

Source Selection Statement for the
Planning and Accelerated Construction Contract 2 (PACC 2)
(Solicitation Number NNJ15510750R)

1. On July 7, 2015, I met with the members of the Streamlined Procurement Team (SLPT) appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Planning and Accelerated Construction Contract 2 (PACC 2). This Solicitation seeks to award a single Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract to a qualified small business in the U.S. Small Business Administration's 8(a) Business Development Program. Several other officials of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center also attended the meeting. The presentation charts represent the final source selection evaluation report and are herein incorporated by reference.

Background

2. The PACC 2 Contract is a single-award IDIQ, Firm Fixed Price acquisition. The performance period of the contract is three-years and the contract has a maximum value of \$9.5M.
3. The scope of the contract effort includes strategic planning for construction, modification and repair and/or performance of minor construction modification and repair. It also includes design-build, design services and historic preservation mitigation services at the NASA Johnson Space Center, Ellington Field, Sonny Carter Training Facility, and White Sands Test Facility.
4. On December 12, 2014, the Contracting Officer issued Request to Proposal (RFP) NNJ15510750R with a proposal receipt date of February 24, 2015. Two amendments were issued on January 22, 2015, and January 27, 2015, respectively.
5. Offerors were notified the Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors and subfactors in the solicitation. Section M.5, Source Selection Decision, of the RFP, states "the award of the PACC 2 contract will be based on a "Performance Price Trade-off" process. For those offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable (i.e. pass the Technical Proposal Factor), tradeoffs will be made between past performance and price. Past Performance is significantly more important than Price."

Evaluation Procedures

6. The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP. The evaluation process was as follows: (1) an initial evaluation was performed to determine if proposals were unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. The companies were also checked against the "List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-Procurement Programs," and proposals were reviewed for compliance with the solicitation instructions. (2) All proposals were then evaluated against the factors listed in the RFP. These factors included technical acceptability (pass/fail), past performance and price.
7. The evaluation factors and their relative importance were described in Section M.3 of the RFP. The Government evaluated Offerors' Technical Proposals on a "pass/fail" basis. Only offers that were determined to be technically acceptable (i.e. pass the Technical Proposal Factor) would be considered for tradeoffs between the past performance and price factors. Past Performance is

significantly more important than Price in reaching the Government's best value decision for award.

8. Technical acceptability was assessed, assigning ratings of either Acceptable (A), Potentially Acceptable (PA), or Unacceptable (U) in order to determine whether proposals met the Government's baseline requirements. Pursuant to the RFP, for technical acceptability, offerors were required to provide the following: (a) bonding capacity of \$1 million per project and \$3 million for the aggregate project amount; (b) the name and license number of the civil, electrical, or mechanical registered professional engineer(s) that is/are capable and responsible for stamping and sealing construction/building/design documents in the states of Texas and New Mexico; (c) a resume(s) for the Historian and/or Archeologist that demonstrates evidence of meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards and includes projects that have been completed; and (d) a current, comprehensive and reasonable, written General Safety and Health Plan describing the Contractor's overall Safety and Health Program. In accordance with Section M.4 B, all technical acceptability subfactors must be passed to be rated Technically Acceptable.
9. In accordance with RFP Section M.4, a proposal will be rated "acceptable" under the Technical Proposal Evaluation Factor, when ALL baseline requirements specified therein are individually rated acceptable based on the level of completeness and reasonableness, such that associated risks do not jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance. A proposal will be rated "unacceptable" under the Technical Proposal Evaluation Factor, when ANY baseline requirement specified therein is individually rated unacceptable based on the level of completeness and reasonableness, such that associated risks jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance.
10. Proposals determined to be technically acceptable then received a performance confidence assessment rating based on the SLPT's evaluation of available information regarding each offeror's recent and relevant past performance on projects. The SLPT relied upon questionnaires submitted by each offeror's customers, information contained in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) and interviews of customers of some efforts. In accordance with the RFP, the following adjective level of confidence ratings were utilized to assign a past performance rating: (1) Very High, (2) High, (3) Moderate, (4) Low, (5) Very Low, and (6) Neutral.
11. The Government performed a price and cost analysis to determine price reasonableness. The proposed model task order price was evaluated for price reasonableness to ascertain if the proposed prices were reasonable for the work to be performed and reflected an understanding of the model task order requirements. The proposed contract fully burdened labor rates were evaluated for reasonableness.

Evaluation of Proposals

12. Three offers were received in response to the RFP. The firms that submitted proposals are (in alphabetical order): (1) Ayuda Companies, (2) P2MG, and (3) Roundhouse PBN, LLC.
13. None of the offerors took exception to the RFP requirements. All three proposals were determined to meet the requirements of NFS 1815.305-70. All proposing companies were checked against the "List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-Procurement Programs" and none were found to be suspended, debarred or otherwise ineligible for award. Following the initial screening for compliance with NFS 1813.305-70 and eligibility for award,

the SLPT evaluated all three offers against the “pass/fail” Technical Acceptability Factor in order to determine if the offers met the Government’s baseline requirements.

Technical Acceptability Evaluation

14. The SLPT determined that only one of the three proposals was technically acceptable. The SLPT determined that the proposals submitted by P2MG and Roundhouse PBN, LLC were technically unacceptable as each of these two proposals failed to meet at least one of the four baseline requirements described in RFP Section M.4 B. P2MG failed to provide a license number for a registered professional engineer in the state of New Mexico as required by RFP Section M.4 B(a)(ii). Roundhouse PBN, LLC proposed a Professional Engineer with a license in Environmental Engineering, which did not meet the requirements of RFP Section M.4B (a)(ii) which specifically required that the licensed engineer be in the Civil, Electrical, or Mechanical Engineering disciplines. In accordance with RFP Section M, proposals determined technically unacceptable are ineligible for award because they fail to meet one or more of the Government’s baseline requirements and represent a risk to the Government receiving an acceptable level of contract performance.
15. The proposals submitted by P2MG and Roundhouse PBN, LLC were not further evaluated for past performance or price factors as they could no longer be considered for award. Each firm was notified in writing pursuant to FAR 15.503, Notification of Unsuccessful Offerors, that the PACC 2 SLPT had determined their proposal to be Technically Unacceptable and therefore outside of the competitive range.
16. The SLPT determined that the Technical Proposal submitted by Ayuda Companies was acceptable. The proposal provided evidence of sufficient bonding capacity as required by RFP Section L.19-1(a); included the names and active license numbers of registered Professional Engineers in Texas and New Mexico that met the appropriate engineering disciplines required RFP Section L.19-1(b); included the resume of an Archeologist and a list of completed projects that met the requirements of RFP Section L.19-1(c); and included a Safety and Health Plan that was at a level of completeness, reasonableness, and feasibility where associated risks would not jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance as required by RFP Section L.19-1(d).
17. The SPLT then proceeded to evaluate the past performance and price/cost of the remaining proposal by Ayuda Companies.

Past Performance Evaluation

18. Ayuda submitted six past performance projects for review as part of their proposal for themselves and their teaming partners ARCADIS and AECOM. The SLPT reviewed the provided information summaries, past performance questionnaires and Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) information for Ayuda, ARCADIS and AECOM. The PACC 2 SLPT also performed interviews with contract customers. The SLPT assessed the recency and relevancy of past performance efforts including the Offeror’s safety, health and environmental past performance. The SLPT integrated all aspects of the Ayuda team’s recent past performance that was relevant to the RFP effort to assess Ayuda’s past performance at an overall factor level. The SLPT determined Ayuda Companies’ overall confidence assessment as providing a “High Level of Confidence” that the Ayuda team will successfully perform the required effort for PACC 2.

Price Evaluation

19. In addition to past performance, the PACC 2 SLPT evaluated Ayuda’s proposal based on price. The proposed model task order price was based on competition. The PACC 2 SLPT also evaluated Aydua’s proposed model task order price for price reasonableness by comparing the proposed price against the Independent Government Estimate (IGE). The PACC 2 SLPT determined that Ayuda’s proposed model task order price was considered fair and reasonable. The PACC 2 SLPT also conducted market research and compared Ayuda’s proposed fully burdened labor rates to various public sources of salary information as well as competitively awarded and negotiated labor rates currently paid on other NASA JSC contracts. Where proposed labor rates exceeded market rates or rates paid other NASA JSC contract rates, the PACC 2 SLPT noted those rates for discussions with Ayuda. Following discussions, Ayuda revised their fully burdened labor rates and the PACC 2 SLPT determined that all proposed rates were in-line with market rates or other NASA JSC contract rates. On the basis of their performed price and cost analysis, the PACC 2 SLPT considered Ayuda’s proposed fully burdened labor rates to be fair and reasonable.
20. The past performance and price evaluation summary results are as follows:

Company	Past Performance Level of Confidence	Price
Ayuda Companies	High	\$486,789

Source Selection Decision

21. Having reviewed the SLPT’s evaluation of Ayuda’s proposal, I concur with the SLPT’s determination that the proposal is technically acceptable for all subfactors, that Ayuda’s past performance indicates a high level of confidence that Ayuda will successfully perform the required effort, and that the proposed price is fair and reasonable. When reaching my decision, I considered Ayuda’s past performance as significantly more important than their proposed cost.
22. I noted that Ayuda had consistently received past performance ratings of “Exceptional” and “Very Good.” I noted that one past performance project that had initially been rated as “Marginal” had subsequently been addressed through a corrective action plan submitted by Ayuda and accepted by the Government. I also noted that Ayuda had demonstrated excellent safety performance which is highly valued at JSC, particularly in construction.
23. In accordance with the RFP, I have determined that Ayuda’s proposal represents the best overall value to the Government. In reaching this determination, I consulted with the JSC Center Operations Directorate’s Facilities Operations and Management Division and the Planning and Integration Office. After considering their input and all the information presented by the SLPT, I therefore select Ayuda Companies for award of the Planning and Accelerated Construction Services Contract 2 (PACC 2).

Carrie Mulholland
Source Selection Authority

Date