

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR THE
KENNEDY SPACE CENTER PROPELLANTS AND LIFE SUPPORT SERVICES
CONTRACT (KPLSS)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)
(SOLICITATION NUMBER NNK15539043R)**

INTRODUCTION

On August 5, 2015, as the designated Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the Kennedy Space Center (KSC) Propellants and Life Support Services Contract (KPLSS), I met with senior officials of the John F. Kennedy Space Center (KSC), FL and the appointed Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to independently evaluate final proposal revisions (FPR) received from the respective offerors. Relevant portions of the SEB's evaluation of proposals along with my decision on selection of the successful offeror are set forth in the accompanying Source Selection Statement (SSS). As more fully expounded upon below, I have selected **URS Federal Services, Inc., an AECOM Company** for award of the subject contract.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement is to acquire a new, stand-alone contract for propellants and life support (P&LS) services. P&LS serves a critical role in executing and supporting mission requirements by providing P&LS operations, maintenance, and engineering support for assigned systems and equipment (S&E) for NASA and other launch processing facilities. P&LS major functions include but are not limited to: engineering; ordering, receipt, repackage, and transportation of commodity; commodity usage analysis and accounting; equipment management; maintenance of vehicle and facility systems; pressure vessel systems management and recertification; sampling and analysis; life support equipment delivery and pick-up; repair and refurbishment of life support equipment; and manufacture of life support equipment. KPLSS will provide P&LS to KSC, Cape Canaveral Air Force Station (CCAFS), Patrick Air Force Base (PAFB), other Government locations, and other Commercial customers as well.

The KPLSS acquisition was conducted using full and open competitive procedures. The RFP advised offerors that the Government would use a trade-off process, as described in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.101-1, in making source selection, and that proposals would be evaluated in accordance with the RFP and the source selection procedures at FAR Subpart 15.3, as supplemented by NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1815.3. The Government intended to award a contract resulting from the solicitation to the responsible offeror whose proposal represented the best value to the Government.

KPLSS contract type is a fixed price, indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ). The KPLSS contract has a catalog of services consisting of a list of P&LS services priced at fixed unit prices for each contract year. Fixed price task orders, based on pre-priced IDIQ units from the catalog of services, will be issued for each KPLSS customer. There is no baseline scope or

value, however, the contract provides for a guaranteed minimum value for each contract year of \$8 Million. KPLSS has a two-year base period with two options (one 2-year option period and one 1-year option period), for a total potential period of performance of five years. The resulting contract will commence on October 1, 2015; with a 30 day phase-in period commencing on September 1, 2015. The contract includes requirements for the following areas: program management (e.g., risk management; business management; financial reporting; information management; work management; security; logistics operations; emergency management; safety, health and mission assurance; and environmental management), engineering support services (e.g., project management; configuration management; fluids management and engineering; design engineering; and pressure vessels and systems), and propellants and life support operations and maintenance (e.g., S&E Operation and Maintenance Engineering; P&LS Operations and Maintenance).

On June 19, 2014, the KPLSS Procurement Development Team (PDT) was appointed by the NASA KSC Procurement Officer. The PDT conducted market research, prepared an acquisition strategy, developed a draft RFP for industry comment, and met with industry representatives. The draft RFP was issued and the KPLSS Bidder's Library was posted on November 19, 2014. The PDT held an industry site visit of the P&LS facilities on December 9, 2014, with nine business entities in attendance as well as one-on-one meetings with five of those nine entities on December 10-11, 2014. The PDT held a Draft RFP Orientation with industry on January 14, 2015, with eight business entities in attendance, and held one-on-one meetings with three of the eight entities on January 14-15, 2015.

On February 11, 2015, the NASA KSC Procurement Officer appointed the KPLSS Source Evaluation Board (SEB) for the purpose of evaluating proposals received in response to the solicitation. Following the SEB's review and consideration of industry comments on the draft KPLSS solicitation, the final RFP was released on February 18, 2015, seeking proposals for a fixed price, IDIQ service contract. During the course of the procurement, a total of six (6) amendments were issued by the Contracting Officer. Amendments 1, 2, 4, and 6 incorporated minor changes to the RFP. Amendment 3, extended the proposal due date from the initial date of April 20, 2015 to April 29, 2015. Amendment 5, revised the phase-in period from 45 days to 30 days.

In response to the KPLSS RFP, three (3) compliant proposals were timely received on or before the due date of April 29, 2015, from the following companies:

- URS Federal Services, Inc., an AECOM company (AECOM)
- Engineering Research and Consulting, Inc. (ERC)
- United PARADYNE Corporation (UPC)

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors, namely, Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price which were to be evaluated using the applicable procedures, adjectival ratings, levels of confidence, definitions, and/or percentile ranges specified in the RFP and in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.3 and NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." The RFP advised offerors of the relative order of importance of these factors stating:

“Mission Suitability factor and the Past Performance factor, when combined, are approximately equal to the Price factor. The Price factor is more important than the Mission Suitability factor which is more important than the Past Performance factor.”

The evaluation of Mission Suitability was to determine how well the offeror demonstrated the requisite understanding of the requirements of the RFP, including proposed approaches to meeting the requirements and resources proposed to implement that approach. The RFP further identified three subfactors which were to be weighted and considered in evaluating Mission Suitability as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Management | 450 Points |
| Technical | 450 Points |
| <u>Small Business Utilization</u> | <u>100 Points</u> |

Total Mission Suitability 1000 Points

Under the procedures established in the RFP and NFS Subpart 1815.305, the SEB was to evaluate Mission Suitability proposals under each subfactor to identify significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses, deficiencies, or uncertainties requiring clarification. As a result of these findings, the SEB assigned an adjectival rating and percentile score for each subfactor, and a total point score for Mission Suitability using the NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) Mission Suitability adjectival ratings, definitions, and percentile ranges.

With regard to the Mission Suitability factor, the RFP described in detail areas that would be evaluated within the Management subfactor, Technical subfactor, and Small Business Utilization subfactor as follows:

- a. Management subfactor: including overall management approach with specific approaches to integrate, balance, satisfy, and prioritize requirements of multiple customers; execute work and maintain flexibility to respond to surge, real time, and unique requirements; recruit and maintain a skilled workforce; effectiveness and efficiency of external and internal communications; proposed key positions and minimum qualifications; identifying and resolving problems, including interfaces with the Government; proposed asset information management and work management system; and vehicle management approach to acquire and provide necessary transportation to meet the requirements. The Management subfactor also

evaluated the proposed phase-in approach, safety and health plan, risk management plan, and total compensation plan.

- b. Technical subfactor: including the overall technical approach with a specific approach to planning, scheduling, and work control; minimum delivery notification time for P&LS, propellant operations and maintenance; engineering services; life support services; method for acquiring, and maintaining adequate levels of consumables, supplies, and other incidental resources; and staffing approach, including staffing levels, skill mix, positions' qualifications, and utilization of personnel.
- c. Small Business Utilization subfactor: evaluated for appropriateness of the total proposed small business subcontracting goals and the proposed goals by small business category. The Government did not impose or mandate small business goals, which allowed offerors to conduct an independent assessment of subcontract opportunities for the KPLSS requirement.

With regard to the Past Performance factor, the RFP advised offerors that recent and relevant performance of work similar in size, content, and complexity to the KPLSS requirements would be evaluated. The RFP further provided that the past performance of each offeror's proposed major subcontractors would be evaluated. A major subcontractor for the purposes of past performance evaluation is defined in the RFP as providing critical functions such as engineering, operations, and safety to the KPLSS effort. The RFP also advised offerors that past performance was to be evaluated using the following level of confidence ratings as they are defined in the RFP: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral in accordance with NFS Subpart 1815.305.

Finally, with regard to the Price factor, the RFP advised offerors that the Government would perform a price analysis in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.404-1(b), Price Analysis. Elements of FAR Subpart 15.404-1(b) that were considered included: adequate price competition to establish a fair and reasonable price and comparison of the proposed prices with the independent Government cost estimate.

The RFP price template contained the complete catalog of services by Task Item Number (TIN) and a Government-provided Best Estimated Quantities (BEQ) for each TIN. The BEQs were developed by using historical data from actual quantities delivered from fiscal years FY-2013 and FY-2014 and were used for evaluation purposes only. The solicitation did not guarantee the BEQs found on the price template; therefore, offerors could conduct an independent assessment of the KPLSS contract requirements. The RFP required offerors to describe the work volume and customer base assumed within the proposed approach described in the Mission Suitability factor.

The total evaluated contract price would be the sum of all the proposed unit prices multiplied by the Government-provided BEQs for each TIN for all contract years and the proposed price for Phase-In.

The SEB appropriately conducted all evaluations using the above described evaluation criteria as specified in the RFP. In evaluating offerors' proposals under each of the factors and subfactors described in the RFP, the SEB utilized evaluators in appropriate disciplines to provide specific expertise needed in the evaluation process. The evaluators were assigned to evaluate their specific areas of expertise and to provide observations, or requests for clarifications back to the SEB. The SEB considered this input to determine findings. Using the analyses of the evaluators, the solicitation's evaluation criteria, and its own findings, the SEB developed and assessed the strengths and weaknesses, and rated and scored each proposal. This produced the initial ranking of proposals for Mission Suitability, a price analysis, a level of confidence rating for the Past Performance factor, and the determination of which proposals fell within the competitive range in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.306(c).

All three evaluated proposals were determined to be among the most highly rated and so were within the competitive range. Written and oral discussions were held with all three offerors during the period of June 25, 2015 through July 23, 2015. The discussions focused on the significant weaknesses, weaknesses, and uncertainties requiring clarification that the SEB identified during the initial evaluation of mission suitability, as well as clarifications to pricing for specific TINs and assumptions. Upon the conclusion of discussions, FPRs were requested from all offerors remaining in the competitive range with a common due date for submission. Fully compliant FPRs were timely submitted on or before July 29, 2015. The SEB conducted a final evaluation of the offerors' FPRs and reported those findings to the SSA on August 5, 2015, as more fully discussed below.

FPR MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATIONS

The evaluation of FPRs resulted in increased Mission Suitability scores for all three offerors. No significant weaknesses, weaknesses, or uncertainties requiring clarification were found to remain in any of the offeror's final Mission Suitability proposals. The SEB's report to the SSA focused on the offerors' significant strengths and strengths.

ERC

Under the Mission Suitability – **Management** subfactor, the SEB found that ERC had no remaining weaknesses, one significant strength, and five strengths in its FPR. The significant strength resulted from ERC's proposal for an innovative and effective approach to achieve a high level of customer satisfaction, which incorporates transparent tools, enhanced customer expectation and satisfaction processes and tools to ensure performance exceeds customer expectations, appreciably increasing the likelihood of successful contract performance. The five strengths in ERC's FPR under the management subfactor included: (1) the proposal demonstrated commitment to safety and health by proposing a detailed approach for providing a safe and healthful working environment, (2) the proposal included a detailed and robust total compensation plan, including a complete explanation of the methodology for arriving at the salaries, (3) the proposal included a phase-in approach that addressed key aspects of contract transition and is based on its proven independent third-party certified contract phase-in process, (4) the proposal detailed an innovative and effective approach to maintain flexibility and respond to surge, and (5) the proposal included use of information technology solutions, tools, and

capabilities for Asset Information Management System and Work Management System (utilizing Maximo) to ensure streamlined and efficient operations enhancing the potential for successful contract performance.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated ERC's proposal under the Management subfactor as **Excellent**.

Under the Mission Suitability – **Technical** subfactor, the SEB found that ERC had no remaining weaknesses, no significant strengths, and one strength in its FPR. The strength was based upon ERC's proposed approach to reduce the minimum delivery notification period for a majority of the propellant services.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated ERC's proposal under the Technical subfactor as **Good**.

Under the Mission Suitability – **Small Business Utilization** subfactor, the SEB found that ERC had no remaining weaknesses, no significant strengths, and one strength in its FPR. The strength was based upon ERC's proposed commitment to offer total small business subcontracting goals of 23% of the KPLSS requirements in the following subcategories: (1) small disadvantaged business (SDB), (2) women-owned small business (WOSB), (3) veteran-owned business (VOSB), (4) historically black colleges and universities (HBCU), (5) other minority educational institutions (OMEI), (6) historically underutilized small business (HUBZone), and (7) service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB).

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated ERC's proposal under the Small Business Utilization subfactor as **Good**.

As a result of the SEB's evaluation, the overall final Mission Suitability score for ERC was **767.5 points** out of 1,000 points available.

AECOM

Under the Mission Suitability – **Management** subfactor, the SEB found that AECOM had no remaining weaknesses and one significant strength in its FPR. The significant strength resulted from AECOM's proposal for an integrated data tool approach along with utilizing Maximo and mobile applications for Asset Information Management System and Work Management System which will result in streamlined and efficient operations with extensive reporting capability; enhancing the potential for successful contract performance.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated AECOM's proposal under the Management subfactor as **Very Good**.

Under the Mission Suitability – **Technical** subfactor, the SEB found that AECOM had no remaining weaknesses, no significant strengths, and two strengths in its FPR. The two strengths in AECOM's FPR under the technical subfactor included: (1) the proposed approach to significantly reduce the minimum delivery notification period for recharge services and life support services to customers which will benefit the customers to order and receive services with

less planning time; and (2) the proposal included proactive replacement of the butyl adhesive on the Self-Contained Atmospheric Protective Ensemble (SCAPE) suit seam tape with the polychloroprene adhesive resulting in improved safety and reliability of the SCAPE suits.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated AECOM's proposal under the Technical subfactor as **Good**.

Under the Mission Suitability – **Small Business Utilization** subfactor, the SEB found that AECOM had no remaining weaknesses, no significant strengths, and one strength in its FPR. The strength was based upon AECOM's proposed commitment to offer total small business subcontracting goals of 16.8% of the KPLSS requirement in the following subcategories: (1) small disadvantaged business (SDB), (2) women-owned small business (WOSB), (3) historically underutilized small business (HUBZone), (4) veteran-owned small business (VOSB), and (5) service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses (SDVOSB).

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated AECOM's proposal under the Small Business Utilization subfactor as **Good**.

As a result of the SEB's evaluation, the overall final Mission Suitability score for AECOM was **692 points** out of 1,000 points available.

UPC

Under the Mission Suitability – **Management** subfactor, the SEB found that UPC had no remaining weaknesses, no significant strengths, and three strengths in its FPR. The three strengths in the FPR under the management subfactor included: (1) the proposal described an approach to cross train and cross utilize the technicians that allows the offeror to execute work and maintain flexibility to respond to surge requirements, (2) the proposal identified an approach for utilizing Maximo for fulfilling the asset integration management system requirements, and inventory management and calibration tracking, and (3) the proposal included an innovative approach establishing a single focal point to integrate, balance, satisfy, and prioritize requirements of multiple customers; enhancing the likelihood of successful contract performance.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated UPC's proposal under the Management subfactor as **Good**.

Under the Mission Suitability – **Technical** subfactor, the SEB found that UPC had no remaining weaknesses, no significant strengths, and one strength in its FPR. The strength was based on UPC's approach to reduce the minimum delivery notification time for a majority of the services.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated UPC's proposal under the Technical subfactor as **Good**.

Under the Mission Suitability – **Small Business Utilization** subfactor, the SEB found that UPC had no weaknesses and one significant strength in its FPR. The strength was based upon UPC as a small business and has proposed one of its major subcontractors as a small business. UPC's

proposal indicates that 92% of the labor work load will be performed by small businesses and will make every effort to obtain small business concerns for any subcontracting opportunities.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated AECOM's proposal under the Small Business Utilization subfactor as **Very Good**.

As a result of the SEB's evaluation, the overall final Mission Suitability score for UPC was **675 points** out of 1,000 points available.

FPR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

The Past Performance evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.305 and NFS Subpart 1815.305. Each offeror was evaluated based on recent and relevant contracts or subcontracts of similar size, content, and complexity to the KPLSS requirement.

ERC

The SEB found that ERC and its two major subcontractors, demonstrated highly relevant activities (similar in size, content, and complexity) in management and technical experience. ERC has successfully managed contracts of similar size as KPLSS. ERC's largest contract value is \$29M/year. ERC's past performance indicates experience managing contracts with a range of personnel from 65 to 150. Team ERC (comprised of ERC and its two major subcontractors) demonstrated experience in similar content of the major areas of KPLSS Performance Work Statement (PWS): program management, engineering support services, and propellants and life support operations and maintenance services. Team ERC demonstrates moderate experience to the KPLSS contract with respect to complexity. Although Team ERC has performed similar content as KPLSS content across multiple contracts, ERC never managed the entire scope of KPLSS under a single contract. ERC demonstrated managing one major subcontractor, but ERC did not show experience managing multiple major subcontractors simultaneously.

Overall, Team ERC demonstrated compliance with the technical requirements and performance standards for previous work presented in the Past Performance proposal, customer questionnaire responses, and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) records from current Government customers. Team ERC demonstrated significant experience to the KPLSS requirements in the following Performance Work Statements (PWS) areas: 1.0, Program Management, and PWS 2.0, Engineering Support Services. Team ERC demonstrated moderate experience to the KPLSS requirements in 3.0, Propellants and Life Support Operations and Maintenance. Performance was assessed as exceeded for all areas of the PWS.

On cited previous contracts, Team ERC demonstrated exceptional cost, technical, and schedule performance. Team ERC demonstrated significant experience and performance exceeded safety and health requirements. Team ERC complied with applicable safety standards with no fatalities, zero lost time cases, and Experience Modification Rating (EMR) numbers below industry average for the last five years. In 2011, ERC was above Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) rates in Days Away from Work, Restricted Work Activity or Job Transfer (DART) and in

2013, one of ERC's proposed major subcontractors was above the BLS rates in Total Case Incident Rate (TCIR).

Team ERC demonstrated significant experience in phase-in and performance was assessed as exceeded.

Team ERC demonstrated moderate experience in labor relations and performance was assessed as exceeded.

Based on Team ERC's performance record, the SEB has a high level of confidence that ERC would successfully perform the KPLSS contract. As a result, the SEB determined ERC's past performance level of confidence as **High**.

AECOM

The SEB found that AECOM demonstrated very highly relevant activities (similar in size, content, and complexity) in management and technical experience. AECOM has successfully managed contracts of similar size as KPLSS. AECOM's largest contract value is \$2.4B over 20 years. AECOM's past performance indicates experience managing contracts with a range of personnel from 539 to 1,000. AECOM demonstrated experience in similar content of the major areas of KPLSS PWS: program management, engineering support services, and propellants and life support operations and maintenance services. AECOM has demonstrated successful performance on contracts with numerous integrated complex technical and management activities as a prime and managed multiple subcontractors simultaneously.

Overall, AECOM demonstrated compliance with the technical requirements and performance standards for previous work presented in the Past Performance proposal, customer questionnaire responses, and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) records from current Government customers. AECOM demonstrated significant experience to the KPLSS requirements across all areas of the PWS and performance was assessed as exceeded.

On cited previous contracts, AECOM demonstrated exceptional cost, technical, and schedule performance. AECOM demonstrated significant experience and performance exceeded safety and health requirements. Team AECOM complied with applicable safety standards with no fatalities, industry/illness rates below the BLS rates, and EMR numbers well below industry average.

AECOM demonstrated significant experience in phase-in and performance was assessed as exceeded.

AECOM demonstrated significant experience in labor relations and performance was assessed as exceeded.

Based on AECOM performance record, the SEB has a very high level of confidence that AECOM would successfully perform the KPLSS contract. As a result, the SEB determined AECOM's past performance level of confidence as **Very High**.

UPC

The SEB found that UPC and its two major subcontractors demonstrated very highly relevant activities (similar in size, content, and complexity) in management and technical experience. UPC has successfully managed contracts of similar size as KPLSS. UPC's largest contract value is Not to Exceed (NTE) \$400M over 8 years. UPC's past performance indicates experience managing contracts with a range of personnel from 8 to 75. UPC demonstrated experience in similar content of the major areas of KPLSS PWS: program management, engineering support services, and propellants and life support operations and maintenance services. UPC has demonstrated successful performance on contracts with numerous integrated complex technical and management activities as a prime.

Overall, UPC demonstrated compliance with the technical requirements and performance standards for previous work presented in the Past Performance proposal, customer questionnaire responses, and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) records from current Government customers. UPC demonstrated significant experience to the KPLSS requirements across all areas of the PWS and performance was assessed as exceeded.

On cited previous contracts, UPC demonstrated exceptional cost, technical, and schedule performance. UPC complied with applicable safety standards with no fatalities, no Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) citations, and EMR numbers well below industry average. In 2011, one of UPC's proposed major subcontractors was above the industry average for TCIR, DART, and Lost Time Incident Rates (LTIR) ratings and in 2012, the same proposed major subcontractor was above the industry standards for TCIR and DART ratings.

UPC demonstrated minimal experience in phase-in and performance was assessed as exceeded.

UPC demonstrated moderate experience in labor relations and performance was assessed as exceeded.

Based on UPC performance record, the SEB has a very high level of confidence that UPC would successfully perform the KPLSS contract. As a result, the SEB determined UPC's past performance level of confidence as **Very High**.

FPR PRICE

The total evaluated price for each offeror was determined by the sum of the (1) product of the offeror's proposed unit prices for each TIN and the Government provided BEQs for each TIN, for all years, and (2) the proposed price for Phase-in. AECOM had the lowest total evaluated price, followed by ERC and UPC. AECOM's total evaluated price was significantly lower than ERC, and ERC's was slightly lower than UPC.

AECOM

The AECOM proposal has a total evaluated price of \$36,502,068. AECOM's proposal price was lower than the ERC proposal, UPC proposal, and the Independent Government Cost Estimate

(IGCE). Based on the information submitted in response to the RFP requirements, no instance of unbalanced pricing was found in the price proposal, and it was found to be fair and reasonable.

ERC

The ERC proposal was priced higher than AECOM's final proposal. Based on the information submitted in response to the RFP requirements, no instance of unbalanced pricing was found in the price proposal, and it was found to be fair and reasonable.

UPC

The UPC proposal was priced higher than AECOM's and ERC's final proposals. Based on the information submitted in response to the RFP requirements, no instance of unbalanced pricing was found in the price proposal, and it was found to be fair and reasonable.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

At the conclusion of the SEB's presentation, I determined that its findings were rational, complete, and well documented. My soliciting additional comments or questions from the SEB and other KSC senior management officials present during the briefing yielded no significant issues or stated concerns.

I first note that, with regard to the three evaluation factors specified in the RFP—Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price—the Mission Suitability and Past Performance factors, when combined, are approximately equal in importance to the Price factor, and that the Price factor is more important than the Mission Suitability factor, which is more important than the Past Performance factor. Using these evaluation factors and relative importance, I reached the following determinations:

- (1) With regard to Mission Suitability, all offerors provided comprehensive approaches demonstrating the capability to successfully perform the requirements of this contract. ERC offers the most advantageous management approach. AECOM offers the most advantageous technical approach. UPC, a small business, offers the most advantageous small business utilization approach. There was no weakness in any of the offerors' proposals.

Under the Management subfactor, I determined ERC's proposal, containing a significant strength associated with its innovative and effective approach to achieving customer satisfaction, when combined with its five other strengths, was appropriately rated as "Excellent." I determined that AECOM's proposal, containing a significant strength associated with its integrated data approach and extensive reporting capabilities was appropriately rated "Very Good." I determined that UPC's proposal with its three strengths was appropriately rated "Good."

Under the Technical subfactor, I determined that all offerors were appropriately rated "Good." All three offerors received a strength associated with reducing the minimum delivery notification period. AECOM received an additional strength for proposing to

proactively replace the butyl adhesive on the SCAPE suit seam tape with polychloroprene adhesive, thereby improving safety and reliability.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, I determined that ERC and AECOM appropriately received a “Good” rating based on the proposed percentage goals and type of work they planned for small businesses. I determined that UPC, a small business, was appropriately at “Very Good,” with its proposal to have 92% of the labor work load performed by small business concerns and its commitment to utilizing small businesses for any subcontracting opportunities.

- (2) With regard to Past Performance, I have confidence that all offerors could successfully perform the required contract effort. I concur with the “Very High” ratings the SEB gave to AECOM and UPC. Both of these offerors demonstrated significant experience with very highly pertinent performance, exemplarily executing contracts of similar size, content, and complexity as KPLSS. I also concur with the “High” rating the SEB gave to ERC. ERC, along with its major subcontractors, demonstrated moderate to significant experience with highly pertinent performance, very effectively or exemplarily executing contracts similar in size and scope. However, ERC lacked experience managing the entire scope of KPLSS under a single, complex contract with multiple subcontractors. I noted that the Past Performance factor was the lowest weighted of the three evaluation factors within the RFP and that the highest ratings rested with AECOM and UPC. As such, although I agreed with the ratings and underlying distinctions identified by the SEB, I found the differences in the offerors’ Past Performance evaluations to have little impact on my overall selection decision.
- (3) With regard to the Price factor, I noted that all offerors’ proposed prices were determined to be fair and reasonable and that AECOM had the lowest total evaluated price.

My selection is based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the evaluation factors. The foregoing analysis resulted in my conclusion that the primary discriminator in my selection was Price. All offerors demonstrated the capability to manage the contract and meet its technical requirements. All offerors’ past performance provided confidence that they could successfully perform the KPLSS effort. AECOM proposed the lowest total evaluated price. While I agreed with ERC’s Mission Suitability Management Subfactor rating of “Excellent,” I found that any benefits from ERC’s Significant Strength in its approach to customer satisfaction and its other five Strengths, when compared to AECOM’s rating of “Very Good” in Management and AECOM’s Significant Strength associated with its integrated data tool, were not sufficient to overcome the significantly higher total evaluated price offered by ERC’s proposal. In reaching that conclusion, I also noted that both AECOM and ERC received a “Good” rating in the Technical Subfactor, with AECOM having a slight discernible benefit over ERC in that Subfactor due to its proposal to significantly reduce minimum notification time and proactively replace the SCAPE seam tape with polychloroprene adhesive, and ERC received a rating of “High” level of confidence in the Past Performance factor compared to AECOM’s rating of “Very High,” although I judged either would be able to successfully perform the contract. With regard to UPC, although it received a Past Performance level of confidence rating of “Very High,” equal to that of AECOM, and a “Very Good” in the Small Business Utilization

Subfactor, UPC's total evaluated price was significantly higher than that of AECOM, and UPC offered no additional benefits to those of AECOM. I noted that AECOM's proposed and evaluated price was significantly lower than the other offerors; however, based AECOM's Mission Suitability and Past Performance proposal, AECOM demonstrated an understanding of the technical requirements and is able to perform successfully under this contract.

Therefore, based on the foregoing analysis, I select URS Federal Services, Inc., an AECOM Company, for award of the KPLSS because its proposal represents the best value to the Government.



Robert D. Cabana
Source Selection Authority
John F. Kennedy Space Center, FL

10 AUG 15
Date