

SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR  
FOR  
MAINTENANCE SERVICE FOR AND SUPPORT  
OF THE NASA LaRC AIRCRAFT

On June 24, 1996, I met with the Source Evaluation Team (SET) appointed to evaluate proposals to provide maintenance service and support of the NASA LaRC aircraft. The SET's presentation consisted of the procurement history, evaluation procedures used, and the results of the evaluation.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement is to provide maintenance service and support of the NASA LaRC aircraft beginning July 1, 1996, following the expiration of the current contract with Lockheed Engineering, which in part provides for this same such service. The successful offeror will provide inspection, maintenance and repair of the aircraft at NASA LaRC which are operated as civil aircraft and public use aircraft.

A fixed price time and materials contract has been determined to be the most appropriate type for this procurement due to the uncertainties inherent to aircraft maintenance support. Specific work requirements will be defined in fixed price time and material task orders to be issued by the Contracting Officer. The contract will have a 12-month initial period of performance followed by four 12-month option periods, for a total potential period of performance of 60 months.

This procurement was initiated by the Flight Operations and Support Division. It is anticipated that Tony L. Trexler will serve as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR).

SOURCES

Based on the market survey that was conducted in October 1995, it was determined that there was not a reasonable expectation that offers would be obtained from at least two responsible small business concerns at fair market prices. Accordingly, LaRC determined that it was in the public interest that this procurement should be a full and open competition. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on March 1, 1996 to approximately 34 firms. The RFP was also available on-line on the NASA Langley Procurement Home Page. Three firms attended the preproposal conference held at Langley Research Center on March 14, 1996. Proposals were submitted on April 1, 1996, by the following four firms:

- LJS Aviation
- Blackhawke Aviation Systems
- Avtel Services Incorporated
- Pemco Aeroplex Incorporated

### EVALUATION PROCESS

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, I appointed a Source Evaluation Team (SET) to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the solicitation. The proposals submitted in response to this solicitation were evaluated using the Best Value Selection (BVS) procedures. The procedures were approved by me on February 16, 1996, and were included verbatim in the RFP, Section M. In summary, the RFP stipulated that the successful offeror would be selected based on the best combination of cost, qualitative merit, and relevant experience and past performance. Qualitative merit relative to the offeror's technical proposal was determined by evaluating the degree to which the objectives of the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria (QEC's) were met or exceeded. The SET used the following QEC's to evaluate the technical proposals:

- A. Offeror's approach to performing all work covered by the Statement of Work, including supporting logistical and maintenance/inspection requirements as described in the Statement of Work, approach to integrating any proposed subcontract/teaming arrangements, and approach to meeting the 8% Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Goal.
- B. Offeror's approach to solutions and quality control to technical problems.
- C. Offeror's approach for response to customer needs which includes timeliness and ability to obtain parts. Approach to solutions for Aircraft On Ground (AOG) and routine customer needs reflecting efficient utilization of resources.
- D. Offeror's capabilities and facilities (including FAA Certification). Offeror's understanding of the requisite personnel qualifications and skill mix essential to the performance of contract activities and approach to recruiting and retaining qualified and skilled personnel.
- E. Offeror's approach to ensuring continuous, uninterrupted support during the life of the contract.
- F. For each sample task order, offeror's approach, deliveries, skill mix, estimate of turnaround time, number of direct labor hours for each level and any teaming/subcontract effort needed.

The SET used the following ratings/definitions to evaluate each QEC:

Adjective Definitions:

**Exceeds Requirement:**

A proposal that meets all essential requirements and gives the Government a greater value than required by the Statement of Work. Technical superiority is clearly demonstrated. The proposal may be accepted on its present terms.

**Meets Requirement:**

A proposal that addresses and demonstrates an understanding and feasible approach to all the requirements of the Statement of Work without any significant value improvements. Some discussions of minor deficiencies may be desirable.

**Does Not Meet Requirements:**

A proposal that contains deficiencies in both approach and understanding, and does not address all the essential requirements of the Statement of Work. This includes approaches that are not technically feasible to perform, or could not be acceptable without substantial rewriting or submission of a new technical approach.

As stated in the RFP, Best Value Selection is based on the premise that, if all offerors are of approximately equal qualitative merit and relevant experience and past performance, award will be made to the one with the lowest proposed price. However, the Government may award to an offeror with higher price if the offeror has higher rated qualitative merit and/or relevant experience and past performance, provided the price differential is commensurate with the added value. Conversely, the Government may award to an offeror whose proposal has lower rated qualitative merit and/or relevant experience and past performance, if the price differential between it and other proposals warrants doing so. Overall, in the selection of an offeror for negotiations leading to contract award, Price, Qualitative Merit, and Relevant Experience and Past Performance will be of essentially equal importance. Further, Qualitative Merit and Relevant Experience and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

Four business firms submitted timely proposals. The SET evaluated the proposals in accordance with the approved evaluation procedures set forth in Section M of the RFP. Initially, all voting members reviewed the proposals (technical and business) to identify any that were considered patently unacceptable. I was notified that one firm, LJS Aviation, was determined to be patently unacceptable and the remaining proposals warranted further review. Concurrently, the cost consultant initiated a review of the business proposals.

At the completion of the initial review, each Voting Member reviewed, in depth, each technical proposal and assigned a rating to each QEC. Strengths and weaknesses and

areas requiring discussion or clarification were noted using the individual rating sheets prepared for each QEC. The SET then met to collectively discuss each technical proposal and assign consensus strengths and weaknesses along with consensus adjective ratings for each QEC.

The SET analyzed each business proposal and received documentation from the cost consultant. Impacts of the business proposal findings on QEC adjectives were discussed and it was determined that no changes were appropriate.

Relevant experience and past performance were reviewed by the SET, both from offeror-supplied information and from reference-supplied input. The SET assigned consensus adjective ratings for each offeror. The adjective ratings and their definitions follows:

Adjective Definitions:

Excellent:

Performance which, in addition to fully satisfying contract and/or customer requirements, features above-average innovation and efficiency and rare or nonexistent deficiencies.

Satisfactory:

Effective performance which is fully responsive to contract and/or customer requirements; identified deficiencies do not affect overall performance.

Less-Than-Satisfactory:

Performance which frequently fails to meet contract requirements and/or customer expectations, and which includes deficiencies that impact other areas of work performance.

The results of the SET's initial evaluation were presented to me on May 14, 1996, and I determined the group of finalists to include Avtel Services, Inc., and Pemco Aeroplex, Inc. Written discussions were conducted with the finalists and each was afforded an opportunity to revise its proposal.

The revised proposals were reviewed to determine if changes needed to be made to the evaluation teams assigned ratings. As a result of this review some adjustments were made to the initial evaluation findings for the finalists. The SET presented the updated findings to me on June 24, 1996.

SELECTION DECISION

After the SET presentation, I reviewed and assessed the evaluation findings. I noted that Pemco received a rating of Excellent for three of the six QEC's and a rating of Meets for the remaining QEC's. Avtel received a rating of Meets for five of the six QEC's and a rating of Fails to Meet for the remaining QEC.

I noted that both finalists were rated Satisfactory for Relevant Experience and Past Performance on similar efforts.

Finally, I reviewed the evaluated price for selection purposes only for the two finalists and noted that Avtel had the lower price.

In making my decision, I have considered price, qualitative merit and relevant experience and past performance. I conclude that Pemco's high quality technical proposal (Qualitative Merit) combined with their relevant experience and past performance rating and reasonable price resulted in Pemco providing the best overall value to the Government. Therefore, Pemco is selected for the purpose of contract award.

I am convinced that the Source Evaluation Team conducted a thorough, fair and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the evaluation procedures set forth in Section M of the RFP.

Panice H. Clark  
Panice H. Clark  
Source Selection Official

7-1-96  
Date