

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Langley Research Center
Hampton, VA 23681-0001

T
62



Selection
Statement

June 17, 1998

Reply to Attn of 44 1

TO: Rosemary C. Froehlich, A-E Board Selection Official
FROM: 44 1/Chairman, Architect-Engineer Selection Board
SUBJECT: Solicitation Number 1-07-GGK.1443 Multidiscipline Architect-Engineer Services

The Multidiscipline Architect and Engineering Services contract will include multidiscipline design, study, and analysis services for institutional projects at NASA - LaRC. The design work will include preparation of bid-ready drawings and specifications using the SPECSINTACT system. The contract will also include construction management services, general drafting, surveying, and engineering library services. The total estimated annual fee for this contract is \$1,800,000.

The A-E Selection Board convened on June 3, 1998 to hear presentations from the four firms that had been slated by a Preselection Panel. After the presentations the Board decided to adjourn until June 5, 1998 to give the Board time to review the Design Quality Assurance Plans that the AE's turned in at the presentations. The Board ranked the four firms on June 5, 1998 as follows:

1. Sverdrup Technology, Inc. (SvT) Fax - 931-393-6389
Attn: Mr. Ward Johnson
600 William Northern Blvd. Phone - 931-455-6400
Tullahoma, TN 37388
2. Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall (DMJM) Fax - 703-807-2599
Attn: Mr. Jim Risher
1525 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100 Phone - 703-807-2500
Arlington, VA 22209
3. Cederquist Rodriguez Ripley Maddux + Hankins and Anderson -joint venture
Cederquist Rodriguez Ripley Maddux (CRRM+HAA)
Attn: Mr. William J. Ripley Fax - 622-2430
129 West Virginia Beach Blvd. Phone - 622-2828
Norfolk, VA 23510

4. HSMM + ADG -joint venture
HSMM, Inc. (HSMM+ADG)
Attn: Mr. Landon G. Carpenter
448 Viking Drive, Suite 145
Virginia Beach, VA 23452

Fax - 306-4001

Phone - 3064000

Sverdrup was selected number one based on experienced technical staff, seven years of partnering and experience with LaRC doing the same type of work, having a local office that covers all disciplines, a large backup staff at their Tullahoma office and, if needed, with the entire Sverdrup Corp., their plans to be ISO certified within 12 months with detailed quality control procedures, excellent organizational chart, good summary of portfolio of design work, and excellent response to all selection criteria in CBD. They have a flexible staffing arrangement with the Tullahoma office and plan to "right size" the local office to keep overhead down.

DMJM was selected number two based on experienced technical staff, experience of key personnel with LaRC, a large, experienced backup staff, recognition of the need for a good transition plan, good organization chart, detailed quality control procedures and portfolio of similar type design work. They did not include present commitments and financial and credit references. The Board was concerned about the small size of the proposed local office and the amount of travel time from outlying offices required for others for site investigations, review meetings and coordination meetings. The Board was also concerned about DMJM's reference to coming in under budget and ahead of schedule on the J-6 Large Rocket Test Facility. This project had major revisions to its budget and schedule.

CRRM + H&A was selected third based on experienced staff in all disciplines, good organizational chart, good quality control procedures in place and a small portfolio of similar type work. The board was very concerned that CRRM + H & A did not propose a local office and the amount of travel time that would be required for site investigations, design review meetings, coordination meetings and day to day coordination and management of their on-site personnel. They did not include financial and credit references.

HSMM + ADG was selected fourth based on experienced personnel, good organization chart with project team leaders, detailed quality control procedures for HSMM, current commitments and financial and credit references. Major concern was that ADG, the joint venture firm, was proposed as the local office and there was very little quality control procedures and portfolio information for them. Also the local office is very small and travel time would again be a major concern for others supporting this contract. Survey requirements specified in the RFP were not adequately addressed. The

presentation by ADG focus on GIS/GFS capabilities and did not include the primary surveying task of utility marking and digging permit issuance.

Attachment No. 1 is the Preselection Board's Ratings of the four recommended Firms for seven of the eight selection criteria. The Selection Board agreed with the ratings with one exception. The Board added three points to the last criteria for DMJM since they provided additional information at their presentation. Attachment No. 2 shows the Selection Board's rating for the Quality Control Assurance Plan added to the corrected ratings for the other factors and the boards overall ranking. For additional strengths, weaknesses and concerns see the Preselection Board Report.

Richard B. Rountree

Richard B. Rountree
47224

Concurrences: *Carl E. Horne*
Carl E. Horne

Mary Morgan C. Hunter
Mary Morgan C. Hunter

James W. Mayhew
James W. Mayhew

Terry D. Tyler
Terry D. Tyler

Rosemary C. Froehlich
Rosemary C. Froehlich

Attachment

cc:

A-E Board Files
442/CEHorne
443/JWMayhew
447/TJTyler
441/RBRountree
436/MMCHunter