

## **Selection Statement for the Center Operations Support Services (COSS)**

### **RFP NNM08223562R**

On May 22, 2008, I along with other senior officials of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC) met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate the proposal in connection with the Center Operations Support Services.

#### **I. PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION**

The Director of the MSFC appointed members of the SEB, which included representation from the Office of Strategic Analysis and Communications, the Center Operations Facilities Management Office, and the Office of Procurement. To aid in the evaluation, the SEB appointed technical evaluators with expertise in appropriate disciplines in order to provide assessments of a proposal's strengths and weaknesses. The SEB utilized this information in conjunction with the predetermined evaluation factors and subfactors in formulating its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses for the Offeror.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Center Operations Support Services (COSS) was released on November 20, 2007. The RFP required Offerors to provide the resources, including management, supervision, labor, materials, tools, and equipment (except as expressly stated in the contract) necessary to provide COSS for the MSFC.

The effort will be performed under a Performance-Based contract containing Firm-Fixed Price Lump Sum and Firm-Fixed Price, Pre-Priced, or Time & Materials Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity work. The contract includes a Schedule of Prices from which deductions shall be taken for work that is not performed, or does not meet the requirements specified. The contract is for a one-year base period and four 1-year option periods. Therefore, the period of performance will be a maximum of five years from the date of award.

One amendment was issued to the RFP:

Amendment No. 1 was released on December 7, 2007, and provided Offerors with answers to written questions received in response to the RFP, as well as revisions to the RFP. These revisions included (1) replacing the Mishap and Safety Statistics Reports Data Requirements Description (DRD 1197SA-002), (2) deletion and replacement of Form SD-Lost Time Case Rates Matrix, and the associated example, and (3) addition of Contract Clauses I.18 (Federal Acquisition Regulations Part 52.203-13—Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct) and I.19 (Federal Acquisition Regulations Part 52.203-14—Display of Hotline Poster(s)).

The procurement was conducted as a full and open competition in accordance with FAR Part 15, entitled "Contracting by Negotiation." On December 20, 2007, one proposal was received from the following company:

EG&G Technical Services, Inc.  
9960 Federal Drive  
Suite 300  
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

## II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The proposal was evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815. The Government evaluated the proposal in two general steps:

Step One – An initial evaluation was performed to determine if all information had been provided and that the Offeror had made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable proposal. The proposal was determined to be acceptable.

Step Two – The proposal was evaluated against the three evaluation factors contained in the RFP. Based on this evaluation, the Government had the option to utilize one of the following methods: (1) make selection and award without discussions; or (2) enter into negotiations with EG&G Technical Services, Inc. (EG&G) and afford the Offeror an opportunity to revise its proposal, and then make selection. Pursuant to FAR Subpart 15 and NFS 1815.305-71, the Source Selection Authority directed the Contracting Officer to enter into negotiations with EG&G.

Since only one proposal was received the procedures in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-71 were utilized. Based on market research, the marginal changes in the Performance Work Statement since the last two competitions of this procurement, and the minimal number of questions received concerning the Draft and Final Request for Proposal, the Contracting Officer concluded in accordance with the requirements of the Source Evaluation Plan and NFS 1815.305-71 entitled: "Evaluation of a Single Proposal," (1) the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive and (2) the proposal was acceptable. Subsequently, in accordance with the authority of NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-71(a)(2), the Source Selection Authority directed the Contracting Officer to initiate negotiations of an acceptable contract with EG&G. In addition, pursuant to Marshall Policy Directive 1203.3 Section A.5.1.2, the Source Selection Authority, the Center Director, delegated his authority to the Acting Director of the Office of Procurement, Byron W. Butler, to serve as the Source Selection Authority for the COSS procurement.

## III. EVALUATION FACTORS

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors considered essential in an offer: Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance. Offerors were advised that the three factors were essentially equal in importance. Therefore, all evaluation factors other than Price, when combined, were significantly more important than Price.

The three evaluation factors were described as follows:

Mission Suitability: The proposals were analyzed for the excellence of the work to be performed, including management and technical subfactors, as well as proposal risk. Mission Suitability consisted of four subfactors:

- A. Management and Technical Approach
- B. Key Personnel, Staffing and Total Compensation Plan
- C. Safety, Health and Environmental
- D. Small Business Utilization

The applicable adjective ratings were “Excellent,” “Very Good,” “Good,” “Fair,” and “Poor.” Mission Suitability was evaluated using the adjectival rating system/definitions shown in NFS 1815.305 “Proposal Evaluation.”

Price:

The proposed price was evaluated for adequacy, reasonableness and realism. The Government evaluated price components, including indirect burdens, in accordance with the price data submitted for Section B., “Schedule of Prices for Lump Sum Work, Pre-priced Work, IDIQ Coefficients, and Fixed Labor Rates,” as well as pricing data submitted in Attachments L-2 (MSFC COSS Lump Sum and Pre-Priced Work Basis of Estimate), L-4 (Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity Coefficients), L-5 (Summary of Total Price for Lump Sum), L-6 (Price Evaluation Form (including Example)), and L-7 (Pricing Forms).

The Government evaluated the offer for award purposes by adding the Offeror’s proposed prices for the Total Lump Sum (CLIN 0001), the Total Pre-Priced Work (CLIN 0002), and the total evaluated price for the following Coefficient Factors (both core and non-core hours) and Coefficients (which were all multiplied by the Government’s assumed bare costs): FFP Labor Coefficient, FFP Material Coefficient Factor, T&M Labor Coefficient Factor, T&M Material Coefficient, and the Specialty Services and Equipment Coefficient for the base year and all option years, in order to develop the Offeror’s total evaluated proposed price.

The SEB then assessed its level of confidence (High, Medium, or Low) in the Offeror’s ability to successfully perform the contract at the proposed price. This assessment was reported to the SSA. The Government could have determined the proposal unacceptable if the option prices were significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of the option periods does not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

The Offeror’s proposed phase-in price was identified separately and reported to the SSA. Adjustments to the proposed phase-in price were not made by the SEB; however, the overall adequacy and realism of the proposed phase-in price were reported to the SSA via an assessment showing the confidence of the SEB (High, Medium or Low) in the Offeror’s ability to deliver high quality phase-in services at the proposed price. Offeror’s

were cautioned that unrealistic or unreasonable prices and inconsistencies between the Mission Suitability Volume and the Price Factor Volume would be assessed as a proposal risk and reflected in the confidence assessment.

Past Performance: The Offeror's overall corporate past performance, including the corporate past performance of any proposed teammates/subcontractors (as opposed to that of proposed key personnel), for contracts similar in size, scope of work performed, and contract type to this requirement was evaluated. Emphasis was given to the extent of direct relevant corporate experience, the Offeror's record of meeting subcontracting goals as provided in Attachment L-12, and quality of past performance on previous contracts that are highly relevant to the effort defined in the RFP (such as planned and reactive maintenance, operations, services, cost control, schedule performance, management).

The SEB considered past performance information provided by the Offeror and information from other sources. In addition to Offeror provided references, the NASA/MSFC past performance database and references known to the SEB were checked as deemed necessary. The Interview/Questionnaire form was used to solicit assessments of the Offeror's performance from the Offeror's previous customers. All pertinent information, including customer assessments and any Offeror rebuttals, if appropriate, were made part of the evaluation records and included in the evaluation.

The Offeror's Lost Time Case (LTC) rate was evaluated. Each referenced contract or project LTC was averaged (3 years) and compared to the latest available Department of Labor (DoL) LTC national average for the given North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). The Offeror, including subcontractors' and teammates', voluntary turnover history for the past 3 years for exempt and nonexempt employees (or other major categorizations used by the Offeror) for the Corporate entity bidding on this contract was also evaluated.

Past Performance is not numerically scored; however, an adjectival rating was assigned. The applicable adjective ratings were "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," and "Poor." In order to not discourage the formation of new firms that fit these criteria, firms with no relevant past performance received an adjectival rating of "Neutral" consistent with RFP Section M.6(F)(3).

#### IV. DISPOSITION AND EVALUATION OF INITIAL PROPOSALS

The offer received from EG&G was determined to be acceptable and was evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP. The initial findings of the Source Evaluation Board were presented to me, the SSA, on March 4, 2007.

By letter dated March 28, 2008, EG&G was advised of its status and provided with its respective weaknesses and clarifications identified during the evaluation of their proposal. The letter established April 8, 2008, as the due date for all written responses. Accordingly, April 15, 2008, was established as the date for oral discussions with EG&G.

Oral, written, and telephonic discussions continued from April 15, 2008, through May 5, 2008.

On May 6, 2008, a letter requesting a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) was sent to EG&G with a due date for receipt of the FPR on May 12, 2008. Subsequently, the final proposal was evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP.

#### V. Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions

As a result of the discussion process and the Final Proposal Revisions, EG&G, eliminated all of its Mission Suitability weaknesses and increased its adjectival rating. The Past Performance adjective rating for EG&G did not change. In addition, EG&G revised its Price Proposal based upon discussions. The final evaluation results of the FPRs are summarized below.

#### **EG&G Technical Services, Inc.**

In the Mission Suitability factor, EG&G received an overall adjective rating of Excellent. EG&G had no deficiencies, significant weaknesses or weaknesses.

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, EG&G received one significant strength, nineteen strengths, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

#### Significant Strengths: 1

- A significant strength is the Offeror's approach and process for Predictive Test & Inspection. The Offeror proposes to add 8 additional tests which improve efficiencies on the COSS Contract.

#### Strengths: 19

- A strength is the Program Manager's autonomy and authority to completely manage this contract. This autonomy reduces time in processing contractual documents and improves efficiency on the COSS contract.
- A strength is the development of critical maintenance, operations, and recovery procedures for buildings and systems, by senior employees to capture their skill level knowledge. This approach benefits the Government by documenting this knowledge base.
- A strength is the Offeror's organizational structure which can provide oversight for accomplishing major IDIQ tasks requirements on the COSS Contract.

- A strength is the Offeror's proposed goals for reduction of response and completion times for trouble calls, trouble call services, and spills are more aggressive than the PWS requirements, which is potentially beneficial to the Government.
- A strength is the Offeror's proposal provides a detailed step-by-step process demonstrating a sound approach to planning, integrating, and performing large scale IDIQ projects.
- A strength is the Offeror's use of Predictive Test & Inspection, Preventive Maintenance Records, failure history analysis, and MAXIMO history in formulating its preventive maintenance strategy. This strategy can save the Government money by extending the life of equipment.
- A strength is the Offeror's process for ensuring contract requirements are met. For example, the Offeror has meetings with all Program Managers where lessons learned and innovative ideas are shared.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes to contract with a consultant to provide assessments of the RCM program at no additional cost to the Government.
- A strength is the Offeror's innovative approach and process for reducing residual IDIQ inventory. This approach has the potential to save Government resources.
- A strength is the Offeror's use of proven processes, dedicated Preventive Maintenance crews, and improved work planning and scheduling in order to improve system reliability and customer service.
- A strength is the Offeror's comprehensive approach to managing subcontractor work. The proposed approach can lead to mission success and contract efficiency.
- A strength is the Offeror's approach to ensure all personnel have the required training to successfully perform their duties under the contract. This approach reduces several risks (i.e., mishaps, violations, system outages, etc.) and improves efficiencies associated with contract performance.
- A strength is the Offeror's one badge approach for teammates which completely integrates the teammates into the Offeror's organization and allows each subcontractor to take direction from the lead in that organization, thus eliminating multiple layers of a chain of command for reporting and decision making.

- A strength is the Offeror's use of multiple training solutions as a means to provide opportunities for growth and development of its employees. This approach is a way of stabilizing and motivating the workforce.
- A strength is the Offeror's detailed and comprehensive approach and process for operating the work control center. This approach increases the offeror's capability of meeting the work control center requirements of the PWS.
- A strength is the Offeror's comprehensive approach to leveraging management techniques and systems by utilizing corporate resources, process improvement teams, Reliability Centered Maintenance, Predictive Test & Inspection, workforce suggestions, customer service feedback surveys, and management innovations in order to develop integrated processes and procedures to successfully complete PWS requirements on time.
- A strength is the Offeror's approach to resolving maintenance issues by having System Engineers work "hand-in-hand" with Maintenance Technicians in order to have an "on-the-spot" resolution of maintenance issues. This proposed method will reduce down time.
- A strength is the Offeror's proposed innovation for a pilot program at the Offeror's expense to install differential pressure switches for Building 4203 in an effort to determine the most cost effective manner for replacing air filters.
- A strength is the Offeror's use of Lean Six Sigma best practices which continually track technologies; assist Program Managers in optimizing processes, and deploying technologies to improve efficiencies.

Under the Key Personnel, Staffing and Total Compensation Plan subfactor, EG&G received three significant strengths, nine strengths, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

#### Significant Strengths: 3

- A significant strength is that the proposed Program Manager (PM) has extensive management experience in contracts comparable in size and complexity to the COSS contract and in managing large organizations in the US Army. During the last eight years he has been a manager on the COSS contract, first as the Work Control Manager and currently as the Program Manager. Prior to working on the COSS contract he was Director of Receiving and Warehouse Division at the Kelly Distribution Center where he managed 250 craft and clerical employees. He has over 32 years of experience in facilities operation and maintenance, distribution, logistics services and training, and he has a MBA. Key personnel interview references were Excellent and his commitment is proposed at 100%.

- A significant strength is the proposed Deputy Program Manager/Maintenance Manager has over 27 years of experience on the COSS contract and predecessor contracts. He is the Deputy Program Manager/Maintenance Manager on the current COSS contract and was the Maintenance Manager for the previous COSS contract. He has a BS degree in Management of Technology. He has received many awards including the NASA Public Service Medal, Manned Space Flight Awareness Honoree, Silver Snoopy, and numerous group achievement awards. Key personnel interview references were Excellent and his commitment is proposed at 100%.
- A significant strength is the proposed IDIQ Branch Manager has over 20 years of related project management experience, most of which occurred at MSFC. He has managed the small construction portion of the Base Maintenance Mission Services contract, was the Test Operations Manager on the MSFC Test Operations Support Contract, and is currently the IDIQ Branch Manager for the COSS contract. He has a BS degree in technical business and a Master's Certificate in Project Management. Key personnel interview references were Excellent and his commitment is proposed at 100%.

Strengths: 9

- A strength is that the proposed Work Control/Business Office Manager has over 20 years of experience in facilities operations. He has been employed for the past seven years on the COSS contract, the last two of which have been as the Work Control Manager and previously as the Operations Manager and in the Engineering Section. Key personnel interview references were Excellent and his commitment is proposed at 100%.
- A strength is that the proposed Operations Branch Manager has over 20 years of experience in facilities support at MSFC with increasingly responsible positions on the current COSS contract leading to his current assignment as the Operations Branch Manager approximately two years ago. He has a BS degree in technical business. Key personnel interview references were Excellent and his commitment is proposed at 100%.
- A strength is that the proposed Engineering Branch manager has 20 years of engineering management experience in various fields including design, project management and electrical safety evaluation. He is a Registered Professional Engineer in Alabama, Tennessee, Texas, and Oregon and has completed significant work toward a MS in Engineering Management. Key personnel interview references were Excellent and his commitment is proposed at 100%.
- A strength is the Offeror will be 100% staffed at contract award and will only need 15 days for phase-in activities at no cost to the Government.



- A strength is the Offeror's proposal to hire 98% of the incumbent workforce which provides a stable work environment.
- A strength is the Offeror's approach to cross-training selected employees to perform multiple functions which improves efficiencies and provides opportunities for growth for contractor personnel. Additionally, the Offeror has negotiated an agreement with the unions to allow its members to work hours out of its category.
- A strength is the Offeror's proven methodology, process and comprehensive approach to transitioning Lump Sum and IDIQ work from the current contract to the new contract.
- A strength is the Offeror's Professional Development Plan which offers employees opportunities for growth and development and gives them input into their future, thus allowing the Offeror to maintain a stable and motivated workforce.
- A strength is the Offeror's fringe benefits package which encourages employees to pursue higher education opportunities.

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, EG&G received no significant strengths, two strength, and no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. This finding is summarized as follows:

Strength: 2

- A strength is the Offeror's SHE Plan which is comprehensive and thorough in addressing each MSFC SHE Core Program Requirement (CPR) and sub-element in sufficient detail in addressing all DRD 1197SA-001 CPRs and sub-elements and proposed additional safety initiatives beyond the MSFC requirements.
- A strength is the Offeror provides a good risk analysis and mitigation plan within its Safety Health and Environment Section of the proposal which supports MSFC's SHE goals.

In the Small Business Utilization subfactor, EG&G received one significant strength, one strength, and no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. This finding is summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 1

- A significant strength is the Offeror's proposed commitment to award subcontracts to small businesses (SB) in core work areas which provide small businesses more significant work experiences with NASA.

Strengths: 1

- A strength is the Offeror's proposed commitment to exceed all established subcontracting percentage goals which provides additional opportunities for small businesses to perform work for NASA.

In the Past Performance factor, EG&G received an overall adjective rating of Excellent. EG&G received five significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses and two weaknesses. This finding is summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 5

- A significant strength is that the Offeror demonstrated highly relevant past performance based on the size, scope, and contract type in the performance of the current COSS contract which provides facility operations and maintenance support to MSFC. Overall, the quality of the past performance was assessed to be Excellent Plus.
- A significant strength is that the Offeror demonstrated highly relevant past performance based on the size and scope in the performance of the Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility (TOCDF) contract which provides facility operations and maintenance support to the TOCDF (DoD). Overall, the quality of the past performance was assessed to be Excellent.
- A significant strength is that the Offeror demonstrated highly relevant past performance based on the size and scope in the performance of the Joint Range Technical Services contract which provides facility operations and maintenance support to four different DoD sites. Overall, the quality of the past performance was assessed to be Excellent.
- A significant strength is the Offeror's LTC is less than 50% of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics LTC national average for the following given North American Industry Classification System (NAICS): NAICS 561210 (MSFC COSS); NAICS 336212 (TOCDF); and NAICS 541330 (J-Tech).
- A significant strength is the Offeror's proposed subcontractors LTC is less than 50% of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics LTC national average for the following given the NAICS: NAICS 541330 (System Engineering Subcontractor-MSFC COSS Contract); NAICS 561210 (System

Engineering Subcontractor-MSFC Logistics Contract); NAICS 5411610 (Heavy Equipment Operations-SVMF); and NAICS 541513 (Boiler Operations Subcontractor - MSFC COSS).

Strengths: 4

- A strength is that the Offeror's subcontractor for Boiler Operations demonstrated relevant past performance based on the scope and contract type in the performance of the current COSS contract which provides boiler operations to MSFC. Overall, the quality of the past performance was assessed to be Excellent.
- A strength is that the Offeror's subcontractor for Systems Engineering demonstrated relevant past performance based on the scope and contract type in the performance of the current COSS contract which provides Engineering Support to the Facilities Management Office. Overall, the quality of the past performance was assessed to be Excellent.
- A strength is that the Offeror's subcontractor for Systems Engineering demonstrated relevant past performance based on the scope and contract type in the performance of the current Logistics contract which provides Systems Engineering support to the Logistics Services Office. Overall, the quality of the past performance was assessed to be Excellent.
- A strength is that Offeror's subcontracting performance under the J-Tech contract exceeded the negotiated goals for Small Business by approximately a factor of 2.

Weaknesses: 2

- A weakness is that the Offeror's subcontracting performance under the current COSS contract failed to meet the Small Disadvantaged Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions negotiated goals.
- A weakness is that the Offeror's subcontracting performance under the J-Tech contract failed to meet the Small Disadvantaged Business, HubZone, Veteran-Owned Small Business, and Small Disabled Veteran Owned negotiated goals.

In the Price factor, EG&G proposed a price of \$78.036M. The SEB determined the proposed price was reasonable, adequate, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the price and the SEB gave EG&G a "High" cost confidence.

VI. DECISION

After polling all of my advisors and obtaining their inputs, I concluded that award of the COSS be made to EG&G Technical Services, Inc. This determination is based on NFS 1815.305-71(a)(2) in that an acceptable contract, as evidenced by EG&G's FPR and signed contract, was negotiated.



Byron W. Butler  
Source Selection Authority

  
Date