



Decision

Matter of: LOGMET LLC

File: B-424477; B-424477.2

Date: August 7, 2026

Wayne C. Rankin for the protester.
Robert K. Colby, Esq., Department of Homeland Security, for the agency.
Kenneth Kilgour, Esq., and John Sorrenti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO,
participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

1. Allegation that the agency failed to evaluate the protester's lowest-priced quotation, in a lowest-priced, technically acceptable procurement, is denied where the record demonstrates that the protester did not quote the lowest price.
 2. Allegation that the agency conducted unfair exchanges with vendors is denied where the record demonstrates the reasonableness of the agency's discussions with vendors.
 3. Allegation that the agency disparately evaluated the quotations of the protester and the awardee is denied where the evaluation was consistent with the solicitation and did not reflect unequal treatment.
-

DECISION

LOGMET LLC, of Round Rock, Texas, protests the award of a contract to SkyQuest Aviation LLC, of Glendale, Arizona, under request for quotations (RFQ) No. 70Z03825QS0000020, issued by the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Coast Guard, for aircraft maintenance and aviation life support equipment (ALSE) maintenance and support services for Air Station Atlantic City, Aviation Training Center Mobile, and Joint Base Andrews. The protester contends that the agency unreasonably failed to evaluate LOGMET's lowest-priced quotation, conducted unfair exchanges, and disparately evaluated quotations.

We deny the protest.

BACKGROUND

The solicitation, set aside for service-disabled, veteran-owned small businesses and issued in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 12, anticipated the award of a fixed-price contract to the vendor with the lowest-priced, technically acceptable (LPTA) quotation with acceptable past performance. Agency Report (AR), RFQ at 2; AR, Tab B, SAM.gov Notice at 3 (System for Award Management). The evaluation of technical acceptability would consider a vendor's ability to provide the required aircraft maintenance and ALSE maintenance and support services. *Id.* The past performance evaluation would assess a vendor's ability to successfully accomplish the proposed effort based on the vendor's demonstrated past performance. *Id.* at 3. Only the lowest-priced quotation would be evaluated for technical acceptability. *Id.* If the lowest-priced quotation did not receive an acceptable technical rating or had less than satisfactory past performance, the process would continue in order of lowest-priced quotations until the LPTA quotation with acceptable past performance was identified. *Id.*

Under the pricing factor, the RFQ included as an attachment the schedule of services. *See id.* at 32. The schedule of services included performance at the following locations: Air Station Atlantic City, New Jersey; Aviation Training Center, Mobile, Alabama; and Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. Protest, exh. 2, Performance Work Statement (PWS) at 12. The RFQ required vendors to populate all areas of the schedule of services highlighted in yellow, which represented the unit pricing for each labor category; incorrect or incomplete schedules of services "may not be evaluated nor considered for award." RFQ at 2.

Prior to the closing date, the agency issued amendment 0001, which contained questions and answers, revised wage determinations, and a revised PWS and schedule of services. Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 15-16. The Coast Guard received quotations from eight firms, including the protester and awardee. *See id.* at 16.

On February 26, 2026, the Coast Guard issued amendment 0002 to correct a FAR reference in the terms and conditions. *Id.*, see Protest, exh. 4, RFQ amend. 0002. The amendment explained that the RFQ stated incorrectly that quotations would be evaluated in accordance with FAR 13.202; the RFQ was revised to reflect that the evaluation would be in accordance with FAR 12.203. Protest, exh. 4, RFQ amend. 0002. The amendment reopened the solicitation and extended the response deadline to March 2, 2026. *Id.* Vendors could provide revisions to their quotations or notify the Coast Guard that no changes would be made to the original quotations. *Id.* Five vendors, again including the protester and the awardee, responded and were considered for award. COS at 16. LOGMET replied that it had no changes to its original quotation. See Protest, exh. 5, Email from Coast Guard to Protester at 1 (confirming LOGMET's reply that it had no changes to its quotation).

After a review of quotations, the Coast Guard determined that two of the five vendors--including LOGMET--had incorrectly completed their schedule of services. COS at 17. Both vendors proposed monthly rates in the option years for aircraft mechanic I, aircraft mechanic II, and ALSE inspector/maintainer positions based at Air Station Atlantic City, while the schedule of services placed those positions at Joint Base Andrews. See Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 4. The lead contract specialist contacted both vendors and advised them to "revise the attached price quotation to reflect updated monthly rates for the positions located at Joint Base Andrews in Option Periods 1-4 ([contract line items (CLINS)] 1-9 in each period of performance)" and further advised both vendors that failure to provide a revised price quotation would result in the removal of their quotations from award consideration. Resp. to GAO Document Req., Notice of Pricing Errors to LOGMET at 1; Notice of Pricing Errors to D2 Government Solutions at 1. Both vendors timely submitted revised price quotations. COS at 17.

LOGMET initially quoted a price of \$5,771,306. AR, Tab I, LOGMET Quotation at 26. On March 4, an individual acting on behalf of LOGMET responded to the agency and submitted a revised price quotation. See AR, Tab K, Email to Lead Contract Specialist at 7. Two LOGMET employees, including the president of LOGMET, were copied on that email. See *id.* LOGMET's revised price was \$7,198,870. *Id.* at 6.

The contracting officer determined that SkyQuest's price of \$5,942,408 represented the lowest-priced quotation. COS at 17; Protest, exh. 9, Debriefing at 2. The Coast Guard evaluated SkyQuest's quotation as technically acceptable and its past performance as satisfactory, and the agency made award to SkyQuest. COS at 17. After a requested and provided debriefing, LOGMET filed this protest. *Id.*

DISCUSSION

LOGMET alleges that the Coast Guard failed to evaluate the protester's lowest-priced quotation, conducted unfair exchanges with the vendors, and disparately evaluated the schedules of services. As discussed below, none of LOGMET's allegations have merit.¹

¹ In its comments, LOGMET asserts that the Coast Guard's post-closing exchange with the protester was misleading because the agency did not clearly advise the protester that the agency would treat the corrected price as the final price. Comments and Supp. Protest at 6. This allegation, raised for the first time in the comments filed June 4, is untimely, because LOGMET knew when it received a debriefing from the agency on May 5 that the agency did not evaluate the protester's technical quotation because LOGMET's revised price was not the lowest price. Protest, exh. 9, Debrief at 2 (noting that the protester's revised price was not the lowest price quoted); 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(2). In addition, while we do not discuss every facet of all allegations, we considered the entirety of LOGMET's protest and supplemental protest and found no allegations to have merit.

LOGMET's Price

As noted above, the protester's revised price quotation, submitted to correct an error in LOGMET's schedule of services, rendered LOGMET's quotation no longer lowest-priced. LOGMET contends that the agency unreasonably used this revised price to determine that LOGMET was no longer the lowest-priced quotation because "[n]o new schedule of services was sent[]." Protest, exh. 11. Alternatively, LOGMET argues that the agency could not "rely[] on a post-closing March 4 price that LOGMET does not concede superseded its operative quote." Protest at 8.

As noted above, the procurement was conducted under simplified acquisition procedures. When using simplified acquisition procedures, an agency must conduct the procurement consistent with a concern for fair and equitable competition and must evaluate quotations in accordance with the terms of the solicitation. *Significance Inc.*, B-421307, B-421307.2, Mar. 3, 2023, at 4. In reviewing a protest of a simplified acquisition, we examine the record to determine whether the agency met this standard and exercised its discretion reasonably. *Id.* A protester's disagreement with the agency's judgment, without more, does not establish that the evaluation was unreasonable. *Id.*

It is incontrovertible that LOGMET submitted a revised price of \$7,198,870, which was higher than SkyQuest's price. AR, Tab K, Email to Lead Contract Specialist at 6. Wayne Rankin, who filed this protest on behalf of LOGMET, was one of two LOGMET employees copied on the email transmission submitting the revised price to the agency. *See id.* The protester did not question why the revised price quotation was needed or otherwise express to the agency that it should not consider the revised quotation. A protester cannot plausibly argue that a revised quotation did not supersede the initial one. *IDB Int'l*, B-257086, July 15, 1994, at 6. LOGMET's argument that amendment 0002 did not require price revisions, Protest at 8, is a red herring, when the requested price revision was, in fact, required by an evaluation that found the protester's schedule of services non-compliant with the RFQ. Absent the revision, LOGMET's quotation would not have been considered for award.² RFQ at 2. The record demonstrates that

² LOGMET contends that the Coast Guard improperly requested the price revision because "[n]othing in the RFQ advised that the Agency would reject, adjust, or force revision of a quote based on the Agency's post-closing view that the quote did not 'correctly reflect' Joint Base Andrews." Protest at 10. LOGMET knew the agency's interpretation of the RFQ when the Coast Guard requested that LOGMET submit a revised price quotation and it chose to submit a revised price. Having submitted a revised price, the protester cannot now complain that the agency's request was noncompliant with the RFQ. *See Northrop Grumman Sys. Corp.--Mission Sys.*, B-419557.2 *et al.*, Aug. 18, 2021, 2021 CPD ¶ 329 at 12 (failure to challenge agency's interpretation of solicitation requirement during discussions that was contrary to protester's understanding was untimely when raised after award).

LOGMET submitted a revised price quotation, and, as discussed above, the protester's revised price was not the lowest one quoted. While LOGMET may now prefer that the agency did not consider this revised price, the protester has not demonstrated that the agency acted unreasonably where it requested and received a revised price from LOGMET and used that as the final evaluated price. This allegation is denied.

Discussions

LOGMET argues that "the Agency conducted an unauthorized post-closing price-correction/evaluation process that changed LOGMET's evaluated price and eliminated LOGMET from the LPTA sequence." Comments and Supp. Protest at 9. The Coast Guard contends that it permitted the two vendors that submitted incorrect schedules of services to submit revised quotations and that without revised pricing those quotations "would have been removed from award consideration for not following the instructions of the solicitation." MOL at 6.

In negotiated procurements, whenever discussions are conducted by an agency, they are required to be meaningful, equitable, and not misleading. *HomeSafe Alliance, LLC*, B-418266.5 *et al.*, Oct. 21, 2020, at 17.

The record establishes that the agency conducted discussions with the two vendors whose quotations were ineligible for award. The lead contract specialist contacted two vendors, one of whom was LOGMET, and asked both to correct errors in their schedules of service. Resp. to GAO Document Req., Notice of Pricing Errors to LOGMET at 1; Notice of Pricing Errors to D2 Government Solutions at 1. As noted above, both vendors timely submitted revised price quotations. COS at 17. The agency identified no errors in SkyQuest's schedule of services, and the awardee was therefore not included in discussions. See *id.*

LOGMET contends that "[i]f the Agency viewed the original quotation as noncompliant, the contemporaneous record should show a reasoned acceptability determination[.]" Comments and Supp. Protest at 6. The record contains that contemporaneous finding in the agency's notice of pricing errors to LOGMET. See Resp. to GAO Document Req., Notice of Pricing Errors to LOGMET at 1. The protester asserts that the Coast Guard "asked LOGMET to provide a revised price quotation and then used the resulting price to remove LOGMET from the LPTA evaluation sequence." Comments and Supp. Protest at 6. That is the evaluation scheme announced in the RFQ; to correct a material error in its schedule of services, LOGMET submitted a revised price quotation that was no longer the lowest-priced and therefore the agency did not evaluate LOGMET's quotation for technical acceptability after finding SkyQuest's lowest-priced quotation to be technically acceptable. On this record, we see nothing improper in the agency's post-closing communications with the vendors, and this allegation is denied.

Disparate Treatment

LOGMET asserts that, when evaluating the protester's quotation, the agency imposed a requirement that quotations include "Joint Base Andrews positions for all four option periods and that vendors had no reason to expect deviations." Comments and Supp. Protest at 8, *citing* COS/MOL at 7-8. The Army disparately applied that requirement, LOGMET argues, because "SkyQuest's own technical quotation appears to frame Joint Base Andrews as an Option Period 1 location, not a location necessarily controlling all four option periods." Comments and Supp. Protest at 8. As support for this assertion, LOGMET notes that the authorization page of the awardee's technical quotation lists the performance locations as: Air Station Atlantic City, NJ; Aviation Training Center Mobile, AL; and "Joint Base Andrews, MD (Option Period I)." *Id.*, *citing* AR, Tab L, Awardee's Technical Quotation at 10 (CERTIFICATION AND AUTHORIZATION). In other words, LOGMET contends that SkyQuest was not required to include pricing for Joint Base Andrews positions for all four option periods while LOGMET was required to do so.

When a protester alleges unequal treatment in an evaluation, it must show that the differences in ratings did not stem from differences between the quotations. See *HomeSafe Alliance, LLC, supra* at 25; *SNAP, Inc.*, B-418525, B-418525.2, June 5, 2020, at 6.

The PWS advised vendors that "[t]he primary places of performance will be Air Station Atlantic City and ATC Mobile[,] and not Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. Protest, exh. 2, PWS at 12. The PWS further advised offerors:

NOTE: The [Coast Guard] anticipates additional positions being located at Joint Base Andrews prior to or at the start of Option Period One of the resulting contract award. This may involve adding additional positions (as required) or moving positions identified in the Schedule of Services from Air Station Atlantic City to Joint Base Andrews.

Id. at 13. In addition, the schedule of services showed that the location of services for nine of the 10 CLINs was Joint Base Andrews for the four option periods. Protest, exh. 10, Schedule of Services.

LOGMET's assertion that a parenthetical in the certification and authorization page of the awardee's technical "quotation appears to frame Joint Base Andrews as an Option Period 1 location," Comments and Supp. Protest at 8, ignores language in the actual technical quotation that "[l]ocations will adjust to Joint Base Andrews, MD as instructed." AR, Tab L, Awardee's Technical Quotation at 16. In other words, the awardee's quotation affirmatively commits the awardee to deploy personnel "as instructed." *Id.* There is no such affirmative commitment in the protester's quotation. See AR, Tab I, Protester's Quotation at 12 (noting that "the primary places of performance will be Air

Station Atlantic City, ATC Mobile AL, and Joint Base Andrews, MD^[3]). The protester has not demonstrated that SkyQuest's pledge to adjust locations as directed fails to conform to the requirements of the PWS. Moreover, the contracting officer asserts that SkyQuest's quotation "did not provide any assumptions or inconsistencies that conflicted with the Schedule of Services or instructions of the solicitation," and SkyQuest's quotation reflected pricing for each of the option year CLINs at Joint Base Andrews. Contracting Officer's Supp. Statement of Facts at 1; AR, Tab L, SkyQuest's Revised Pricing and Certifications at 4-7 (showing SkyQuest's pricing for the schedule of services across all option years). Because the protester has not shown that the agency disparately evaluated quotations, or that the evaluation was otherwise unreasonable, this allegation is denied.

Miscellaneous Allegations

LOGMET asserts that the award decision was flawed because the agency made award to a higher-priced vendor without first determining whether LOGMET's quotation was technically acceptable. Protest at 10. As discussed above, LOGMET submitted a revised price that was not the lowest-priced quotation and therefore LOGMET's quotation was appropriately not evaluated for technical acceptability. The protester also asserts that the agency conducted an unreasonable price realism evaluation, because the agency's evaluation of LOGMET's quoted price did not consider the protester's technical approach. Protest at 11. The record contains no evidence that the Coast Guard conducted a price realism evaluation; the agency evaluated whether the vendors' schedules of services conformed to the RFQ requirements. Finally, the protester's allegation that the agency unreasonably failed to evaluate LOGMET's past performance fails to state a valid basis of protest; the announced evaluation scheme required the agency to evaluate the past performance of the lowest-priced quotation that was found technically acceptable. Because LOGMET's quotation was never the lowest-priced, technically acceptable one, the Coast Guard's failure to evaluate LOGMET's past performance was consistent with the RFQ's terms. These allegations are dismissed because they fail to state valid bases of protest. 4 C.F.R. §§ 21.1(c)(4), (f); 21.5(f); *Raith Eng'g & Mfg. Co.*, B-419023.4, July 19, 2021, at 6.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel

³ In fact, the PWS states that "[t]he primary places of performance will be Air Station Atlantic City and ATC Mobile[.]" Protest, exh. 2, PWS at 12.