

SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
Langley Research Center (LaRC) Force Measurement Support Services (FMSS)
Contract
Request for Proposal (RFP) Number NNL13464982R**

On August 27, 2013, the Source Evaluation Team (SET) for the FMSS procurement presented its findings to me in a formal source selection briefing.

Background

The purpose of the FMSS contract is to procure high quality force measurement and strain gage instrumentation for NASA programs and projects by obtaining services to produce, calibrate, repair and utilize these instruments in a wide range of environments (e.g. from cryogenic to high temperature ranges) and applications. Typical services include engineering design, drafting, fabrication, instrumentation, repair, design of experiments, statistical methods, calibration with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) traceability, evaluation and estimation of existing or new force and strain measuring instruments.

Market research was conducted in order to determine the level of existing small business capabilities. On December 10, 2012, a sources-sought synopsis was issued on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and the Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) website seeking capability statements from potential sources under NAICS code 334511, Search, Detection, Navigation, Guidance, Aeronautical and Nautical System and Instrument Manufacturing, with a size standard of 750 employees. Based on the three responses received, the Contracting Officer (CO), with the concurrence of the Small Business Specialist and the Small Business Administration (SBA) Procurement Center Representative, determined that an adequate number of small business concerns did not exist to allow the FMSS procurement to be conducted as a total Small Business set-aside. Therefore, the FMSS acquisition was conducted as a full and open competition.

The SSA appointed the LaRC SET on March 4, 2013 to evaluate the proposals received in response to the RFP. An Acquisition Planning & Strategy Meeting was held on March 8, 2013 at LaRC. The RFP was released on May 17, 2013.

The FMSS RFP contained provisions for partial awards to be made by Contract Line Item Number (CLIN). Each CLIN is set up as an Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) effort with a five-year period of performance. Task orders issued against awarded contracts will be awarded on a Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) or Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee (CPFF) basis. The total maximum cumulative value of all the IDIQ contracts issued is not to exceed \$9.725M.

The following companies (listed in alphabetical order) submitted proposals in response to the RFP and all proposals were received on or before the due date of June 18, 2013:

- Modern Machine and Tool Company, Incorporated (Modern)
- Triumph Aerospace Systems – Newport News (Triumph)

Evaluation Process and Factors

This best value source selection was conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 15. The appointed SET conducted an evaluation of proposals in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in Section M of the RFP. As stated in the RFP, the SET initially performed reviews on all proposals to determine acceptability in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. The acceptable proposals then were evaluated for technical acceptability based on the “Technical Considerations” set forth in the RFP Section M.2. Finally, for each CLIN, the SET conducted a separate evaluation for each Offeror in accordance with the following three evaluation factors that were set forth in the RFP:

Factor 1: Price

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Small Business Utilization

The RFP stated that the contract would be awarded to the Offerors whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on the evaluation of Past Performance, Price, and Small Business Utilization. The RFP also stated that it was anticipated that award will be made without discussions. In addition, the RFP stated that a tradeoff process (see FAR 15.101-1) would be performed between the factors of past performance, price, and small business utilization on those proposals determined to be technically acceptable. Overall, in the selection of an Offeror for contract award, the Past Performance Factor was significantly more important than the Price Factor in importance. The Price Factor was somewhat more important than the Small Business Utilization Factor.

The CO’s determination that the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive was based on the multiple offers received and the fact that there were no deficiencies identified in the proposals.

Technical Considerations

Under Technical Considerations (RFP Section M.2), the four areas were evaluated as follows:

Technical Area 1 – Quality	Demonstration that quality systems were certified in ISO 9001 and/or AS9100 standards
Technical Area 2 – Facility and Equipment	Demonstration that offeror has facility/equipment needed to perform the contract
Technical Area 3 – Facility Clearance	Proof that offeror has facility clearance at the level identified in the RFP
Technical Area 4 – Staffing Capability	Demonstration that offeror has (or will have) the labor skills as set forth in Attachment 2 to the RFP

Factor 1 – Price

The RFP does not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Price Factor; however, the RFP provides evaluation language in Section M.3(a), as follows:

In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b), the Government will conduct an analysis of the price/cost proposal to determine completeness, price reasonableness, and cost realism. Specifically, the evaluations will include, but are not limited to, comparing the prices proposed in response to this solicitation and comparing the proposed prices to the independent Government cost estimate (IGCE). Results of the price/cost analysis may be used in responsibility determinations.

Factor 2 – Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor, the SET assessed each Offeror's current/recent record (including the record of any subcontractors, but not the past performance of individuals who are proposed to be involved in the required work) of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation. Specifically, the RFP stated that each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "pertinence" component. The Offeror must meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating. In assessing "performance," the Government made an assessment of each Offeror's overall performance record and each significant subcontractor's overall performance record. The Government evaluated the Offeror's and any significant subcontractors' past performance record for meeting technical, schedule, cost, management, overall mission success, subcontracting goals, and other contract requirements. In assessing "pertinence," the Government considered the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity to the requirements in the solicitation, as well as the recency and duration of the past performance of each Offeror and each significant subcontractor. The SET used the following confidence level ratings to evaluate the Past Performance Factor in accordance with NFS 1815.305:

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.

Factor 3 – Small Business Utilization

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program applied to all Offerors, except that small businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan was evaluated in terms of the Offeror's proposed subcontracting goals in comparison to the CO's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals as stated in the RFP for the FMSS procurement. The Offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan was also evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR

19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements. Additionally, the Offeror's commitment to the small business program was evaluated for strengths and weaknesses as appropriate. In doing this NASA evaluated: 1) the extent to which any work performed by a small business as prime or subcontractor(s) was identified as "high technology" and the commitment to utilize the prime or subcontractor(s) (i.e. enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments); 2) the extent to which the identity of small business subcontractors were specified in the proposal as well as the extent of the commitment to use the small business(es) identified; and 3) the Offeror's established or planned procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and small business identification, and relevant purchasing procedures. The Small Business Utilization Factor was not adjectively rated or scored.

Evaluation Procedures and Findings

The SET members initially reviewed each Offeror's proposal in sufficient depth to identify any proposals that were unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All proposals were evaluated in accordance with Step 1 of RFP Section M.1(c) and were found to warrant further consideration. The SET then reviewed, in depth, the acceptable proposals, as stated below.

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. The SET rated the proposals as "acceptable", "reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable", or "unacceptable". All Offerors' Technical Proposals were rated by the SET as "Acceptable" based on the Technical Considerations set forth in the RFP. The following is a summary of the results of the SET evaluation:

Offeror	Overall Technical	Criteria 1 Quality (ISO 9001)	Criteria 2 Facility & Equipment	Criteria 3 Facility Clearance (Secret)	Criteria 4 Staffing Capability
Modern	Acceptable	ISO 9001 (Certificate is current through 6/10/15.)	Provided acceptable facilities in Newport News including a facility layout/floor plan and equipment list	Currently approved for a DD254 level of Secret	Provided an acceptable approach to staff the contract by including resumes for numerous personnel and an organizational chart
Triumph	Acceptable	ISO 9001 (Certificate is current through 9/28/13.)	Provided acceptable facilities in Newport News and San Diego including a facility layout/floor plan and equipment list	Currently approved for a DD254 level of Secret	Provided an acceptable approach to staff the contract by including 3 resumes and an organizational chart

Factor 1 – 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 FMSS contract requirements. Offerors' price proposals were evaluated in accordance with Section M.3(a), Factor 1 - Price, of the RFP.

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 adequate price competition, comparison of the proposed prices of the two competing Offerors with each other, and comparison of the proposed prices to the IGCE.

Modern:

Modern's proposed price for each CLIN was either equal to or slightly higher than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed and reflected a clear understanding of the FMSS contract requirements. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. Modern had the lowest total overall evaluated price for all CLINs among the two Offerors evaluated.

Triumph:

Triumph's proposed price for each CLIN was higher than the IGCE. The SET found the price proposal to be realistic for the work to be performed and reflected a clear understanding of the FMSS contract requirements. The price proposal was found to be fair and reasonable. Triumph had the highest total overall evaluation price for all CLINs among the two Offerors evaluated.

Factor 2 – Past Performance

The SET evaluated the Offerors' past performance in accordance with RFP Section M.3(b) (Past Performance Factor) 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 two evaluated Offerors:

Offeror	Pertinence	Performance	Confidence Rating
Modern CLIN 0001 CLIN 0002 CLIN 0003	Highly Pertinent Not Pertinent Highly Pertinent	Very Good Satisfactory Exceptional	High Level of Confidence Very Low Level of Confidence High Level of Confidence
Triumph CLIN 0001 CLIN 0002 CLIN 0003	Somewhat Pertinent Highly Pertinent Somewhat Pertinent	Satisfactory Very Good Not Applicable	Low Level of Confidence High Level of Confidence Neutral

CLIN 0001:

Modern:

For Pertinence, Modern's past performance volume contained sufficient information, but not in great detail in all areas, related to the CLIN 0001 requirements. The SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent based on work Modern performed under contract NNL08AA21B at NASA LaRC that aligns very closely to the statements of work (SOW) elements contained in the RFP. The LaRC effort is considered highly pertinent in size, content, and complexity. The Highly Pertinent rating was further corroborated by the Contracting Officer Representative (COR) of LaRC contract NNL08AA21B. Modern also referenced two commercial efforts that were not considered comparable in size and dollar value, but the strain gaging effort was considered somewhat pertinent and the dynamometer effort was considered highly pertinent due to similarity and complexity of the requirements (strain gaging, calibration, and instrumentation, design, fabrication, finite element analysis).

For Performance, the SET determined that Modern demonstrated Very Good performance based on contract performance at NASA LaRC under contract NNL08AA21B and from past performance evaluations submitted by other commercial customers. The information from the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) reports and the two past performance questionnaires submitted by commercial customers showed Modern's overall performance is rated as Very Good to Exceptional for the LaRC and two commercial efforts, with the predominance being Very Good. In addition, all other areas such as safety, cost, schedule, business relations, management of personnel, and higher level quality standards received ratings of Very Good to Exceptional. For the two commercial efforts, there was no performance rated in cryogenic balance design and pressurized balance calibrations, which these functions were rated as Not Applicable for CLIN 0001.

Confidence Rating: Considering the Highly Pertinent rating, combined with the Very Good Performance rating, an overall High Level of Confidence was assigned using the rating definitions contained in the RFP.

Triumph:

For Pertinence, Triumph's past performance volume did not contain sufficient details to evaluate all functional areas of CLIN 0001. The information provided for standards metrology, cryogenic balance design, limited calibration of pressurized balances, design of single-piece balance, and fabrication is insufficient for evaluation. These areas are critical to CLIN 0001. Triumph stated that they have performed metrology and did not describe the types of metrology instruments calibrated or the volume of metrology instruments calibrated. Triumph's references illustrated additional efforts ranging from \$45K to \$332K which are not commensurate with the size, content, and complexity of the Government's requirements for CLIN 0001. The SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Somewhat Pertinent relating to CLIN 0001 requirements that were stated in the RFP.

For Performance, the four questionnaire ratings received ranged from Marginal to Exceptional. These questionnaires did not provide rating information for design and analysis of force balances for cryogenic environments and two of the questionnaires did not receive ratings for single-piece balance and fabrication which limited the amount of performance information available for evaluation. The CPARS ratings range from Satisfactory to Very Good. However, only one of the reports supported CLIN 0001 force measurement related requirements and did not indicate an ability to design, fabricate, strain gage, or provide metrology services as they relate to force measurement services. All other areas such as safety, cost, schedule, business relations, management of personnel, and higher level quality standards received ratings of Very Good to Exceptional. Overall, the SET determined Triumph's performance for CLIN 0001 to be Satisfactory based on the ratings received from questionnaires and CPARS reports and due to the fact that there was limited performance information for the CLIN 001 functions.

Confidence Rating: Given the Somewhat Pertinence rating combined with the Satisfactory Performance rating, an overall Low Level of Confidence was assigned using the rating definitions contained in the RFP.

CLIN 0002:

Modern:

For Pertinence, the SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Not Pertinent relating to CLIN 0002 requirements that were stated in the RFP. Modern's example of large load calibrations work is not relevant because the work described is not within the

calibration load range defined in the SOW. The calibration of a task balance for NASA LaRC is considered to be relevant but only demonstrated one of the four areas of the CLIN 0002 requirements. Modern did not provide any evidence that they have performed work of the size, content, and complexity required for the performance of CLIN 0002.

For Performance, the SET determined that Modern demonstrated Satisfactory performance relating to CLIN 0002 requirements that were stated in the RFP. Modern did not receive any ratings for the following CLIN 0002 SOW elements: design, fabrication, repair of high capacity or task balances, large load rig (LLR) calibrations, or automatic balance calibration system (ABCS) calibrations. The only demonstrated work was at NASA LaRC in the area of calibration of task balances which received a rating of satisfactory. No additional performance information was available in CPARS or the Customer Questionnaires to support any CLIN 0002 requirements that were performed by Modern. There were no problems in areas such as safety, cost, schedule, business relations, management of personnel, and higher level quality standards and received ratings of Very Good to Excellent for these functions.

Confidence Rating: Given the Not Pertinence rating combined with the Satisfactory Performance rating, an overall Very Low Level of Confidence was assigned using the rating definitions contained in the RFP.

Triumph:

For Pertinence, the SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent based on the ratings that Triumph received for its work in the SOW elements relevant to the FMSS contract. Triumph has demonstrated highly pertinent experience based on size, content, and complexity based on the past performance volume and the four questionnaires received. The information from past performance volume clearly demonstrated Triumph's CLIN 0002 experience, and the CPARS and Customer's questionnaires confirmed this level of pertinence.

For Performance, the SET determined that Triumph demonstrated Very Good performance relating to CLIN 0002 requirements that were stated in the RFP. The information from CPARS and the Customer's questionnaires received indicates that Triumph has the ability to perform all CLIN 0002 requirements. Overall, when combining the information from CPAR, and the customer past performance questionnaires, the SET determined Triumph's overall performance as being Very Good. All other areas such as safety, cost, schedule, business relations, management of personnel, and higher level quality standards received ratings of Marginal to Exceptional, with most of the ratings in the Very Good range.

Confidence Rating: Considering the Highly Pertinent rating combined with the Very Good Performance rating, an overall High Level of Confidence was assigned using the rating definitions contained in the RFP.

CLIN 0003:

Modern:

For Pertinence, the SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent based on work Modern performed under contract NNL08AA21B at NASA LaRC that aligns very closely to the SOW elements contained in the RFP. The LaRC effort is considered highly pertinent in size, content, and complexity based on the information provided in Modern's proposal when compared to the CLIN 0003 requirements that were stated in the RFP.

For Performance, the SET determined that Modern demonstrated Exceptional performance based on work Modern performed under contract NNL08AA21B at NASA LaRC. The information from the CPARS reports and the customer past performance questionnaires received indicates that Modern's overall performance is rated as Exceptional for the LaRC effort. For the two commercial efforts, the information from the customer past performance questionnaires received discloses "Not Applicable" ratings for CLIN 0003 requirements. All other areas such as safety, cost, schedule, business relations, management of personnel, and higher level quality standards received ratings of Very Good to Exceptional.

Confidence Rating: Considering the Highly Pertinent rating combined with the Exceptional Performance rating, an overall High Level of Confidence was assigned using the rating definitions contained in the RFP.

Triumph:

For Pertinence, the SET assigned an overall pertinence rating of Somewhat Pertinent. Triumph's past performance volume demonstrates that Triumph's CLIN 0003 work is limited only to strain gage instrumentation for high-temperature efforts which is highly pertinent to RFP requirements for CLIN 0003. However, there was no Single Vector System (SVS) calibration, cryogenic strain gage installation, or cryogenic check loadings work demonstrated. In addition, Triumph's past performance volume did not include details to demonstrate previous work that is comparable in size, content, and complexity to the RFP requirements and does not meet minimum acceptable standards for SVS and cryogenic work.

For Performance, the SET rated Triumph's past performance factor for CLIN 0003 as "Not Applicable." The information from the Customer's past performance questionnaires received did not address any CLIN 0003 work. No CPARS or past performance questionnaire information was available for CLIN 0003. The past performance volume included information on performing high temperature instrumentation for a commercial customer, but no demonstrated performance ratings was provided. Therefore, Triumph was not evaluated favorably or unfavorably on its demonstration of past performance.

Confidence Rating: Given the Somewhat Pertinence rating combined with a “Not Applicable” Performance rating, an overall Neutral Level of Confidence was assigned using the rating definitions contained in the RFP.

Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization

Set forth below is a summary of the Small Business Utilization Findings for the Offerors. As required by RFP Section M.3(c) and Amendment 2 of the solicitation, the SET only evaluated the Offeror’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan (if applicable) and Commitment to the Small Business Program for strengths and weaknesses relating to CLIN 0001.

Offeror	Small Business Subcontracting Plan	Commitment to Small Business
Modern	Not Applicable	Meets
Triumph	Weakness	Meets

Modern:

In its proposal Modern demonstrated its commitment to small businesses by commitment letters that disclosed the amount of participation with the other small businesses. In addition, Modern identified targeted efforts such as machining and polishing of components for areas with potential for small business subcontracting.

Triumph:

The RFP specified an overall small business goal of 15 percent. Triumph proposed meeting a 12.5 percent goal. It was determined that Triumph meets 10 of the 11 subcontracting plan requirements failing only to identify the types of small businesses that would perform which technical requirement of the contract. Triumph explained they could not identify small business types because this is an IDIQ contract and until the work is defined they cannot make specific commitments, which was considered reasonable for this effort.

BASIS FOR SELECTION

The SET presented its findings to me on August 27, 2013. A follow up meeting was held on September 3, 2013, 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. At the August 27, 2013 meeting, I asked questions about specific aspects of the past performance evaluations in order to enhance my understanding. After all questions were answered on September 3, 2013, I was satisfied that I fully understood their findings. I then proceeded to make my selections as follows.

I comparatively assessed the proposals against the evaluation factors in the RFP. Given that the RFP states the Past Performance Factor was significantly more important than the Price Factor and that the Price Factor was somewhat more important than the Small Business Utilization Factor, I evaluated the offers as stated herein and using these factors as indicators of which Offeror provides the best value to the Government.

CLIN 0001: I noted that Modern had the lowest evaluated price of \$8,678,695 and received a High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance. I noted that Triumph's evaluated price for CLIN 0001 was significantly higher priced and received a Low Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance. I also considered that the Past Performance evaluation factor was significantly more important than Price. I also noted that Triumph received a weakness in the Small Business Utilization factor while Modern's commitment to Small Business Utilization was considered acceptable. With Modern's High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance combined with the lower Price and acceptable commitment for Small Business Utilization, I determined that Modern represents the best value to the Government for CLIN 0001.

CLIN 0002: I noted that Modern was the lowest priced Offeror; however, received a Very Low Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance. I noted that Triumph's evaluated price of \$876,731 was higher; although, received a High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance. Factor 3, Small Business Utilization, was not applicable to CLIN 0002 because this requirement was not estimated to exceed the \$650,000 threshold contained in FAR 19.702. A higher degree of confidence of successful performance represents value because the instrumentation being produced on this CLIN is directly related to LaRC's research product and reduces programmatic and technical risk for the Center. At this point, because the solicitation stated Past Performance is significantly more important than Price, I decided that the High Level of Confidence of Triumph was worth the additional cost and determined that Triumph represents the best value to the Government for CLIN 0002.

CLIN 0003: I noted that Modern was the lowest priced Offeror at \$658,186 and received a High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance. I noted that Triumph was the highest priced Offeror and received a neutral rating for Past Performance reflecting no identifiable relevant past performance record. Factor 3, Small Business Utilization, was not applicable to CLIN 0003 because this requirement was not estimated to exceed the \$650,000 threshold contained in FAR 19.702. Since Modern's proposal provided a High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance at a lower price, I determined that Modern represents the best value to the Government for CLIN 0003.

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.

For CLIN 0001, Modern's proposal provides the greater benefit to the Agency based on my integrated assessment of Past Performance, Price, and Small Business Utilization. Modern's higher rated Past Performance at a lower price is highly beneficial to the Center due to the reduced risk and higher confidence of successful performance. Modern's higher rated Past Performance provides confidence they can successfully perform CLIN 0001. In addition, their support of Small Business Utilization is acceptable. Therefore, I select Modern for award of CLIN 0001.

For CLIN 0002, Triumph's proposal provides the greater benefit to the Agency based on my integrated assessment of Past Performance and Price. Triumph's higher rated Past Performance even with the higher Price is of more value to the Government as it provides reduced risk and a higher confidence of successful performance when compared to Modern's lower Past Performance rating. While Triumph's price for CLIN 0002 is higher than the Independent Government Cost Estimate and Modern's price, I have concluded the higher rated Past Performance is worth the additional cost. Therefore, I select Triumph for award of CLIN 0002.

For CLIN 0003, Modern's proposal provides the greater benefit to the Agency based on my integrated assessment of Past Performance and Price. Modern's higher rated Past Performance factor at a lower price is highly beneficial to the Center due to the reduced risk and higher confidence of successful performance. Modern's higher rated Past Performance provides confidence they can successfully perform CLIN 0003. Therefore, I select Modern for award of CLIN 0003.



C. Tom Weih
Source Selection Authority

9/17/13
Date