

Selection Statement

Selection of Contractor for Operation and Routine Maintenance of the Ancillary Systems of the National Transonic Facility (NTF)

On May 2, 1991, I met with the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate proposals for Operation and Routine Maintenance of the Ancillary Systems of the NTF. The Committee's presentation consisted of the procurement history, the evaluation procedures, and the results of the evaluation of the proposals submitted.

Procurement Description

This procurement will provide support services for operating and maintaining the ancillary systems of the NTF. A cost-plus-award-fee level-of-effort type contract has been determined to be the most appropriate type for the proposed procurement. The contract will have a 24-month initial period of performance followed by one 12-month priced option, one 24-month priced option, and six 1-month priced options. The contract will also include priced options during each period for the procurement of additional labor hours.

Sources

Seventy-nine (79) firms were provided the Request for Proposal and ten (10) firms attended the preproposal conference held at this Center on December 19, 1991. Proposals were submitted by four (4) companies.

Calspan Corporation, Service Contracts Division
Engineering Design Group, Inc. (EDG)
Systems Engineering Associates Company (SEACOR)
Wyle Laboratories

Evaluation Procedure

The RFP set forth the following four evaluation factors:

Mission Suitability
Cost
Relevant Experience and Past Performance
Other Considerations

The Mission Suitability subfactors and weights assigned to each were listed as follows:

Subfactor 1.	Phase-In Plan, Staffing and Continuing Personnel Management	20%
Subfactor 2.	Total Compensation Plan	10%
Subfactor 3.	Operations Plan	35%
Subfactor 4.	Key Personnel and Organization	35%

While the numerical weights were indicative of the relative importance of the above subfactors, they were to be used only as a guide by the Source Selection Official. The RFP reflected that in the overall selection, Mission Suitability, Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations would be of essentially equal importance. However, within Factor 2, Cost, the RFP stated that the costs associated with the options for additional level-of-effort and all costs associated with the six 1-month option periods "may be considered of less significance than the costs for the base requirement and the first and second option periods."

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the SEC developed an evaluation plan, including a numerical and adjectival scoring system for the Mission Suitability subfactors. In addition, the plan stated that the SEC would evaluate but not score Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations, ultimately assigning these factors an adjective rating to reflect the results of that evaluation. The Other Considerations factor was comprised of the following five subfactors: financial condition and capability; safety and health; contract terms and conditions; small business and small disadvantaged business subcontracting plan; and security. This evaluation plan stated that the SEC would determine after receipt of proposals whether to use the standard evaluation procedure or the Alternate Evaluation Procedure, as outlined in the NASA Streamlined Acquisition Handbook dated February 16, 1990, which dispenses with initial scoring.

The evaluation was performed entirely by the SEC. After receipt of proposals, the SEC determined that the Alternate Evaluation Procedure would be used. The evaluation began with each member individually reviewing the proposals to determine if any should be rejected as patently unacceptable.

It was the consensus of the SEC that the proposal submitted by Engineering Design Group, Inc. (EDG) was unacceptable because it did not represent a reasonable initial effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP nor did it clearly demonstrate that the offeror understood the requirements of the RFP. EDG was so notified.

Each voting member independently evaluated the remaining Technical/Management proposals in alphabetical order, noting strong and weak points and questions. Next the SEC developed consensus strong and weak points and questions.

The SEC then reviewed and analyzed the Business Proposals. The SEC assessed the proposed costs, relevant experience and past performance, and other considerations as reflected in each remaining proposal. Questions were developed for these factors.

The SEC then held written and oral discussions with the firms and requested submission of Best and Final Offers (BAFO's) by a common cut-off date.

After receipt of BAFO's, the SEC independently evaluated all information, noting any changes to strengths/weaknesses, and assigned adjective ratings to each Mission Suitability subfactor. The SEC then developed consensus strong and weak points, identified strong and weak points as major or minor, and assigned a consensus adjective rating for each subfactor. The SEC then scored the proposals.

A probable cost was developed for each offer. The SEC assigned an adjective rating to both Factor 3 and Factor 4.

Evaluation Results

Set forth below is a summary of the SEC's final findings with regard to all three (3) proposals. As regards ranking, it should be noted that the Calspan and Wyle proposals were determined to be essentially equal from a Mission Suitability standpoint.

Mission Suitability

Calspan Corporation

Calspan's proposal received an overall Mission Suitability adjective rating of "Excellent".

Major strengths were noted in each of the Mission Suitability subfactors. Calspan had a comprehensive phase-in plan with strong supporting data; their company programs were conducive to maintaining a competent staff; and their total compensation

plan was excellent and reflected a sound management approach to attracting and retaining competent professionals. The proposed operations plan reflected a thorough understanding of the Statement of Work, complete and clear work flow for performing tasks, a well-defined plan for tracking and controlling the work, a comprehensive safety program, and a clear understanding of data system requirements and the transitioning from a development to a production facility. In addition, Calspan proposed well-qualified key personnel and a good organizational structure for NTF operations. No major weaknesses were noted.

Wyle Laboratories

Wyle's proposal received an overall Mission Suitability adjective rating of "Excellent".

Major strengths were noted in each of the Mission Suitability subfactors. Wyle has a trained and qualified staff in place, which insures continuity of service to the Government; their company programs were conducive to maintaining a competent staff; and their total compensation plan was excellent and reflected a sound management approach to attracting and retaining competent professionals. The proposed operations plan reflected a thorough understanding of the Statement of Work, clear and concise plans for oversight and control of data systems functions, a structured and proven approach for the instrumentation task, a comprehensive safety program, and well-defined plans for tracking and controlling the work. In addition, Wyle proposed well-qualified key personnel and a good organizational structure for NTF operations. No major weaknesses were noted.

SEACOR

The proposal submitted by SEACOR received an overall Mission Suitability rating of "Marginal".

Minor strengths were noted in all subfactors. However, numerous major weaknesses were also noted. The SEC noted major weaknesses in SEACOR's initial staffing and continuing personnel management plan, as well as in their total compensation plan. The proposed operations plan did not demonstrate a complete understanding of Statement of Work requirements or comprehension of the complete operational procedures/schedule for NTF. Each of the proposed Key Persons were found not to meet one or more RFP requirements.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance

In its evaluation of relevant experience and past performance, the SEC assigned the rating of "Very Good" to the proposals submitted by Calspan and Wyle.

Calspan's rating of "Very Good" was based on their extensive and varied applicable experience, and performance reference checks which resulted in overall past performance being very good.

Wyle's rating of "Very Good" was based on their extensive and directly applicable experience and performance reference checks which resulted in overall past performance being very good.

A rating of "Marginal" was assigned to the proposal submitted by SEACOR. SEACOR had relevant experience in oxygen monitoring systems and plant systems, particularly with respect to preventative maintenance programs and documentation and records. Reference checks indicated their performance was good to very good. However, their relevant experience was considered limited in the following areas: (1) structural analysis experience was primarily limited to the design and fabrication of hardware with no experience utilizing the sophisticated structural analyses techniques required for hardware at the NTF; and (2) instrumentation and software experience had not been applied in a research environment.

Other Considerations

In assessing the Other Considerations Factor, the SEC assigned an overall adjective rating of "Excellent" to Calspan and to Wyle and "Very Good" to SEACOR.

Calspan was considered to have a sound financial posture, their Safety and Health Plan was very detailed and thorough, their Subcontracting Plan complied with NASA policy and proposed goals which were considered reasonable, and they were deemed capable of complying with security provisions.

Wyle was considered to have a very sound financial posture, their Safety and Health Plan was very detailed and thorough, their subcontracting plan complied with NASA policy and proposed goals which were considered reasonable, and they were deemed capable of complying with security provisions.

SEACOR was considered to have a sound financial posture, their Safety and Health Plan was very detailed, their subcontracting plan complied with NASA policy and proposed goals which were considered reasonable, and they were deemed capable of complying with security provisions. However, their Safety and Health Plan had a minor weakness in that it did not address two elements contained in the RFP.

Cost

The Committee's cost evaluation was based on the costs and award fee proposed by each offeror for performance of the required effort. The SEC evaluated the realism of those proposed costs and the degree to which they reflected the performance addressed in the technical proposal. A detailed probable cost assessment was then performed for each firm.

The most significant adjustments were made to direct labor rates, labor escalation and proposed fee. The effect of these adjustments was to decrease Wyle's and Calspan's costs and to increase SEACOR's. However, the offerors' cost ranking (high to low) remained the same for proposed and probable.

In presenting its probable cost findings, the SEC in accordance with the approved evaluation plan, separated those costs associated with the base requirement for the initial and two option periods from those associated with the remaining options. As a result, the relative ranking of the offeror's cost from high to low, for the base effort was as follows:

Wyle Laboratories
Calspan Corporation
SEACOR

Probable costs for the total contract effort (including all options) reflected that the ranking would remain unchanged.


Selection Decision

After considering the results of the final evaluation, I have concluded that the SEC performed its duties in accordance with the established Source Evaluation Plan. I further conclude that the SEC's evaluation was objective and fair.

I noted that the SEACOR proposal, while lowest in cost, had "marginal" ratings for both Mission Suitability (Factor 1) and Relevant Experience and Past Performance (Factor 3). These ratings were significantly lower than those of the other two offerors. I concluded that SEACOR's much lower ratings in two of the evaluation factors could not be reasonably offset by their lower cost. I therefore eliminated SEACOR from further consideration for selection.

For the remaining two proposals, I noted that Wyle and Calspan were essentially equal from the standpoint of three of the evaluation factors, since they both received "Excellent" Mission Suitability ratings, "Very Good" Relevant Experience and Past Performance ratings and "Excellent" Other Considerations ratings. The Calspan proposal, however, had lower proposed and probable costs, both for the base requirement plus the two option periods and for the total effort, with all options.

Based on the above, and in view of its excellent technical proposal, very good relevant experience and past performance, and reasonable costs, Calspan Corporation is selected for the purpose of final negotiations leading to award of the contract for Operation and Routine Maintenance of the Ancillary Systems of the NTF. In making this decision, I have considered Mission Suitability, Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations to be of essentially equal importance.


W. R. Kivett
Procurement Officer

Date: 6-3-91