SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT FOR THE TEST EVALUATION & SUPPORT TEAM (TEST) CONTRACT AT THE WHITE SANDS TEST FACILITY (WSTF)

On November 30, 2010 and December 1, 2010, I, along with other key officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) JSC and WSTF met with the members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for the White Sands Test Facility (WSTF) Test Evaluation & Support Team (TEST) Solicitation, NNJ10336472R. The TEST Contract is to be awarded as an Award Fee Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract with Cost Reimbursable and Fixed Price Task Orders. The basic period of performance for this acquisition is 3 years, from May 1, 2011, through April 30, 2014. There are two 1-year options. The IDIQ minimum base contract value is $1.5 million and the maximum base contract value is $300 million. This acquisition is a partial follow-on contract to the WSTF Test & Evaluation Contract (TEC) and Facility Operations & Support Contract (FOSC).

This procurement provides for NASA requirements including: propulsion subsystem and system testing, propellants and aerospace fluids materials and components testing, remote hazardous testing, hypervelocity impact testing, flight hardware processing, technical services, training, quality, test and institutional safety and health, facility maintenance, communication systems and construction management. TEST also supports external customers, thus reducing NASA's cost to operate the facility and creating synergy with customer organizations engaging in operations similar or complementary to NASA's.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.2, "Synopses of Proposed Contract Actions", this proposed contract action was synopsized on April 9, 2010, at the FedBizOps website and thereafter placed on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service business opportunities website. NASA issued a Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) on June 10, 2010, and an industry comment period ensued.

On August 3, 2010, the Contracting Officer issued Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ11HA02C. NASA posted Amendment number 1 on August 20, 2010, to post remaining answers to the DRFP; NASA posted amendment number 2 on September 2, 2010, to publish an outstanding answer for the DRFP and to publish questions and answers pertaining to the RFP and replacement pages to the RFP and a change log.

NASA conducted this procurement as a full and open competition in accordance with FAR Part 15, "Contracting by Negotiation", under North American Industry Classification System code 541712 with a size standard of 1000 employees. The RFP divided the proposal into five volumes with separate due dates. NASA requested Volume III, related to past performance, on September 8, 2010. Volume I, related to Mission

Suitability, Volume II, related to Plans and Other Data, Volume IV, related to the Cost/Price, and Volume V, related to the Model Contract, were all due on September 20, 2010.

NASA received complete proposals from the following companies:

Jacobs Technology, Inc.
600 William Northern Boulevard
P.O. Box 884
Tullahoma, Tennessee 37388 USA

United Space Alliance, LLC
600 Gemini Avenue
Houston, TX 77058-2708

The following company submitted a Past Performance Volume; however, this Offeror decided not to submit the remaining proposal volumes for the TEST procurement:

ASRC Aerospace Corporation
6303 Ivy Lane, Suite 130
Greenbelt, MD 20770

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The SEB conducted the evaluation of the submitted complete proposals from Jacobs, and Team USA (hereinafter referred to as "USA") in accordance with the approved evaluation plan and the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15, "Contracting by Negotiation", and NFS Part 1815 with an objective of achieving the best value. The RFP delineated three primary evaluation factors – Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined were significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability was more important than Past Performance. Past Performance was more important than Cost/Price.

Each proposal received a Mission Suitability score based on the following sub-factors and associated numerical weights.

Sub-factor 1 – Management Approach	350
Sub-factor 2 – Technical Approach	300
Sub-factor 3 – Safety and Health	250
Sub-factor 4 – Small Business Participation	100
Total	1000

The SEB evaluated and rated Mission Suitability using the following adjectival ratings for the sub-factors: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

Since Past Performance is a significant predictor of likely performance under the proposed contract, the SEB evaluated the Past Performance of each Offeror. The overall rating for Past Performance was related to the relevancy and quality of performance on referenced contracts provided by the prime and subcontractors as they relate to the specific kind of work the prime/subcontractor would be performing for the proposed effort. The SEB based its evaluation on information submitted by the Offeror, on the Past Performance Questionnaires, and on communications with listed references, as well as on any other information obtained independently by the SEB. The SEB evaluated and rated Past Performance using the following scale: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral.

To ensure that the final negotiated prices were fair and reasonable the SEB performed price and cost analysis in accordance with Section M.6 Cost/Price of the TEST Solicitation. The SEB assessed each proposal's probable cost and assigned a Cost/Price level of confidence. The Cost/Price Confidence Levels utilized were High, Medium, and Low.

Following the presentation by the SEB Chairperson, Contracting Officer, and Cost/Price Analyst, and my vigorous questioning of the SEB, I fully considered the findings the SEB presented to me. I commended the SEB on their comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the two proposals. Following the discussion, I held an executive session with my advisors to discuss the evaluation results, and in that session I requested and received the opinions of my key advisors. Following the discussion I made a comparative assessment of the proposals based upon the evaluation factors in the Solicitation.

SELECTION DECISION

In making my selection decision, I reviewed the relative importance of all evaluation factors. The RFP delineated three evaluation factors – Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Cost/Price. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Past Performance is more important than Cost/Price. I first performed an analysis of the Significant Strengths and Significant Weaknesses of Jacobs and USA separately, to see if I weighted those differently from the evaluation of the SEB. I agreed with the SEB's assessment of the two proposals, and I did not take any exceptions with the findings of the SEB.

I considered the factors and found true discriminators between the proposals, especially in the highest rated factor, Mission Suitability. In initially comparing the two proposals, I observed that Jacobs received an "Excellent" from the SEB for all of the sub-factors under Mission Suitability. The SEB evaluated USA as "Fair" under the Management and Technical Approach sub-factors, "Excellent" in Safety and Health, and "Good" in Small Business Utilization. When I considered the four sub-factors that

comprise Mission Suitability, I found that Jacobs was substantially better than USA in Management Approach, Technical Approach and Small Business Utilization, and equal in Safety and Health. I noted that across the Mission Suitability Factor, Jacobs earned ten Significant Strengths and no Significant Weaknesses. On the other hand, across Mission Suitability, USA earned just two Significant Strengths and seven Significant Weaknesses.

Mission Suitability Assessment

Jacobs-Mission Suitability/Management Approach

Within the Mission Suitability area, I first analyzed the ratings given to Jacobs for its Management Approach. I observed that the SEB evaluated Jacobs' Management Approach as "Excellent," receiving five Significant Strengths and one Weakness. I found the overall Management Approach proposed by Jacobs was of exceptional merit in that it fully encompasses a cohesive management structure and approach that is consistently demonstrated throughout all elements of its proposal. I noted the proposed structure of the TEST group is as an independent operating segment led by a General Manager (GM) who is also an Officer in the company. This allows for an autonomous organization where the GM is fully responsible for making all decisions related to TEST functions, which signifies accountability and responsiveness at WSTF. I also found value in Jacobs' unified leadership with subcontractors spread throughout the contract, strong mentorship for small businesses, and its Integrated Team Management Approach that ensures employees are treated equally across the contract. I favorably evaluated Jacobs for its plan to utilize corporate reach-back, thereby reducing the risks to WSTF of fluctuating workloads due to uncertainties in future agency test requirements.

Under the Management Approach sub-factor, the SEB also awarded Jacobs a Significant Strength for its Key Personnel. Like the SEB, I found that Jacobs' key personnel have outstanding qualifications and backgrounds that are commensurate with the responsibilities required of the identified positions. I determined that Jacobs' provides an effective approach to succession planning, including a thorough requirement for the minimum qualification standards in terms of training, certifications, type and length of experience to be used when replacing Key Personnel. I concluded that Jacobs' proposed approach to Key Personnel would result in long-term success-oriented leadership for the TEST Contract.

The SEB additionally assigned Jacobs a Significant Strength for its Staffing Approach. I found value in Jacobs' strong salary plan, flexible benefit plan, management training classes, attrition rate goal, frequent direct communications with its employees, award fee sharing, a bonus plan, performance awards, and use of corporate funds for spot recognitions. Additionally, I found Jacobs' long history of cooperation with the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, the extensive experience of the lead negotiator who is designated to work a Collective Bargaining

bridge agreement, and the plans to put an instrument in place to bridge the contract transition all greatly reduce the risk of work interruption.
I agreed with the SEB that Jacobs' External Customer Plan was of Significant Strength. Jacobs presented an all-encompassing, multi-year approach towards identifying, attracting and retaining external customers. The marketing approach that Jacobs would implement involves gaining a full understanding of how WSTF's technical capabilities compare to other Government facilities before determining what opportunities should be pursued and where facility improvements should be focused. Jacobs would look beyond WSTF's core capabilities to identify support functions that are potentially marketable.

Finally, under the Management Approach sub-factor, I found Jacobs' Phase-In Plan to be highly effective. In particular, Jacobs' Phase-In Plan emphasizes frequent, open and direct communication with the workforce and all stakeholders. This significantly increases the likelihood of a successful contract transition without interruptions to WSTF operations.

I did note that Jacobs received one Weakness for its Phase-in Plan because it proposed to perform only a partial statistical inventory of store and program stock items instead of the required 100% inventory. However, I did not find this Weakness to be of concern to the Agency because the exiting Contractor would be required to perform a 100% inventory during Contractor Close-out, and Jacobs would then do a statistical count against that inventory. DCAA also does a statistical count against that inventory, which would serve to confirm the Contractor's inventory.

Jacobs- Mission Suitability/Technical Approach

Next, under Mission Suitability, I noted that the SEB evaluated Jacobs' Technical Approach as "Excellent" (the highest adjectival rating possible). In particular I noted that Jacobs received three Significant Strengths and one Weakness.

First, Jacobs received a Significant Strength for its proposed innovations and its comprehensive understanding of the TEST requirements and dynamic work environment. I noted that the SEB identified a number of value-added innovations. Each innovation proposed by Jacobs is highly feasible and provides mitigation to WSTF's high risk areas. Jacobs' commitment to implement these innovations is demonstrated by providing corporate resources to do so. I too found value in the twelve identified innovations pertaining to the following focus areas: Maintaining Critical Skills and Encouraging High Performance, Modernizing Facilities and Technologies, and Improving Safety and Environmental Aspects of WSTF.

I noted that Jacobs' Maintenance, Operations and Repair Plan was highly effective and sound. Jacobs proposed a comprehensive and structured approach to maintenance and repair that clearly established short and long term objectives and outlined a plan for effective execution that is fully coordinated so that there are no adverse impacts to WSTF testing organizations and customers. In my judgment, the Jacobs' proposed

approach would improve and reduce the cost of WSTF maintenance and repairs. I found that the Agency would benefit from Jacobs' proposed Asset Owner program, where a single point of contact is responsible for all matters associated with a particular facility asset. This ensures uniform facility asset stewardship and enhances the overall Maintenance, Operations and Repair Plan.

Jacobs also earned a Significant Strength for its approach to the Cost Reimbursable Sample Task Orders. Jacobs' overall response to addressing the technical requirements of the Sample Task Orders left me with the conclusion that Jacobs can effectively and efficiently meet WSTF's technical requirements. Jacobs fully integrated its proposed management philosophy into its technical approach within the Sample Task Orders. Its technical proficiency was well demonstrated by the detailed narrative discussions and accurate risk assessments. The response demonstrates that Jacobs is highly capable of meeting the unique and challenging requirements that TEST would present through Cost Reimbursable Task Orders.

Jacobs received a Weakness for its response to the Contract Management Fixed Price Task Order because they did not address delivery of the Management Review Report. I did not find this Weakness to be of concern because any successful Offeror would be required to submit this report as a Type II DRD, which requires post-award submission and approval. In addition, the proposal assigned resources to developing the report.

Jacobs- Mission Suitability/ Safety and Health Approach

I noted the one Significant Strength in Jacobs' Safety and Health Approach. I agreed with the SEB that Jacobs has an effective and sound Safety and Health approach that is supported by a strong corporate safety philosophy. I also noted and found of value to the Agency Jacobs' proposed Associate Contractor Agreements which have safety cooperation embedded.

Jacobs-Mission Suitability/ Small Business Approach

I noted the one Significant Strength in Small Business Participation. I agree with the SEB that Jacobs' Small Business approach is sound and demonstrates its commitment to Small Businesses. I found value in Jacobs' enforceable teaming agreements, which provide a guaranteed minimum percentage of work-share to each Small Business partner. In addition, Jacobs actively participates in the NASA Mentor-Protégé program and has a formal Mentor-Protégé relationship with one of its proposed partners.

In its Small Business Plan and Contract Management Plan, Jacobs proposed that Small Business personnel be uniformly distributed across the scope of the TEST Contract elements. This results in direct participation by Small Businesses in the high-technology portions of the contract.

USA- Mission Suitability/Management Approach

I noted the SEB rated USA considerably lower than Jacobs in the more highly valued area of Mission Suitability. As a general matter, USA received only two Significant Strengths and yet seven Significant Weaknesses across all of Mission Suitability, compared to Jacobs' ten total Mission Suitability Significant Strengths and zero Significant Weaknesses.

USA earned one Significant Strength in Management Approach for proposing a highly effective and innovative strategy for seeking new business through its proposed TEST External Customer Plan. USA proposed strong corporate dedication to the External Customer Plan through letters of commitment from Boeing and Lockheed Martin, USA's parent companies. In these two letters, company executives indicate that they would perform extensive reviews of their aerospace programs to seek business opportunities that would support the External Customer Plan (ECP). To further demonstrate USA's commitment to the ECP, USA proposed a corporate funded position to manage the overall effort. This External Customer Manager (ECM) will collaborate with NASA to develop a final ECP and after formal approval they will integrate external customers into the WSTF Operating environment. I agreed that execution of this plan would contribute significantly towards exceeding the Agency's requirements of retaining technical expertise and supporting WSTF's facility operating costs.

On the other hand, USA received three Significant Weaknesses under the Management Approach sub-factor. The first Significant Weakness was based on USA's proposed organizational structure and responsibilities for managers. USA's proposed Management Approach would overload key management positions, thus creating restrictions and introducing risk into WSTF's processes.

One example of this overload is demonstrated by the Facilities Department Manager being responsible for managing half of the total TEST Contract personnel and nearly half of the contract work elements from the work breakdown structure. However, USA also proposes to designate the Facility Department Manager as the Deputy Program Manager whose responsibilities expand to include fostering successful implementation of the External Customer Plan, leading the Strategic Workforce Planning innovation to assess skills across the contract and, in the Program Manager's absence, management of the entire TEST Contract. USA's plan for succession of the Program Manager presents a significant risk to the Facility Department as well as the rest of the site that relies on the enabling capabilities that reside in the Facilities Department.

As another example, the Chief Project Engineer (CPE) is responsible for many project management duties, including review of all task order requests and distributing those requests to the appropriate department, as well as many other managerial duties. Because Task Orders are the principal method that NASA uses to authorize work on the TEST Contract, I found there is a considerable concern that effective task order management, and ultimately execution of tasks, would suffer due to the significant extra managerial burdens.

A second concern in this finding is the numerous discrepancies, inconsistencies and omissions within the proposal that caused me to believe that USA does not have a comprehensive understanding of the TEST scope of work. I agreed with the SEB's concerns that USA's description of roles and responsibilities with respect to Maintenance and Operations were conflicting throughout the proposal, including narrative descriptions that don't match figures. In addition, the USA proposal did not provide a clear integration and approach for managing and identifying major and minor subcontractors and their respective functions. USA's proposal described functions within its Management Approach in a one-size-fits all manner, and in doing so, it failed to acknowledge that the minimum requirements for projects of varying size and complexity should and would differ. Although the USA Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan appears sound, the proposal failed to identify and discuss implementation methods for avoiding, neutralizing, or mitigating an OCI issue as it related to a subcontractor. The Contract Management Plan indicated that USA would establish an IDIQ CPAF contract with each of its subcontractors; however, its cost proposal showed that Fixed Rate Labor Hours were predominately used.

A second Significant Weakness was identified in USA's Key Personnel Approach. I determined that USA's key personnel approach demonstrates a significant lack of effective understanding of the required skill level and qualifications necessary to efficiently meet the requirements of the TEST Contract. While USA proposed well-qualified key personnel for some positions, they proposed key personnel with only partial qualifications for other positions when judged against the proposed areas of responsibility. USA did not describe its minimum training, certifications, or type and length of experience qualification standards to be used when replacing its key personnel and also failed to address how it would ensure that key personnel would maintain its minimum qualification standards.

The SEB identified a third Significant Weakness, and I agreed that USA's total compensation plan fails to properly recognize and offer mitigation for differences in the fringe benefits that exist between the three team mates. This has the potential to increase the likelihood of low employee morale and the loss of high-caliber personnel, if the differences are not effectively mitigated. This concern could result in increased cost and safety risk to NASA.

USA- Mission Suitability/Technical Approach

Next, I looked at the Technical Approach sub-factor to Mission Suitability for USA. I noted that USA received no Significant Strengths and four Significant Weaknesses.

The first Significant Weakness the SEB noted, and I agreed, that USA's proposed tools, innovations and efficiencies lacked integration and interfacing details and weren't consistent with their management approach. USA did not present a cohesive plan for introducing, integrating and interfacing its tools, particularly in the area of business management. Many tools are inadequately described and are not clearly incorporated

into USA's plans and strategies. There is no discussion on interfaces between fundamental business management tools. USA's inability to properly describe the business management tools appreciably decreased the likelihood that it would successfully interface these various IT programs, especially since there is no indication that Team USA has successfully utilized all of these software packages on the same contract in the past. I also found numerous proposed USA tools to be comparable to existing WSTF tools without offering an explanation as to how these tools would be effectively integrated.

I concurred with the SEB's assessment of USA's innovations and efficiencies. There were significant inconsistencies in USA's proposal in this area. The efficiencies and innovations that were discussed throughout the Management and Technical Approaches were not effectively described or do not align with the list that was provided in the model contract. A majority of the innovations and efficiencies that were described in Volume I of the proposal are not integrated or mentioned in the plans contained in Volume II, leading to a concern that USA had not considered how a majority of the items would actually be effectively integrated in the contract. Conversely, there were numerous efficiencies and innovations that were described elsewhere in the proposal, but were not captured in the USA list at Technical Approach 1.

Additionally, I agreed with the SEB in their finding that several USA proposed innovations and efficiencies have already been implemented at WSTF, for example, a digital radiograph capability to the WSTF Metallurgy Laboratory and Pro-E capability for all design engineers.

A second Significant Weakness as determined by the SEB that I agreed with involved USA's Maintenance, Operations, and Repair plan which illustrated USA's distinct lack of comprehensive understanding of the requirements for accomplishing the successful maintenance, operation, and repair activities of the TEST Contract and greatly increases the risk to the WSTF mission. The Maintenance, Operations, and Repair (M&O) Plan did not provide a detailed approach or an indication of the responsible personnel that would identify all WSTF systems that are not in the Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS). Without the identification of WSTF systems and integration of information, the proper maintenance of all important WSTF systems would not be done and would severely compromise USA's ability to support WSTF testing and operations activities.
I agreed with the SEB that the USA M&O Plan failed to describe an effective approach to operating the WSTF facility systems for supporting the WSTF mission, including programmatic-specific systems. There was no reference to the responsible personnel who would operate WSTF institutional and programmatic facility and utility systems, nor the respective operational procedures that would be followed to ensure safety and efficiency. USA failed to explain how the operational requirements profile for WSTF and the overall operational readiness profile would be generated and applied by WSTF management and customers. Additionally, the USA Plan did not describe its approach for dealing with deferred and backlog repairs.

I agreed with the SEB that USA's M&O Plan also failed to recognize various key elements in the approach to Quality Assurance. The Plan neglected to describe how the TEST Quality Management System (QMS) and Configuration Management System (CMS) would be applied specifically to all WSTF maintenance, operations, and repair activities including inspecting work, coding work requests, and establishing meaningful and appropriate metrics. Through inadequate incorporation of a comprehensive approach to quality assurance principles and associated techniques throughout the Plan, USA greatly increases the likelihood of unsuccessful or subpar performance and negative impacts to operations and testing costs and schedules.

I concurred with the SEB's finding that USA did not explain the organizational interfaces that are necessary between the M&O organization and the remaining TEST institutional and programmatic working groups, including design/system engineers, Project Leaders, technicians, data base and work control administrators, logisticians, managers, and the Chief Project Engineer. The lack of identified and structured interfaces would greatly impede the efficient application and verification that M&O resources are being properly allocated and balanced between institutional and programmatic schedules and priorities.

Third, I noted the SEB's assignment of a Significant Weakness in USA's Technical Approach with regard to USA's response to the Cost Reimbursable Sample Task Order for the Joint Environmental Control and Life Support System (ECLSS). The response failed to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the technical requirements and in particular, an understanding of oxygen component testing, offgassing and outgassing testing, and composite overwrapped pressure vessel (COPV) testing requirements. The failure to demonstrate a technical understanding of these and other critical WSTF capabilities greatly increases the risk that USA does not have the sufficient technical understanding to effectively perform the requirements of the TEST Contract.

Fourth, I found that USA's proposed efficiencies claimed in the Cost Reimbursable Sample Task Orders are inadequately explained, and demonstrate a lack of comprehensive understanding of the TEST requirements. I agree that allowing these efficiencies as justification for lowering the proposed staffing of the sample task orders greatly increases the risk of not meeting the requirements and therefore the resource adjustment is justified.

USA- Mission Suitability/ Safety and Health Approach

I noted the one Significant Strength in the Safety and Health Approach. I agreed with the SEB that USA's Safety and Health Plan demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the WSTF requirement.

USA- Mission Suitability/ Small Business Participation

For the Small Business Utilization, I noted that USA received no Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses.

COMPARITIVE ASSESSMENT, TRADE-OFF ANALYSIS and DECISION

Jacobs-USA Mission Suitability Management Approach Comparison

I initially noted that Jacobs received an Adjectival rating of "Excellent" and USA received a "Fair". The SEB assigned Jacobs five Significant Strengths and no Significant Weaknesses for its Management Approach. On the other hand, USA earned one Significant Strength and three Significant Weaknesses in this area.

As described earlier in this Source Selection Statement, I found Jacobs' overall management approach to be extremely feasible, highly effective and demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the TEST requirements. Jacobs proposed key personnel that would ensure the effective performance of the TEST Contract. Additionally, I found that implementation of Jacobs' External Customer Plan would attract and retain external customers. Finally, Jacobs' Phase-In Plan would greatly improve contract transition with low risk of interruption to WSTF operations.

In contrast, USA's Significant Strength in the mission suitability area dealt with its External Customer Plan, which I did find to be of value to the Agency. This one Significant Strength, in my opinion, could not offset USA's three Management Approach Significant Weaknesses. Based on these and the other Mission Suitability Significant Weaknesses, I determined that USA's proposal presented significantly higher risk to the Agency of successful contract performance.

Jacobs-USA Technical Approach Comparison

Under the Technical Approach sub-factor, the SEB rated Jacobs as "Excellent," awarding Jacobs three Significant Strengths. The SEB rated USA as "Fair" under this sub-factor and assigned no Significant Strengths and four Significant Weaknesses.

I determined Jacobs' Technical Approach to be of great value to the Agency. I noted and agreed with the SEB's assessment of three Significant Strengths in this area. In particular, I noted that Jacobs' proposed innovations demonstrated a feasible approach and comprehensive understanding of the TEST requirements and the dynamic work environment. The Maintenance, Operations, and Repair plan was highly effective, demonstrated Jacobs' comprehensive understanding of the TEST requirements and its approach to the Sample Task Orders effectively incorporated time saving techniques, corporate resource relationships, risk management, and comprehensive understanding of the TEST technical scope.

On the other hand, USA's Technical Approach lacked effective tools and innovations, in addition, the Maintenance, Operations and Repair Plan was ineffective and demonstrated a lack of understanding of the TEST requirements. Finally, USA's

response to the Cost Reimbursable Task Order "Joint ECLSS Development Initiative" demonstrated a less than comprehensive understanding of the TEST Requirements.

Jacobs-USA Safety and Health Approach Comparison

Jacobs received a Significant Strength in its approach to Safety and Health. I found particular merit in Jacobs' very effective and efficient corporate safety philosophy, which exceeded the Agency's requirements. Likewise, USA received a Significant Strength for its Safety and Health Plan. Given both Offerors were equal in the Safety and Health sub-factor; I did not find Safety and Health to be a discriminator in my evaluation of the two proposals.

Jacobs-USA Small Business Participation Comparison

I agreed with the SEB and found that Jacobs' Small Business Plan resulted in a Significant Strength. The plan was sound, reasonable, and included enforceable teaming agreements with its small business partners, offering great value to the Government.

In contrast I noted no Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses in USA's small business utilization approach.

Mission Suitability Comparison Summary

When I considered the four sub-factors that comprise Mission Suitability, I found that Jacobs was substantially better than USA in Management Approach, Technical Approach and Small Business Utilization, and equal in Safety and Health. I noted that across the Mission Suitability Factor, Jacobs earned ten Significant Strengths and no Significant Weaknesses. On the other hand, across Mission Suitability, USA earned just two Significant Strengths and seven Significant Weaknesses.

Past Performance Assessment

I then considered the Offerors' Past Performance. I weighed the relative importance of the evaluation factors, which states that Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price; Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance; and Past Performance is more important than Cost/Price. At the outset, I noted the SEB evaluated Jacobs' Past Performance as having a Very High Level of Confidence with three Significant Strengths and no Significant Weaknesses. USA earned a High Level of Confidence in Past Performance with one Significant Strength and no Significant Weaknesses.

I found Jacobs' depth of experience across several very highly relevant contracts both in test and evaluation and in facility operations and maintenance to be of value. Jacobs received three Significant Strengths for its extensive and very relevant collective

bargaining unit experience; its very relevant and highly successful technical and managerial past performance across its fifteen referenced contracts; and its very relevant and extensive working relationships with its small business partners.

I found that USA received a Significant Strength for its highly relevant experience with unions. They also have past experience with very relevant contracts though there were some elements of the SOW where they didn't demonstrate expertise or direct relevance. In addition, the SEB's review of questionnaires noted mixed customer satisfaction ratings. In addition, I found that USA failed to provide safety performance information for its three minor subcontractors, resulting in the SEB's inability to fully assess its team's safety past performance.

Cost/Price Assessment and Comparison

I considered the relative importance of the evaluation factors in my assessment of Cost/Price. Cost/Price is significantly less important than Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined. The SEB performed a cost realism analysis, resulting in a probable cost.

I noted the SEB had High Confidence in Jacobs' probable cost. On the other hand, the SEB assigned a Medium Confidence in USA's probable cost due to multiple Weaknesses and Significant Weaknesses identified, which created uncertainty in the accuracy of its probable cost adjustment. USA failed to adequately resource its requirements, and proposed efficiencies were not substantiated, resulting in the SEB making resource adjustments.

Finally, I noted that Jacobs' evaluated "Total Cost Reimbursable Probable and Fixed Price" was slightly lower than that of USA's.

The SEB informed me it had not received the full DCAA audits for either Offeror. The SEB had verbally discussed the progress on the audits with DCAA and there were no issues with Jacobs' cost proposal. However, because the DCAA audit reports were not available at the time of the SEB's presentation I did not consider the DCAA audits in my decision.

Decision

I applied the RFP's stated evaluation criteria in making my final determination, including the previously stated relative weights of the evaluation factors. My ultimate decision involved a determination of which proposal I thought represented the best value to the Agency.

In particular I noted that the SEB rated Jacobs higher in all three factors, and significantly higher in the most important factor, Mission Suitability. I noted that Jacobs

had highly comparable and very highly relevant past performance which will contribute to successful contract performance and gain efficiencies for WSTF. Additionally, Jacobs proposed a slightly lower probable cost and fixed price.

NASA's intent, stated in the FAR clause 52.215-1(f) (4) in the RFP, was to award a contract without discussions. During the presentation, the Contracting Officer recommended that a competitive range should not be determined, and that award without discussions be made in accordance with the RFP Section L.1(I) specifically referencing FAR 52.215-1 Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition. I concurred with the Contracting Officer's recommendation.

In accordance with the RFP that states the SEB will award a contract resulting from this Solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after utilizing a combination of Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Cost/Price, I find that Jacobs is the best value and select it for award of the TEST Contract. My selection decision is based solely on and is wholly consistent with the selection criteria and evaluation framework, including the relative importance of the evaluation factors and sub-factors as explained in the Solicitation and supported by the SEB findings that I identified as relevant and material to my decision.

Ellen Ochoa

Ellen Ochoa
Source Selection Authority

2/2/11
Date