIST contract and its familiarity with Glenn Research Center. Relative to the Cost/Price factor, I find that after probable cost adjustments, Frontier-Arrowhead had the lowest probable cost. Additionally, no cost adjustments needed to be made to Frontier-Arrowhead's cost thereby providing me a greater confidence in its costs.

In summary, the SEC's findings and my independent analysis conclude that the Frontier-Arrowhead's proposal was qualitatively the strongest in the Technical Capability Factor, essentially tied for the best in the Past Performance and Relevant Experience Factor, and had the lowest probable cost proposal to the Government. Frontier-Arrowhead has fully responded to the requirements of the RFP and has displayed the potential to successfully perform the contract requirements at a lower overall cost to the Government.

Therefore, in accordance with the RFP requirements and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria as stated earlier, I find that Frontier-Arrowhead provided the best solution to the CMIST RFP and I therefore select Frontier-Arrowhead to perform the Construction Management, Inspection, Surveillance, and Testing as outlined in the request for proposal NNC12ZFD011R.



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

