

**Source Selection Statement for the  
Center Safety and Fire Operations (CSFO) Contract  
(Solicitation Number NNJ1361974R)**

On May 1, 2014, I met with members of the Streamlined Procurement Team (SLPT) appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Center Safety and Fire Operations (CSFO) Contract, Solicitation NNJ1361974R. Several other officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center (JSC) also attended the presentation. I made my selection decision at this meeting.

**BACKGROUND**

The CSFO is a total 8(a) small business set-aside. The CSFO is an Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee Task Orders (TOs), Firm-Fixed-Price TOs and a Firm-Fixed-Price phase-in period for JSC institutional safety and fire protection services. The performance period of the contract is a five-year base period, with a twenty-nine day phase-in period. The maximum not-to-exceed (NTE) amount for all Task Orders to be issued under the contract is \$37.5M for the five-year period of performance. This is a follow-on contract to the Center Institutional Safety Services (CISS) Contract.

The CSFO contract provides institutional safety and fire protection services to support NASA JSC in accomplishing its institutional safety program objectives. The Contractor specifically supports the JSC Safety and Test Operations Division (STOD). The mission of the STOD is to assist line management and employees in reducing and preventing injuries to NASA personnel and damage to NASA equipment. Together, the STOD employees and the CSFO Contractor provide guidance and assistance ensuring line management fulfills its safety responsibilities and maintains the integrity and effectiveness of the JSC fire protection systems.

The services to be performed under this contract will be performed at the Johnson Space Center, NASA operations at Ellington Field (EF) and Sonny Carter Training Facility (SCTF); all located in Houston, Texas. Intermittent support may be required at other sites for which JSC has responsibility such as the El Paso Forward Operating Location (EPFOL) in El Paso, Texas; the White Sands Test Facility (WSTF) in Las Cruces, New Mexico, and other locations in the continental United States. Safety support may also be required at locations where JSC has interests such as off-site contractor locations, other NASA centers, and other domestic and international non-NASA locations.

On February 22, 2013, a Sources Sought Synopsis was issued, followed by a Request for Information (RFI) from potential Offerors regarding potential organizational conflicts of interest (OCI) on March 25, 2013. On March 26, 2013, an Industry Day Synopsis was posted on the CSFO website providing notice of the Industry Day which was held on April 16, 2013. On August 8, 2013, a draft Statement of Work (SOW) was posted to the CSFO website. On

September 12, 2013, a Pre-Solicitation Synopsis was posted to the CSFO website which included draft Sections L and M, select draft Document Requirement Descriptions (DRDs) and draft pricing templates.

On November 6, 2013, the Contracting Officer issued Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ1361974R with a proposal receipt date of December 10, 2013. Three amendments were issued to the RFP.

### **EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP.

An initial evaluation was performed to determine if proposals were unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals, each Offeror was checked against the "List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-Procurement Programs", and proposals were reviewed for compliance with the solicitation instructions.

**Technical Acceptability** was assessed with ratings of "Acceptable," "Potentially Acceptable" or "Unacceptable." Pursuant to the RFP, for Technical Acceptability, Offerors were required to be rated "Acceptable" or "Potentially Acceptable" in order to continue the evaluation process.

Each "Acceptable" and "Potentially Acceptable" proposal was given a **Past Performance** confidence assessment rating based on the SLPT's evaluation of available information regarding each Offeror's recent and relevant past performance based on the RFP (Section M.4.2) as stated, in part, below:

**Recency:** Contracts with more recent performance will receive greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than those with more distant performance, assuming all other considerations to be equal. Only contracts with performance within 3 years from date of the solicitation will be considered recent. If the contract is still ongoing, it must have a documented performance history. The Government will not consider performance on a newly awarded contract that has no documented performance history (in other words, projects that are less than six months under contract).

**Relevancy:** Relevancy was given an assessment of "Very Relevant," "Relevant," "Somewhat Relevant" or "Not Relevant" As defined in M.4.2 of the RFP.

Additionally, past performance efforts, which include the following elements will be considered more relevant:

- a) Managing diverse safety efforts with changing priorities.
- b) Test Safety, especially in human testing.
- c) Fire Protection System Maintenance.
- d) Emergency Action Services.

More recent and more relevant past performance will receive greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than less recent or less relevant past performance. The performance confidence assessment will be based on the recency, magnitude, complexity and content of the projects being evaluated for past performance, as compared to the effort in the RFP. Contracts that exhibit all specific trades/type of work required under the solicitation statement of work will be considered more relevant than contracts limited to specific trades only.

The proposed past performance effort of the program manager will receive less consideration in the performance confidence assessment than the proposed past performance effort of the same recency, magnitude, complexity and content of that offered by a prime or subcontractor.

The SLPT used information provided by the Offeror and other sources, including the narrative provided by the Offeror in Volume II Past Performance; completed Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) submitted by the Offerors' customers on work similar to CSFO; conversations with Contracting Officers and Contracting Officer Representatives to obtain details about the questionnaires; the Government Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); the Government Award Fee Evaluation System (AFES); information independently obtained from other sources (including commercial sources); OSHA logs, Underwriter Letters and the OSHA website; and EPA Enforcement and Complaints History Online website. The past performance evaluation assessed the degree of confidence the Government had in the Offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements for the contract while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The past performance evaluation considered each Offeror's demonstrated record of performance in supplying the requirements of this solicitation that meet the user's needs. The Offeror's past performance record was examined for recent and relevant past performance to determine its ability to perform the required work.

After evaluating the Offeror's recent and relevant Past Performance, in accordance with the RFP, the SLPT assigned the proposals one of the following Past Performance Confidence Ratings: "Very High Level of Confidence," "High Level of Confidence," "Moderate Level of Confidence," "Low Level of Confidence," "Very Low Level of Confidence," and "Neutral."

The Government performed a *Cost Realism Analysis* on each "Acceptable" or "Potentially Acceptable" proposal in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) 15.305 - Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 - Proposal Analysis, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305 - Proposal Evaluation. The Government performed a cost realism analysis of the proposed direct labor rates and resources, and developed a probable cost estimate for TOs 2 and 3. The Government also evaluated the reasonableness of the non-labor resources for Contract Year 1 only. In addition, the Government performed a price analysis of the fixed price proposed for TO 1 as well as a price analysis of the fully burdened fixed price rates proposed in Section B

of the proposals for future fixed price IDIQ tasks. The probable cost/price reflected the Government's best estimate of the cost/price of any contract that would result from either of the Offeror's proposals, and was used for purposes of evaluation and selection.

RFP Section M.2, Award Without Discussions states:

As provided for in FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions", the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors [except for clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)]. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

RFP Section M.4, Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) Proposal Evaluation and Award, states, in part:

**For those Offerors who are determined to be "Acceptable" under the Technical Acceptability Factor, tradeoffs will be made between Past Performance and Cost/Price. Past Performance is significantly more important than Cost/Price.**

...

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal offers the best overall value to the Government, meets all solicitation requirements, and is determined responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104, "Standards".

### **EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

Three Offerors timely submitted proposals in response to the RFP. The firms that submitted proposals are (in alphabetical order):

- 1.) BGI/Fiore JV, LLC (BGI)
- 2.) GET-NSA, LLC (GET-NSA)
- 3.) NLT Management Services, LLC (NLT)

None of the Offerors took exception to the RFP requirements. All proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP as well as the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement Part 1815.

## **Technical Acceptability**

During the initial evaluation, the SLPT determined Technical Acceptability as follows:

<b>Offeror</b>	<b>Overall Technical Acceptability Rating</b>	<b>Management Approach</b>	<b>Technical Approach</b>
<b>BGI</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>	Unacceptable	Potentially Acceptable
<b>GET-NSA</b>	<b>Potentially Acceptable</b>	Potentially Acceptable	Potentially Acceptable
<b>NLT</b>	<b>Potentially Acceptable</b>	Potentially Acceptable	Acceptable

The SLPT then evaluated Past Performance and Cost/Price on those proposals rated “Potentially Acceptable”, namely, GET-NSA and NLT.

## **Past Performance**

### **GET-NSA**

The SLPT evaluated past performance information for GET-NSA, its one subcontractor, MEI Technologies, Inc. (MEIT), and its proposed Program Manager (PM). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Overall, the SLPT found the GET-NSA Team’s past performance to be “Relevant” to the work to be performed in the CSFO solicitation.

The past performance of GET-NSA, the prime contractor, was determined to be overall “Somewhat Relevant” to the CSFO SOW requirements. Additionally, GET-NSA has “Somewhat Relevant” experience in three (Fire Protection System Maintenance, Emergency Action Services, and Test Safety Operations (without human testing)) of the four elements considered more relevant, according to the RFP.

The past performance of MEIT was determined to be overall “Very Relevant” across all but one of the SOW areas. MEIT lacks relevant experience in SOW 5.0 Fire Protection System Maintenance Services. Additionally, the SLPT found that MEIT has “Very Relevant” experience in two (Emergency Action Services and Test Safety Operations) of the four elements considered more relevant according to the RFP.

The past performance of the proposed PM was determined to be “Somewhat Relevant” to the CSFO requirements. The SLPT found that the PM had limited experience in the four elements that were considered more relevant according to the RFP. Specifically, although there was experience with emergency response planning (SOW 6.4), there was no relevant experience with the other emergency action services required in SOW 6.0. There was also no relevant experience with fire protection system maintenance and test safety operations.

The GET-NSA Team's past performance includes multiple contracts with much of the same complexity as the proposed CSFO contract. The GET-NSA proposal includes multiple examples of contracts which involve essentially the same or a larger magnitude of effort than is expected for the CSFO. In particular, GET-NSA's contract with the Department of Energy Office of Health, Safety, and Security's Office of Classification (DOE HSS) Contract has a slightly larger magnitude of effort than the CSFO. The SLPT assessed the overall contract performance and quality of work performed on the past performance contracts referenced in GET-NSA's proposal, as well as other relevant work the SLPT identified through independent research.

The SLPT interviewed Contracting Officers (COs), Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs), and other points of contact (POCs) to obtain a better understanding of the quality of support provided. With one exception, all ratings for all proposed past performance contracts were "Excellent" or "Very Good." The only ratings below "Very Good" were found in a PPQ for MEIT's Test and Evaluation Support Team (TEST) subcontract. The ratings included in this PPQ were all "Good" and "Satisfactory". The respondent had high levels of satisfaction with technical support and lower ratings for MEI's corporate support.

The SLPT found the GET-NSA Team's safety performance for the past three years indicates a low risk to JSC's safety and health performance. All safety performance indicators were below the industry average with no OSHA or EPA violations reported in the past three years.

The SLPT reviewed all of this past performance information and assigned a Past Performance confidence rating of "**High Level of Confidence**" to the GET-NSA Team.

#### NLT

The SLPT evaluated past performance information for NLT, its one subcontractor, Anadarko Industries, LLC (AI), and its proposed PM. All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Overall, the SLPT found the NLT Team's past performance to be "Relevant" to the work to be performed in the CSFO solicitation.

The past performance of NLT, the prime contractor, was determined to be overall "Somewhat Relevant" to the CFO SOW requirements. Additionally, NLT has "Somewhat Relevant" experience in one (managing changing priorities without diverse safety efforts) of the four elements considered more relevant, according to the RFP.

The past performance of AI was determined to be overall "Very Relevant" across all aspects of the SOW including those considered more relevant. AI has "Very Relevant" experience in all four elements considered more relevant, according to the RFP.

The past performance of the proposed PM was determined to be "Very Relevant" in managing safety-related work on contracts with the same magnitude and complexity as the CSFO contract.

Additionally, the PM has “Very Relevant” experience in all four elements considered more relevant, according to the RFP.

The NLT Team’s past performance includes multiple contracts which involve much of the same complexity as the CSFO solicitation. This work includes all of the work performed on the current JSC Center Institutional Safety Services (CISS) contract. The NLT proposal includes multiple examples of contracts which involve much of the same magnitude of effort as is expected for the CSFO. In particular, NLT’s ATF Laboratory Support Services contract involved much of the same magnitude of effort as the CSFO. The SLPT also assessed the contract performance and quality of work performed on the past performance contracts referenced in NLT’s proposal, as well as other relevant work the SLPT identified through independent research.

The SLPT interviewed Contracting Officers (COs), Contracting Officer’s Representatives (CORs), and other points of contact (POCs) to obtain a better understanding of the quality of support provided. With a one exception, all ratings for all proposed past performance contracts were “Excellent” or “Very Good.” A rating of “Satisfactory” was noted in the PPIRS assessment report for AI’s performance under the CISS contract for the evaluation period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 in the area of safety and health. The assessment report included the statement “The contractor had one lost time injury as a result of an auto accident. The investigation showed that the contractor could not have prevented the accident. There was also a small property damage incident due to inadvertent deluge activation. The contractor thoroughly investigated the incident and took corrective action beyond what was expected.” The SLPT considered this “Satisfactory” rating to be minor in nature with no adverse effect on overall performance. Additionally, as shown above, these issues were corrected to the satisfaction of the SLPT. All other ratings identified in the SLPT’s review of the NLT Team’s past performance contracts were “Very Good” or “Excellent.”

The SLPT found that the NLT Team’s safety past performance for the past three years indicates a moderate risk to JSC’s safety and health performance. AI’s OSHA Recordable rates for all three years were above the RFP NAICS 541330 industry averages. No OSHA or EPA violations were reported in the past three years. The SLPT’s review determined that AI’s small size and low number of establishments tend to amplify the effects of a single incident and that injury rate trends show improvement over time.

The SLPT reviewed all of this past performance information and assigned a Past Performance confidence rating of “**High Level of Confidence**” to the NLT Team.

**Cost/Price**

**GET-NSA**

GET-NSA’s proposed cost/price proposal was completed in accordance with the RFP instructions. In accordance with Section M, to ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, the SLPT performed price analysis and cost analysis to include a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.305. After performing the cost realism analysis, the SLPT made an adjustment to the proposed cost based on GET-NSA’s initial proposed incumbent retention rate and commitment to pay incumbent labor rates. Additionally, a technical adjustment was made to the number of WYEs.

**NLT**

NLT’s proposed cost/price proposal was completed in accordance with the RFP instructions. In accordance with Section M, to ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, the SLPT performed price analysis and cost analysis to include a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.305. After performing the cost realism analysis, the SLPT made an adjustment to the proposed cost based on NLT’s initial proposed incumbent retention rate and commitment to pay incumbent labor rates.

**Competitive Range Determination**

Based on the SLPT’s initial evaluation of proposals, on February 27, 2014, I concurred with the Contracting Officer’s determination that it was in the Government’s best interest to include GET-NSA and NLT in the competitive range. The SLPT engaged in written discussions with the two Offerors remaining in competitive range.

**Discussions and Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions**

GET-NSA and NLT were informed of their inclusion in the competitive range on March 5, 2014. The SLPT conducted three rounds of written discussions with both Offerors. At the conclusion of discussions, both Offerors were given an opportunity to submit final proposal revisions (FPRs) and signed model contracts that would reflect their intent to be contractually bound. The SLPT received FPRs from both Offerors by the delivery due date of April 9, 2014.

After evaluating both Offerors' FPRs, **the SLPT rated the proposals submitted by GET-NSA and NLT as Technically “Acceptable”:**

<b>Offeror</b>	<b>Overall Technical Acceptability Rating</b>	<b>Management Approach</b>	<b>Technical Approach</b>
<b>GET-NSA</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	Acceptable	Acceptable
<b>NLT</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	Acceptable	Acceptable

The SLPT also assessed a past performance level of confidence rating for each Offeror. The SLPT assigned a **High Level of Confidence rating to the GET-NSA Team's past performance** and a **High Level of Confidence rating to the NLT Team's past performance**.

The SLPT also determined a probable cost/price for each proposal in accordance with the RFP. The SLPT found that the **costs proposed by GET-NSA and NLT in the FPRs were fair and reasonable for the work to be performed**. Direct and indirect rates were validated by review of historical information submitted with the proposals. NLT proposed a lower overall price than GET-NSA. Final probable cost adjustments were developed for GET-NSA's Cost Reimbursement Task Orders 2 and 3 due to GET-NSA's proposed incumbent retention rate and commitment to pay incumbent labor rates. Similarly, final probable cost adjustments were developed for NLT's Cost Reimbursement Task Orders 2 and 3 due to NLT's proposed incumbent retention rate and commitment to pay incumbent labor rates. I also noted the increase in the proposed price of GET-NSA. The SLPT explained this was a result of GET-NSA's revised management and technical approach which increased costs in their FPR.

### **SOURCE SELECTION DECISION**

My decision is based on selecting the proposal offering the best overall value to the Government in accordance with the RFP's stated criteria for award. I reviewed the SLPT evaluation and posed a variety of questions, solicited the SLPT member views, expressed my own, dispositioned any questions and made the selection.

I agreed with the SLPT that each Offeror provided a technical approach and a management approach that is at a level of reasonableness, feasibility and completeness where associated risks do not jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance. Consequently, I also agreed with the SLPT that both Offerors' overall Technical Acceptability Ratings were "Acceptable."

In assessing the relative value of the Past Performance of all proposals, I reviewed the SLPT documentation of Past Performance and level of confidence ratings.

Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, the lengthy discussion during the selection meeting, and applying the RFP's stated Past Performance evaluation criteria, I determined an overall Past Performance confidence rating of "High Level of Confidence" for the GET-NSA Team. I accepted the SLPT's findings that all reference contracts were found to be recent and the Past Performance of the GET-NSA Team was relevant to the solicitation's SOW requirements. In our discussion, I noted that the GET-NSA Team had limited relevant experience in some areas. Specifically, although the prime has "Somewhat Relevant" experience in SOW 5.0, neither the subcontractor, nor the PM has experience in Fire Protection System Maintenance Services. Fire Protection System Maintenance Services is also mentioned in the RFP as one of the areas considered more relevant. These services are a significant component of the work to be performed on the contract.

Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, the lengthy discussion during the selection meeting, and applying the RFP's stated Past Performance

evaluation criteria, I determined an overall Past Performance confidence rating of “High Level of Confidence” for the NLT Team. I accepted the SLPT’s findings that all reference contracts are recent and the Past Performance of the NLT Team was relevant to the solicitation’s SOW requirements. In our discussion, I delved into a few areas I noted in my review of the information presented. I specifically questioned the SLPT on the moderate risk rating on safety, particularly since this is a safety contract. The SLPT responded by stating that the moderate rating was based largely on the Subcontractor’s safety performance. It was pointed out to me that the Subcontractor’s small size and low number of establishments amplify the effects of a low number of incidents, and that the injury rate trends show improvement over time. I also took note of the NLT Team’s experience in the four elements which were considered more relevant in the RFP. According to the SLPT, although the prime only had experience in one of the four elements, the sub-contractor, AI, and the PM had “Very Relevant” experience in all four elements. Additionally, the subcontractor had “Very Relevant” experience in most of the work in the SOW; in those areas where the subcontractor had only “Relevant” experience, the experience was in managing a subcontractor who was performing those elements of the work. I also noted that the PM has “Very Relevant” experience in all areas of the SOW. I did question the SLPT why the team relevancy rating was “Relevant” rather than “Very Relevant” and they explained that the technical content of the experience of the prime was limited to one of the four elements considered to be more relevant.

Considering the entirety of the information provided by both Offerors, in addition to my independent knowledge, the lengthy discussion at the selection meeting, and the SLPT’s evaluation statements, I note my complete confidence that both Offerors could perform the work required by the solicitation’s SOW. However, I noted that the NLT Team had relevant experience, in those areas of Past Performance noted in section M.4.2 of the RFP (Managing diverse safety efforts with changing priorities; Test Safety, especially in human testing; Fire Protection System Maintenance; and Emergency Services); whereas, the GET-NSA Team lacked relevant experience in some of those areas, particularly in the area of Fire Protection System Maintenance. Although the PM’s experience does not weigh as heavily as that of the prime and subcontractor, when looking at the team, as a whole, the NLT Team has more relevant experience than the GET-NSA Team.

In assessing the Cost/Price, I agreed with the SLPT’s cost/price evaluation. The proposed cost/price of both Offerors’ proposals were fair and reasonable. There was a \$1.9M delta between the probable prices of the two offers. This difference is equivalent to over \$300K per year.

### **FINAL DECISION**

Tradeoffs were made between Past Performance and Cost/Price. According to the RFP, “Past Performance is significantly more important than Cost/Price”.

In making my decision, I found that there were material discriminators in Past Performance that were significantly more important than Cost, and therefore offers the best value to the Government. NLT’s Past Performance provides the Government with a high level of confidence that they will successfully perform the work required under the contract. Additionally, even

though cost is the least important, NLT also has the lowest cost to the Government. As a result of this assessment, I select NLT for the Center Safety and Fire Operations contract.

The Contracting Officer has determined that NLT is eligible in accordance with FAR 9.104. Therefore, in accordance with the RFP statement that the Government will award to the Offeror whose proposal offers the best overall value to the Government that meets all solicitation requirements, I find the proposal submitted by NLT is the best value to the Government and select NLT to perform the Center Safety and Fire Operations contract.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jose C. Garcia  
Source Selection Authority

5-14-14  
Date