

**SELECTION STATEMENT  
FOR  
FACILITIES OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE SERVICES  
RFP-NNG10000489R**

On August 21, 2012, I along with senior officials from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) met with members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to hear their findings based on the evaluation of proposals for the Facilities Operations and Maintenance Services (FOMS) contract.

**PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION**

The FOMS requirement was issued as a total 8(a) set-aside competitive procurement to acquire the following services: ensuring utility availability for critical operations including power, uninterruptible power supply, generators, elevators, fire protection systems, utility control systems, and heating, ventilation, air conditioning and refrigeration (HVAC/R) systems; mission support; operation and maintenance of High Voltage Shop and Central Power Plants; snow/ice removal; roof replacement/repair; asbestos abatement; painting/caulking; paving/concrete; fence repairs; chemical water treatment; boiler maintenance/repair; and emergency services at Wallops Flight Facility. These services include the personnel, facilities, and materials (unless otherwise provided by the Government) to accomplish the Statement of Work requirements.

**EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

The Request for Proposals (RFP) defined the evaluation factors as Mission Suitability, Cost and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors as follows:

"The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Cost Factor is approximately equal to the Mission Suitability Factor and also approximately equal to the Past Performance Factor."

The RFP established that only the Mission Suitability factor would be point scored in the evaluation process. The Mission Suitability factor consisted of the following three sub-factors with assigned points as indicated:

SUBFACTOR		POINTS
A	Technical Approach	450
B	Management Approach	550
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the SEB developed detailed evaluation criteria and the numerical scoring system for Mission Suitability as delineated above.

Regarding the Cost Factor, the RFP stated that the cost evaluation would be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B). Offerors were referred to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of "cost realism" and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of "cost realism analysis" and "probable cost." Both the proposed and probable cost of core services and Representative Task Order (RTO) #1 reflect the Offeror's proposed fee amount; any proposed fee was not adjusted in the probable cost assessment. The proposed cost of RTO#1 and the rates proposed in Attachment O, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Fee Matrices, were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The Offeror's pricing charts (Exhibit 11) and the prices proposed in Attachments P through T were evaluated for completeness and reasonableness. Price analysis was used to determine price reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b). The proposed and probable cost assessment for core services, the proposed and probable RTO#1 costs, total/summary of Exhibit 11, and the total Firm-Fixed-Price Phase-In price were presented to the Source Selection Authority.

For the Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated the past performance evaluation would be conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15. Each Offeror's contract references (including significant subcontractor(s) defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$2M), were evaluated to determine initial relevance and subsequently the degree of relevance based on size, content, and/or complexity. In evaluating Past Performance, the SEB relied on telephone and written responses received on recent Past Performance questionnaires, the government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) database, in addition to the narrative on relevant past/current contracts provided by the Offerors. The Past Performance factor was not point scored, but was assigned an adjectival rating of "Very High Level of Confidence," "High Level of Confidence," "Moderate Level of Confidence," "Low Level of Confidence," "Very Low Level of Confidence," or "Neutral."

### EVALUATION PROCESS

NASA's Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this procurement appointed the SEB which included a team of technical and business members and consultants from appropriate disciplines to assist in proposal evaluation. NASA issued the RFP on November 24, 2010. Several amendments were issued to provide clarification to the Statement of Work and Sections L and M of the Request for Proposal. A listing of these amendments and their purpose is shown below:

Amendment No.	Date Issues	Purpose
1	12/15/2010	Incorporate Wage Determinations MD100075 and MD1000138
2	1/11/2011	Incorporated requirement
3	2/2/2011	Chemical Water treatment requirement deleted from core services and

The following companies submitted initial proposals by the June 27, 2011 due date:

BOSS Joint Venture, Bowie, MD  
Chugach Federal Solutions, Inc., Anchorage, AK  
Fort Mojave Services II, LLC, Mohave Valley, AZ  
I&L FMS Joint Venture, Lancaster, SC  
Mission Critical Support Services, Herndon, VA  
Meltech Corporation, Inc., Landover, MD

The SEB presented its initial findings to the SSA on March 6, 2012. At this meeting, the Contracting Officer recommended that a competitive range be established and discussions be held.

With the SSA's concurrence, the Contracting Officer established a competitive range that included two Offerors: Chugach Federal Systems and BOSS Joint Venture. Requests for Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) were issued on May 31, 2012, and timely FPRs were received by the due date of June 13, 2012 established in Amendment 13 to the solicitation.

#### MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

After re-evaluating each subfactor in accordance with the weights delineated in the RFP, the SEB rated the FPRs in the following order, based on their total Mission Suitability score:

1. Chugach Federal Systems
2. BOSS Joint Venture

The table below provides the adjectival ratings assigned in each Mission Suitability subfactor for the two FOMS proposals.

Subfactor Adjectival Ratings		
Subfactor	BOSS	Chugach
A - Technical Approach	Very Good	Excellent
B - Management Approach	Good	Very Good

The substance of the SEB's evaluation of Mission Suitability for the Offeror's FPR is presented below.

#### Chugach

Under Subfactor A, Chugach received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" with two significant strengths, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, no weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

Chugach received the first significant strength for proposing a number of innovative, and proactive, techniques and technologies in various areas including scheduling, training, staffing, and equipment replacement that have the potential to reduce the risk of power failures and repairs, reduce downtime, produce improved records/data, and to provide staffing and other operational efficiencies.

Chugach received a second significant strength for its response to both Representative Task Orders, displaying a thorough understanding and an excellent technical approach to both RTOs which clearly demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the task orders and greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Chugach received one strength for demonstrating a detailed understanding and a sound approach to fulfilling the Statement of Work (SOW) requirements, including Facilities Operations Console staffing and procedures, use of hardware/software systems to improve cost reporting and scheduling, and an approach to the Utility Control System that will provide seamless maintenance support.

Chugach received a second strength for a well-developed risk analysis and mitigation plan that was tied directly to the FOMS Statement of Work (SOW) requirements that demonstrated the Offeror understands the risks associated with the SOW requirements and ways to mitigate those risks in order to provide uninterrupted service.

Chugach received a third strength for proposing a valuable approach for high voltage work procedures and emergency operations that will minimize power interruptions and downtime of mission critical buildings.

Chugach received a fourth strength for providing a detailed process for monitoring, operating, maintaining and repairing the Building 31 Power Plant complex, demonstrating the Offeror's depth of understanding of this requirement.

Chugach received a fifth strength for proposing a detailed and proactive approach to Reliability Centered Maintenance which provided sound recommendations for continually improving the program and that has the potential to provide efficiencies and less downtime for critical equipment.

Chugach received a sixth strength for its Quality Control Plan (QCP) that contains effective and efficient quality control processes and that demonstrates a detailed approach for ensuring SOW requirements are met.

Chugach received a seventh strength for providing a noteworthy discussion of how they develop hazardous operations Standard Operating Procedures, that provided detailed hazard analyses for SOW activities, and that demonstrates a good

understanding of the safety and health hazards associated with the SOW requirements.

Under Subfactor B, Chugach received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" with one significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, no weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

Chugach received one significant strength for a comprehensive and exemplary staffing plan demonstrating an exceptional understanding of the critical skill mix required to accomplish the contract requirements.

## **BOSS**

Under Subfactor A, BOSS received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" with one significant strength, three strengths, no significant weaknesses, no weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

BOSS received a significant strength for an approach that will enhance the efficient and effective management of materials/parts under the contract. The approach will greatly enhance the ability to effectively manage the data for task tracking, and parts management.

BOSS received a strength for its proposed Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM) program. The Offeror's demonstrated knowledge and proposed techniques will reduce critical downtime and repairs of center facilities.

BOSS received a second strength for proposing a Quality Control Plan that demonstrates a detailed and thorough approach for ensuring that Statement of Work requirements are met.

BOSS received a third strength for a proposing a new and innovative technology that has the potential to improve facilities data management and the effective use of personnel.

Under Subfactor B, BOSS received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no significant strengths, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, no weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

## **COST EVALUATION**

In conducting its assessment, the SEB evaluated the estimated proposed cost elements to determine if the cost elements were realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and were consistent with the unique methods of

performance (technical and management approach and utilization of proposed personnel) and materials described in the Offeror's technical proposal.

In their FPRs, both Offerors corrected all costs for which a probable cost adjustment had been made during the SEB's evaluation of initial proposals. Minimal probable cost adjustments were made to each Offeror's final proposal.

Chugach was evaluated as having the highest probable cost, which was between 6 and 7% higher than BOSS' probable cost.

#### PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In evaluating Past Performance, the SEB gave both Offerors an overall rating of "Very High Level of Confidence". Both Offerors demonstrated significantly relevant experience in content, complexity and size, and received very high performance ratings from their customers.

#### DECISION

In addition to the presentation materials, I carefully reviewed the SEB's detailed cost and past performance reports. I also reviewed the evaluation criteria, which stated that the Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Cost Factor is approximately equal to the Mission Suitability Factor and also approximately equal to the Past Performance Factor.

Regarding the Mission Suitability evaluation, I reviewed the Significant Strengths and Strengths associated with both Offerors and agree with the SEB's assignment of Significant Strengths and Strengths based on the relative benefit and value of the various proposed features. I noted that Chugach received an overall adjectival rating of "Excellent" for subfactor A with 2 Significant Strengths and 7 Strengths, while BOSS received an overall adjectival rating of "Very Good" with 1 Significant Strength and 3 Strengths. I concluded that Chugach's proposal was superior to BOSS' in subfactor A given that Chugach offered more strengths and significant strengths overall (9 versus 4); offered one more Significant Strength for an excellent technical approach to both RTOs; and offered several technical strengths that were unmatched by BOSS' (strength one for a detailed understanding of the SOW requirements, strength two for risk analysis and mitigation, strength three for high voltage work procedures and emergency operations, strength four for detailed process for monitoring, operating, maintaining and repairing the Building 31 Power Plant complex, and strength seven for related to hazardous operations). I determined that these advantages offered by the Chugach proposal would likely result in performance benefits for the contract.

In subfactor B, Chugach received an overall adjectival rating of "Very Good" with 1 Significant Strength while BOSS received an overall adjectival rating of "Good" with no Significant Strengths or Strengths. Therefore I concluded that Chugach's proposal

offered an advantage over BOSS' proposal in this subfactor based on Chugach's superior staffing plan.

Finally, I noted that Chugach received a significantly higher Mission Suitability score, which was consistent with the assessment of Chugach's proposal's superiority in both subfactors based on the findings. Based on my assessment of the relative merits of each offeror's subfactor A and B proposals, I agree with the SEB's assessment that Chugach's Mission Suitability proposal was substantially better than BOSS' and was a significant discriminator between the two Offerors.

In the Past Performance factor, I noted that both Offerors received "Very High Level of Confidence" ratings for their significantly relevant experience and very high level of performance. With identical ratings, the Past Performance factor provided no meaningful discriminator in my selection decision.

Regarding the cost evaluation, the SEB found the BOSS proposal to be lower (about 6 to 7 percent) than the Chugach proposal in both the proposed and probable costs. The SEB made relatively minor probable cost adjustments to both Offerors, but these adjustments did not have a significant impact on the cost advantage proposed by BOSS.

In making my decision, I noted that the Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost factors are all approximately equal in importance. With the Offerors equal in Past Performance, my decision came down to Mission Suitability and Cost. Weighing cost and Mission Suitability equal in importance, I concluded that Chugach's significant advantage in Mission Suitability outweighed BOSS' 6-7% advantage in cost. More specifically, I find that the technical advantages as described in the Significant Strengths and Strengths associated with Chugach's proposal are more valuable to NASA than the cost savings offered by BOSS' proposal. Chugach's technical approach is worth the additional cost because the value to NASA of the enhanced potential for successful contract performance and for exceeding the contract requirements outweighs the 6-7% cost savings offered by BOSS. In conclusion, based on my review of Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost, I have concluded that Chugach's proposal represents the best value to NASA on the basis of a significantly better technical approach (Mission Suitability) despite the minimally higher cost. Consequently, I have selected Chugach for the award of the Facilities Operations and Maintenance Services (FOMS) contract.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Paprocki  
Source Selection Authority

9/11/12  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date