

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
Ames Research Center  
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000**

**Selection of Contractor  
For  
Aerospace Testing and Facilities  
Operations and Maintenance (ATOM)  
NNA08220778R-AMA  
June 2, 2009**

On May 13, 2009, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Board (SEB) ex-officio members, met with the ATOM SEB, the board appointed to evaluate the proposals for the procurement of ATOM for the Office of the Director of Aeronautics and the Office of the Director of Exploration Technology. During this meeting, the Chairperson of the SEB presented the findings from its Evaluation Report, which we discussed to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

I assessed the SEB's findings and evaluation of proposals. This Source Selection Statement reflects my independent judgment, consistent with the source selection criteria prescribed by the Request for Proposal (RFP), and sets forth my selection decision.

**Procurement Description**

This procurement is for Testing, Operations, and Maintenance support for ground-based Aerospace facilities at Ames Research Center (ARC), specifically for the facilities of the Aeronautics Directorate and the Exploration Technology Directorate. The two primary facilities operated by these organizations, and which this contract will support, are the Unitary Plan Wind Tunnels and the ArcJet Complex. The ArcJet Complex plays a key role in Thermal Protection Material System development, testing, and qualification. Both facilities are also Shuttle stand-by facilities used to provide urgent testing services during Shuttle missions if needed. The Unitary has also been identified as the Navy's primary transonic validation wind tunnel and is scheduled for a number of weapon integration tests during the period of the upcoming contract. Both facilities have supported, and are expected to continue to support, a number of other DOD programs both classified and unclassified. Lastly, US commercial entities have a significant need for these facilities. These Agency-critical facilities have been in service for at least 40 years and are projected to remain as nationally important assets to NASA, DOD, and US industry for the foreseeable future.

This procurement was conducted as a full and open competition, and will result in a single award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee (CPIF) contract, with a minimum contract value of \$300,000 and a maximum contract value of \$200,000,000. The period of performance will consist of a two-year base period,

and three one-year priced option periods, resulting in a maximum performance period of five years.

**Evaluation Procedure**

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, “Source Selection,” as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, “Source Selection.” Section M of the solicitation, at paragraph M.2 “Evaluation Approach”, advised potential Offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. Therefore, potential Offerors were advised to submit their initial proposals to the Government using the most favorable terms from a cost and technical standpoint. The RFP further stated that “Discussions will be held only if award on the basis of initial offers is determined not to be in the Government’s best interest.”

The RFP identified three evaluation Factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Of these evaluation factors, Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost are essentially equal to each other. Evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.

Regarding Mission Suitability, the RFP stated: “The overall Mission Suitability Factor will be numerically scored, and the Mission Suitability Subfactors will be rated by adjective and numerically weighted and scored...”

The Mission Suitability Factor consists of four Subfactors. The Subfactors are shown below with their respective available point allocation, which signifies their importance.

<b>MISSION SUITABILITY</b>	
<b>Subfactors</b>	<b>Assigned Weight</b>
Technical Understanding	375
Management Approach Organizational Structure and Approach Response to Sample Task(s) Key Personnel Staffing, Recruitment, Retention, and Training Phase-in Plan Total Compensation Plan Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan	325
Safety and Health Plan	200
Small Business Utilization	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>

Potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings are: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

With regard to the Past Performance Factor, the RFP provided for evaluation by the use of level of confidence ratings including Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral, depending on the SEB's assessment of each proposal in this area. For an Offeror and its major subcontractors, the RFP required the SEB to evaluate overall Past Performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition. This Factor provides an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services provided by an Offeror, to the Government and other organizations as either a prime or subcontractor. The Past Performance evaluation was based on the information provided in Past Performance Volume II, an assessment of customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of an Offeror and of its major subcontractors, and other information submitted and collected pursuant to the solicitation.

For the Cost Factor, the SEB performed a cost realism analysis on the proposed cost, which included an assessment of probable cost and business methods as they affect cost. The RFP prescribed that the SEB assign a level of confidence of High, Medium, or Low in the probable cost assessment for each proposal, and perform a price analysis to determine adequate price competition and reasonableness. The SEB also evaluated the definition of labor categories and utilization of personnel both in-house and from other sources. This assessment also considered technical/management risks to determine if an Offeror can perform the requirements within the proposed cost and with the proposed resources.

### **Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals**

Prior to issuance of the formal RFP, in an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and improve communications, ARC issued a Sources Sought synopsis to get a level of interest from industry. A draft RFP was issued requesting industry comments and recommendations on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach to satisfy these requirements. In addition, a Presolicitation Conference and tour (15 companies attended) was held to provide additional information. Industry was encouraged to ask questions and provide comments regarding the ATOM requirement and the procurement process. The comments and recommendations received in response to these communications with industry were carefully evaluated and incorporated in the formal RFP as appropriate. A Government response to each comment/recommendation was prepared. As a result of the various documents released to gauge industry interest, a total of thirty-seven (37) companies responded positively.

The formal RFP was issued electronically on the World Wide Web (WWW) on February 11, 2009 with a proposal due date of March 16, 2009. One amendment was issued to respond to additional questions and was placed on the WWW for the benefit of all respondents on February 17, 2009. The response date was not extended as a result of this amendment.

One proposal was received in response to the RFP by the specified closing time and date. The Contracting Officer reviewed the solicitation, proposal, and related documents and, in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305, determined that the solicitation was not flawed nor unduly restrictive and the single proposal is acceptable and an adequate industry response. On March 23, 2009, I met with the SEB to discuss this information and determined that the SEB should continue with evaluation of the single proposal received. The contract file contains the complete analysis but the primary factor for the determination was the number of parties (37) that expressed interest in the ATOM procurement and the number of parties (15) that attended the PreSolicitation Conference and Tour, leaving the Government and the contracting community with the impression that there would be competition for this requirement. Additionally, the proposed teaming arrangement captures industry leaders that showed interest and might have proposed on their own. The Offeror and its subcontractors names and addresses (subcontractors listed alphabetically) are as follows:

**Offeror:**

**Jacobs Technology Inc.  
600 William Northern Blvd.  
PO Box 884  
Tullahoma, TN 37388**

**Subcontractors:**

**Qualis Corporation  
5000 Bradford Drive, Suite B  
Huntsville, Alabama 35805**

**Sierra Lobo, Inc.  
11401 Hoover Road  
Milan, OH 44846**

Oral proposals were received for a portion of Mission Suitability. A written proposal was received for Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. Each factor was submitted in a separate volume in accordance with Section L of the Solicitation and FAR Parts 15.101 and 15.306. Copies of the proposal were issued to each of the four voting members of the SEB.

**Evaluation Process**

The SEB members individually reviewed the one proposal received, attended the Oral Presentation, and met to discuss individual findings. The SEB identified strengths and weaknesses for Mission Suitability. In Mission Suitability, the identified strengths and weaknesses were categorized either as a “Significant Strength” or “Significant Weakness” or, if not significant, as an “Other Strength” or “Other Weakness”. The strength and weakness findings were used to establish adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability Subfactor, and then an overall numerical score for

Mission Suitability. No “Deficiencies” were identified in the Mission Suitability proposal.

The SEB assigned a level of confidence for the Past Performance Factor, based on the proposals, questionnaires completed by past and current customers, and the data obtained by the SEB from other sources as provided for in the RFP. No adverse past performance information was identified.

The SEB conducted a probable cost assessment and assigned a level of confidence to the probable cost in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a) (1), "Cost or price evaluation." The SEB also conducted a cost realism analysis on the overall cost proposed to ensure the Offeror understood the magnitude and complexity of the contract, and offered a sound approach to satisfying the SOW requirements. The proposal was evaluated to identify if technical/management risks existed. The SEB considered the definition of labor categories and the Offeror’s plans to use personnel from its own organization, make new hires, or obtain personnel from other sources to meet the requirements of the SOW.

## **EVALUATION FINDINGS OF THE SEB**

### **Mission Suitability Factor**

The Offeror’s Mission Suitability proposal received a numerical score of 960 out of a possible 1,000 points.

In the Technical Understanding Subfactor, the SEB assigned a rating of Excellent, arising from six (6) Significant Strengths and no Other Strengths. No Weaknesses or Deficiencies were assigned. The Significant Strengths are: (1) the Offeror proposed an innovative, process-oriented approach addressing issues and critical risks for operating the facilities, improving customer perception, and ensuring the safety of people, facilities, and test customer property; (2) the Offeror’s exceptional approach would provide additional technical expertise on an as-needed basis during periods of high facility demand or when unique projects or problems arise; (3) the Offeror’s exceptionally effective risk management process would identify, assess, and evaluate countermeasures to mitigate the various operational and safety risks inherent with aerospace testing from pretest planning through delivery of data; (4) the Offeror’s exceptional integrated project management process would provide a comprehensive technical approach to enhance the potential for developmental project success that would attract and keep customers; (5) the Offeror’s proposed comprehensive approach demonstrates a thorough understanding of the engineering processes for successful operation of support facilities, maintenance, calibration, and repair; and (6) the Offeror’s proposed comprehensive initiative plan and key processes would ensure safe, reliable facility utilization and would provide first-class testing exceeding customer needs.

In the Management Approach Subfactor, the SEB assigned a rating of Excellent, arising from four (4) Significant Strengths and five (5) Other Strengths. No Weaknesses or Deficiencies were assigned. The Significant Strengths are: (1) the Offeror proposed an

exceptionally streamlined organizational approach that would provide local autonomy and direct local access to corporate resources and authority; (2) the Offeror's efficient management approach would provide cost savings to the Government; (3) the Offeror's comprehensive approach to the sample tasks demonstrated an in-depth understanding of the unique aspects and complexity of those tasks and this requirement; and (4) the Offeror's proactive approach to Staffing, Recruitment, Retention, and Training would greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance, safe operation of the facilities, and customer satisfaction. The other Strengths are: (1) the Offeror's proposed Key Personnel would be exceptionally effective in managing a testing and facility operations and maintenance contract of this size and complexity; (2) the Offeror's proposal would provide an exceptionally complete, fully integrated, and efficient approach to phase-in which would ensure safe and secure continuity of operations, with minimal Government oversight; (3) the Offeror's proposed business operation would be efficient and significantly reduce overhead costs and duplication and result in efficiencies; (4) the Offeror's proposed employee-centric Total Compensation Plan would provide an excellent way of motivating the entire workforce; and (5) the Offeror proposed an Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Avoidance Plan that would ensure that its Team would be inherently and completely free from potential or actual OCI.

In the Safety and Health Plan Subfactor, the SEB assigned a rating of Excellent, arising from two (2) Significant Strengths and no Other Strengths. No Weaknesses or Deficiencies were assigned. The Significant Strengths are: (1) the Offeror's highly detailed safety and health plan would provide a comprehensive approach to ensure the safety of all personnel and of the high-risk facilities critical to NASA's mission; and (2) the Offeror's proposed comprehensive safety program would ensure an effective and safe work environment.

In the Small Business Utilization Subfactor, the SEB assigned a rating of Excellent, arising from one (1) Significant Strength and one (1) Other Strength. No Weaknesses or Deficiencies were assigned. The Significant Strength is: (1) the Offeror demonstrated a serious commitment to meet or exceed NASA's socio-economic goals in their Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The Other Strength is: (1) the Offeror's proposed Small Business Subcontracting Plan is well thought out, providing details of the approach, processes, and procedures for implementation of a strong subcontracting program.

### **Past Performance Factor**

The SEB assigned a Very High Level of Confidence rating to the Offeror's Past Performance Proposal.

The SEB determined that the Offeror's past contracts are highly relevant in both size and technical work, and the performance ratings associated with those contracts were excellent. The Offeror also demonstrated that its team has significant, excellent, and relevant technical past performance in all areas of the ATOM requirement and has consistently received high ratings and recommendations from its customers. The Offeror also consistently receives high ratings and superlative recommendations from its

customers in the areas of contract management and safety. The Offeror also demonstrated that each team member has a corporate structure with demonstrated autonomy. The proposed subcontractors received very good to excellent ratings.

### **Cost Factor**

The SEB found the Offeror's proposed hours and skill mix to be both reasonable and realistic. The SEB also determined that the proposed materials, travel, other direct costs, and subcontract costs were reasonable and realistic. No adjustment was made to the Offeror's proposed costs, and thus the proposed and probable costs are the same. The Offeror provided sufficient data to allow the SEB to have a High Level of Confidence in the Offeror's probable costs and in its ability to perform the resultant contract within the costs proposed.

## **SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR ATOM SERVICES**

Introduction:

FAR Part 15.308 "Source Selection Decision" states: "The Source Selection Authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The source selection decision shall be documented and the documentation shall include rationale for any business judgments and trade-offs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs. Although the rationale for the selection decision must be documented, that documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the decision."

I made my selection decision based on an assessment of the proposal against all of the source selection criteria prescribed in the RFP. My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEB's findings to ensure a full understanding thereof. I did not simply count and compare the number of findings; rather, I considered the potential impact of each finding, and its relevance to this proposed effort.

### **Assessment of the SEB's findings:**

I reviewed the SEB's findings for Mission Suitability and the resultant adjectival ratings, at the Subfactor level, and the numerical scores. I reviewed the findings and level of confidence rating for Past Performance. I reviewed the Cost evaluation results, including the proposed costs, cost realism assessment, and the confidence level in the probable cost assessment. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision.

I concur with all of the SEB's findings. As the Source Selection Authority, I hereby adopt the findings of the SEB without exception.

**Selection Discussion:**

I concur with all of the strengths assigned by the SEB to the one Offeror, Jacobs Technology Inc., under the Mission Suitability Factor, and the assigned numerical score of 960 out of a possible 1,000 points. Jacobs' Mission Suitability proposal had no Weaknesses, no Deficiencies, and nineteen (19) Strengths, thirteen (13) of which are Significant. In my independent judgment, the following attributes of the Jacobs Mission Suitability proposal are particularly impressive and important to this requirement: Significant Strengths (1), (3), (4), and (6) (as cited and outlined above) in the Technical Understanding Subfactor; Significant Strength (2) and Other Strength (3) in the Management Approach Subfactor; and Significant Strengths (1) and (2) in the Safety and Health Plan Subfactor.

I find the potential value to the Government of these attributes, and the overall quality, of Jacobs' Mission Suitability Proposal to be highly compelling.

I am also impressed with Jacobs' Past Performance, and I share the SEB's Very High Level of Confidence in Jacobs' ability to meet the requirements of the resultant contract based on Jacobs' impressive and relevant experience on previous efforts, as evidenced by Past Performance testimonials.

Finally, I share the SEB's High confidence level in Jacobs' probable costs. It is my independent judgment that Jacobs' highly credible proposal would lead to the successful performance of the contract's requirements within the established contract value.

**Selection:**

Jacobs' Mission Suitability proposal is outstanding, and has no Weaknesses; its Strengths, as outlined above, will ensure excellent contract performance and customer satisfaction. I have a Very High Level of Confidence in Jacobs' ability to provide excellent contract performance, as reflected by its impressive Past Performance on work similar to the work requirements of this contract. Finally, I deem Jacobs' proposed and probable costs to be both reasonable and realistic. Jacobs, in short, demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirements of this effort, and will provide outstanding value to the Government.

I select Jacobs Technology Inc. for contract award.



Dr. Thomas A. Edwards  
Source Selection Authority