

**Source Selection Statement  
Occupational Health Services  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)  
Armstrong Flight Research Center (AFRC)**

On August 20, 2015, I, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), along with other key officials of the NASA AFRC, met with the members of the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate Quotes in response to the Occupational Health Services (OHS) solicitation, No. NND15531905Q. The OHS solicitation anticipates awarding a Firm-Fixed Price contract. The Request for Quote (RFQ) included the following period of performance dates:

Phase-in	8/01/2015 – 8/31/2015
Base Period	9/01/15 - 8/31/16
Option 1	9/01/16 - 8/31/17
Option 2	9/01/17 - 8/31/18
Option 3	9/01/18 - 8/31/19
Option 4	9/01/19 - 8/31/20
Option to Extend Services	9/01/20 – 2/28/21

The Occupational Health Services (OHS) contract provides Occupational Medicine (to include Occupational Health Nursing and Fitness Center Management), as well as Industrial Hygiene and Health Physics (i.e. Radiation Safety) at NASA AFRC.

**Procurement History**

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.2, “Synopsis of Proposed Contract Actions,” the OHS effort was synopsised on NASA Acquisition Internet Service and uploaded to Federal Business Opportunities on December 18, 2014. On May 1, 2015, NASA AFRC issued a RFQ as a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Set-Aside under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 621111 with a size standard of \$11M.

Four amendments were issued on 5/4/2015, 5/21/2015, 5/29/2015 and 6/01/2015, respectively.

Amendment 1: Changed paragraph 3 of the RFQ to read, “This procurement is a total Small Business Set-Aside to Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business.”

Amendment 2:

- Revised SF1449, Item No. 20, Schedule of Supply/Services, CLINS 001 through 005 to reflect a change in periods of performance
- Revised SF 1449, Item No. 21, Quantity and Item No. 22, Unit added

- Revised Provision E.5, Addendum to 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors-Commercial Items, Section Past Performance to include questionnaire submission information
- Revised Provision E.5, Addendum to 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors-Commercial Items, Section Price, Table E-2 replaced
- Revised Provision E.5, Addendum to 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors-Commercial Items, Section Price, Paragraph 2, Table E-3 replaced
- Revised Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items, Paragraph 1 to reflect correct PPTO language
- Revised Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items, Section Evaluation Factor #3 – Price, Paragraph 2 removed entirely
- Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items, Section Evaluation Factor #3 – Price, added Paragraph 3
- Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items, Section Evaluation Factor #4 – Subcontracting/Joint Venture removed verbiage “Evaluation Factor #4”.
- Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items, Section Basis of Award, added Last Paragraph
- Published responses to questions #1 – 11
- Provided copies of the pre-quote conference welcome package, conference presentation slides and list of attendees

Amendment 3: Extended Quote response date from June 3 at 4:00 P.M. (PT) to June 12, at 4:00 P.M. (PT).

Amendment 4: Published responses to questions #12 – 45.

The RFQ required that Quotes be divided into three (3) volumes. The three volumes were: Volume I – Technical Quote; Volume II - Past Performance Information; Volume III - Price. The following documents were not included in the calculation of the Technical Volume page count:

- Subcontracting/Joint Venture Efforts: Ostensible Subcontractor Rules Requirements
- Key Personnel Résumés
- Phase-In Plan
- Management Plan
- Credential Requirements

All Quotes were due by June 12, 2015. Two Offerors submitted Quotes that met the time and date requirement in response to the RFQ: Professional Management Enterprises (PME), Inc. and Wisestaff, LLC.

After receipt of Quotes on June 12, 2015, the SEC conducted an initial review of the Quotes to determine acceptability, in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Quotes. SEC members conducted a records check through System for Award Management (SAM) to ensure all Offerors had an active registration and no active exclusions, then verified that the Offeror's Representations and Certifications were current and complete. Additionally, a determination of responsiveness was assessed, verifying page number and font size limitations for the volume and appendices, required elements of the cover letter (a statement that the quote shall remain in effect for a minimum of 120 calendar days, a statement regarding acceptance of the anticipated contract terms and conditions, etc.), Standard Form 1449, inclusion of DRD M10, DRD M11 and DRD M14, and that all pertinent portions of the Quote were readable and in compliance with the RFQ.

Furthermore, the Offeror's Quotes were to ensure compliancy with the Ostensible Subcontractor Rule.

The evaluation was conducted using best value source selection in which competing Quoter's' past performance history was evaluated on a basis significantly more important than price consideration. Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items of the solicitation set forth the following areas for evaluation:

- Technically Acceptable -
- Past Performance
- Price

**Technically Acceptable**

The Technical Quote consisted of evaluation of the proposed Technical Approach, Management Approach and Staffing Approach. The SEC evaluated the technical quotes on a pass/fail basis, assigning a rating of Acceptable or Unacceptable, see solicitation Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items. Each Quoter's technical quotes were evaluated to determine if the proposed approach and existing capability met or exceeded the various requirements identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and the solicitation. All technically acceptable offers were treated equally except for their past performance records and prices. Failure to meet a requirement resulted in an offer being determined technically unacceptable.

The results of the technical evaluation are as follows:

<b>TECHNICAL EVALUATION RESULTS</b>	
<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>RATING</b>
Professional Management Enterprises (PME)	Acceptable
Wisestaff	Unacceptable

## **Technical Findings Summary**

### **Wisestaff – Technically Unacceptable**

The Offeror's overall proposal did not meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation and is determined to be technically unacceptable.

The Offeror's proposal failed to provide sufficient evidence of a thorough understanding of the technical, management, and staffing approach required to effectively perform the Occupational Medicine and the Industrial Hygiene requirements stipulated within the PWS. The Offeror stated they will meet or exceed the requirements; however, they provided no specific information in this regard.

The Offeror's proposal provided background information of the management staff, which did not reflect abilities necessary to carry out the complex, technical requirements outlined in the PWS. The Offeror's identification of all personnel as Key Personnel reflected a lack of understanding of the complexities required to perform the various technical requirements.

The Offeror's management approach did not adequately provide the required coverage of the AFRC Main Campus and the Building 703 Medical Office in accordance with the PWS.

The Offeror's proposal did not demonstrate the ability to ensure quality and delivery of the required deliverables.

The Offeror failed to demonstrate how their management approach will accomplish the requirements outlined in the PWS.

### **Professional Management Enterprises (PME) -- Technically Acceptable**

The Offeror's overall proposal meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation and is determined to be technically acceptable.

The Offeror provided evidence of having a comprehensive understanding of the technical approach required to effectively perform the work stipulated within the PWS.

The Offeror's staffing approach provided information on the roles and expected duties of the Occupational Medicine and Industrial Hygiene personnel. The Offeror demonstrated a clear understanding of the required coverage for the AFRC Main Campus (Health Unit) and Building 703 Medical Office.

The Offeror's management approach provided detailed information on the basic procedures for accomplishing Occupational Medicine and Industrial Hygiene requirements. Specifically, the Offeror outlined an approach for accomplishing job

certification physicals, medical surveillance exams and other work-related medical examinations. Likewise, the Offeror outlined an approach for accomplishing samplings, surveys, and workplace exposure assessments.

### **Past Performance**

The past performance evaluation is an assessment of the Government’s confidence in the Quoter’s ability to perform the solicitation requirements. This factor indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of each Quoter’s record of performing services or delivering products similar in size, content, and complexity as the requirements of the PWS and solicitation.

The first aspect of the past performance was to evaluate the quantitative (relevant) aspects of the Quoter’s present/past performance. Relevant performance included performance of the Occupational Health Services contract similar or greater in size, content, and complexity of the effort described in the PWS and solicitation. The evaluation team reviewed the Quoter’s Past Performance and identified the significant strengths, strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, and/or significant weaknesses of the Quoter’s quote in determining the relevancy of the present/ past performance to the task requirements of the PWS and solicitation and assigned a Past Performance Relevancy Rating based on the following ratings and definitions:

<b>PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY ASSESSMENT TERMS</b>	
<b>RATING</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
<b>Very Relevant</b>	Present / past performance effort involved essentially the same size, content, and complexities this solicitation requires.
<b>Relevant</b>	Present / past performance effort involved similar size, content, and complexities this solicitation requires.
<b>Somewhat Relevant</b>	Present / past performance effort involved some of the size, content, and complexities this solicitation requires.
<b>Not Relevant</b>	Present / past performance effort involved little or none of the size, content, and complexities this solicitation requires.

The Offeror’s overall relevancy (quantitative) ratings are listed below:

<b>OVERALL RELEVANCY (QUANTITY) RATING</b>	
<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>RATING</b>
Professional Management Enterprises (PME)	Somewhat Relevant
Wisestaff	Somewhat Relevant

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation was to evaluate the qualitative aspects of the Quoter’s present/past performance to determine how well the Offeror performed on previous contracts. Past performance information was obtained on the

relevant, similar current or past contracts listed by the Quoter, listed in Volume II, Past Performance, to determine the quality level of past performance. The Government's evaluation was not limited to past performance information on the listed contracts. Past performance information on work for commercial customers, local, state and federal Government that were relevant and similar to this procurement was also evaluated. The Government used past performance information obtained from the Government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), as well as the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ). The Quoter's past performance in occupational health, security, safety, and mission success was evaluated based on the following ratings and definitions:

<b>PAST PERFORMANCE QUALITY ASSESSMENT TERMS</b>	
<b>RATING</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
<b>Exceptional</b>	Performance meets contractual requirements with many exceeding the agency's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with no more than a few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
<b>Very Good</b>	Performance meets contractual requirements with some exceeding the agency's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with no more than some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory.
<b>Marginal</b>	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions or the contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.
<b>Neutral</b>	Performance was not observed or not applicable to the current effort being reported against.

The Offeror's overall quality assessment ratings are listed below.

<b>OVERALL QUALITY RATING</b>	
<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>RATING</b>
Professional Management Enterprises (PME)	Satisfactory
Wisestaff	Very Good

The results of the quality and quantity assessments were used to determine an overall Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating. The ratings assigned are defined in

accordance with Provision E.6, Evaluation-Commercial Items, Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Items, Page 26, table titled, “Performance Confidence Assessments”. The Offeror’s overall confidence ratings are listed below.

<b>OVERALL CONFIDENCE RATING</b>			
<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>RELEVANCY</b>	<b>QUALITY</b>	<b>CONFIDENCE LEVEL</b>
Professional Management Enterprises (PME)	Somewhat Relevant	Satisfactory	Moderate
Wisestaff	Somewhat Relevant	Very Good	Moderate

The evaluation team utilized the past performance information on the relevant, similar current or past contracts provided by each Offeror in Volume II, Past Performance, to identify the significant strengths, strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, and/or significant weaknesses and determine a relevancy rating for past performance.

The evaluation team utilized the past performance information provided in Volume II, Past Performance, obtained from the Government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), as well as the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) to assign an overall quality rating for past performance.

The evaluation team used the findings from these two aspects to assign an overall level of confidence.

**PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISES (PME) PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:**

The Offeror's overall Past Performance relevancy demonstrates some experience in the area of Occupational Medicine. The Offeror's past performance did not demonstrate management and technical complexity to support the requirements of this acquisition. Due to the lack of pertinent past performance in the areas of Industrial Hygiene and Health Physics, which are major components of this acquisition, an overall rating of Somewhat Relevant was assigned for past performance.

The Offeror's Past Performance evaluations have consistently received a rating of Satisfactory. The Offeror's subcontractor has received Past Performance ratings of Excellent/Exceptional or Satisfactory. An overall Quality rating of Satisfactory was assigned.

The Offeror's overall Past Performance is Somewhat Relevant to the requirement and the overall Quality rating is Satisfactory. Based on the overall assessment, the Government has a Moderate Level of Confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**WISESTAFF PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:**

The Offeror's overall Past Performance relevancy demonstrated some experience in the areas of Occupational Medicine. There is a lack of pertinent past performance in the areas of Industrial Hygiene and Health Physics, which are major components of this acquisition. The Offeror's past performance did not demonstrate management and technical complexity to support the requirements of this acquisition. Therefore, an overall rating of Somewhat Relevant was assigned.

The Offeror's Past Performance Questionnaires ratings were Very Good. The Offeror's subcontractor has received a wide range of Past Performance ratings from Excellent/Exceptional to Marginal. Therefore, an overall Quality rating of Very Good was assigned.

The Offeror's overall Past Performance is Somewhat Relevant to the requirement and the overall Quality rating is Very Good. Based on the overall assessment, the Government has a Moderate Level of Confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Price**

Price analysis was conducted to ensure that a fair and reasonable price is paid by the Government and to assess the reasonableness of the proposed price.

The evaluated price was determined by multiplying the proposed monthly prices for each CLIN by the Government quantity identified in each CLIN.

The total evaluated price was determined by adding the evaluated price of the phase-in, base period, and all options to include the "Option to Extend Services".

Fixed Monthly Burdened Rate (FMBR) was evaluated in terms of reasonableness for selection purposes.

The completed price analysis resulted in the determination that Wisestaff's total evaluated price is lower than Professional Management Enterprises' (PME) total evaluated price.

<b>PRICING</b>		
<b>OFFEROR</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE PERIOD</b>	<b>TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE</b>
Professional Management Enterprises (PME)	09/01/2015 to 09/30/2020	\$5,823,014.24

## Selection Decision

The SEC presented the results of their evaluation to me as the SSA on August 20, 2015.

Following the SEC presentation, I fully considered the SEC's findings. I commended the SEC on their comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the two proposals. I have reviewed the detailed findings of the SEC, and I agree with each of the SEC's findings.

As the SSA for this acquisition, I have determined the proposal submitted by Professional Management Enterprises (PME) provides the best overall value to satisfy the Government's requirement. This decision was made using my independent judgment and based upon the criteria established in FAR 52.212-2, *Evaluation – Commercial Items*, of the solicitation, and the capability (*i.e.* Technical Acceptability, Past Performance Confidence Assessment, and Cost/Price) of PME to fulfill the subject requirement.

In making my selection decision, I first reviewed the relative importance of the evaluation factors. This solicitation is a competitive Performance Price Trade-off best value source selection where all evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price. First a technical rating of acceptable or unacceptable was given to each proposal. All technically acceptable quotes shall be treated equally except for their past performance records and prices. Failure to meet a requirement may result in a quote being determined technically unacceptable. After, assigned a technical rating the Offeror's past performance history was evaluated.

With regard to the Technically Acceptable factor, I considered the SEC's evaluation of Wisestaff's technical unacceptable rating, ultimately finding that Wisestaff failed to provide sufficient evidence of a thorough understanding of the technical, management, and staffing approach required to effectively perform the requirements stated in the PWS. Most notably, Wisestaff's proposal often failed to provide specific information to demonstrate their ability to perform the complex technical requirements outlined in the PWS.

I also considered the SEC's finding that PME's overall proposal meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation and is determined to be technically acceptable. PME provided acceptable approaches to meeting the technical, management and staffing requirements. PME provided detail information on how they would accomplish the day-to-day task. Moreover, PME demonstrated a clear understanding of the technical complex of this requirement.

I then reviewed the past performance confidence of both PME and Wisestaff by reviewing the SEC's findings of each Offeror's past performance relevancy and quality.

With regard to the past performance relevancy (quantitative) factor, both proposals demonstrated experience on previous/current NASA contracts performing some similar

work, although neither proposal demonstrated past performance in the areas of Industrial Hygiene (IH) and Health Physics. Of their remaining past performance references, both Offerors showed experience in the Clinic Environment, but were unable to demonstrate extensive experience in other content areas. Accordingly, both proposals demonstrate an overall Past Performance Relevancy rating of Somewhat Relevant.”

I then reviewed the past performance quality results for both PME and Wisestaff. The adjectival rating for Past Performance Quality assigned to Wisestaff was Very Good, with Wisestaff’s receiving Past Performance ratings of Very Good and their subcontractor receiving a wide range of Past Performance ratings from Excellent/Exceptional to Marginal. The adjectival rating assigned to PME for Past Performance Quality was Satisfactory, receiving Past Performance ratings of Excellent/Exceptional or Satisfactory, with PME’s proposed subcontractor receiving ratings of Excellent/Exceptional.

For the past performance confidence rating, I considered both the overall past performance relevancy and overall past performance quality ratings of each Offeror. As discussed above, I find the past performance relevancy of both Offerors to be somewhat relevant with neither Offeror’s past performance relevancy to be a better value than the other. While Wisestaff received a slightly higher past performance quality rating of Very Good, as opposed to PME’s Satisfactory rating, the difference is not enough to justify an increase or decrease in the overall past performance confidence level. Accordingly, I have a Moderate level of confidence that both PME and Wisestaff could successfully perform the subject contractual effort.

With regard to price, I noted that PME’s proposed price of \$5,823,014 was slightly higher than Wisestaff.

Considering that PME’s proposal is technically acceptable, that Wisestaff’s proposal is technically unacceptable, that the past performance confidence of both Offerors was the same, and that PME’s proposed price was only slightly higher than Wisestaff’s proposed price, the key discriminator in my selection decision is technical acceptability. As such, I find PME’s technical acceptability and Moderate level of past performance confidence significantly outweighs PME’s slightly higher price. Therefore, I find that PME’s proposal offers the best value to the Government.

Accordingly, I select PME as the awardee.

  
James Eastman  
Source Selection Authority

9-16-15  
Date