



**John H. Glenn Research Center**  
**Lewis Field**  
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191

## **SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT**

GENERAL AND PRECISION MACHINING AND FABRICATION II BPA  
RFP 80GRC022Q0001

### **Procurement History/Description**

---

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has a need to augment the NASA Glenn Research Center (GRC) Machine Shop, Model Shop, Fabrication Shop, Instrumentation Shop, Inspection Department, facilities, and equipment. Following this award, the Government will solicit and evaluate fixed price quotes containing total costs, number of labor hours, cost per hour, material cost and delivery on proposed order conditions and specifications for individual orders. Individual Calls placed under this BPA will not be placed below \$10,001.00 and will not exceed \$250,000.00. The aggregate dollar amount of all orders under this BPA shall not exceed \$4,999,999.00. Each order may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- **Machining**
- **Fabrication**
- **Welding/Metal Joining**
- **Instrumentation**
- **Inspection**
- **Non-Destructive Testing (NDT)**

To accomplish this requirement, the Government intends to award a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA). The full period of performance (POP) will be five (5) years from the contract effective date. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code and small business size standard are 332710 – Machine Shops and 500 employees, respectively. This procurement was issued as a small business set-aside.

A Request for Information (RFI) was issued on July 26, 2021. Responses to the RFI were received from fifteen (15) companies. A draft Request for Quotation (RFQ) was issued on December 2, 2021. The final RFQ was issued on February 15, 2022. Thirty-six (36) proposals were timely received by 5:00 PM EDT March 17, 2022.

Proposals were submitted by the following Offerors (listed in alphabetical order):

- **Applied Fab & Machining, Inc.**
- **Axial Global, LLC**
- **Brinker Machine, LLC**
- **Calspan Systems Corporation**
- **Cardinal Scientific, Inc.**
- **CAV Manufacturing, LLC**
- **Center Tool Company**
- **Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc.**
- **Coherent Technical Services, Inc.**

- Conroe Machine
- D&D Automation, Inc.
- Delflo Industries, Inc.
- Futuramic Tool and Engineering
- Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc.
- Kaydek Machining, Inc.
- KCS Advanced Machining Services
- Kessington Aerospace
- LAI International, LLC
- Liberty Hill Company
- Lindquist Machine Corporation
- Loper Machine LLC
- Mainstream Waterjet, LLC
- Majestic Tool & Machine, Inc.
- Maritech Machine, Inc.
- Mound Manufacturing Ctr.
- MSP Aviation, Inc.
- Precision Fabricating & Cleaning Co., Inc.
- Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc.
- Selectwo Machine Company, Inc.
- TFI, LLC
- Thriller Metal Fab & Mfg.
- Tri Models, Inc.
- TWF Enterprise
- Unipak Aviation, LLC
- VTN Manufacturing, Inc.
- WB Industries

### **Evaluation Criteria/Procedures**

---

The proposals were evaluated by the Contracting Officers (COs) and NASA Glenn Research Center (GRC) FabShop Team in accordance with the evaluation criteria included in the RFQ.

The RFQ provided that the Government may award a contract based on initial offers received without discussion. Additionally, award will be made to responsible Offerors whose proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.

The RFQ evaluation criteria consisted of the following factors: Technical and Past Performance. Offerors were also required to submit miscellaneous requirements for award and responsibility determination purposes.

### **Evaluation Factor 1 - Technical**

In accordance with the RFQ, each proposal was required to include the following technical requirements:

- Offerors shall complete Attachment 4 – Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form for all services the Offeror is capable of providing
- Offerors shall submit their company's current Quality Manual
- Offerors shall submit relevant certifications (AS9100, ISO9001, NADCAP, welding, etc.) if applicable
- Offerors shall submit a capability statement

Offerors were technically evaluated to determine if they were able to fulfill the requirements of one or more Manufacturing Discipline(s). The Government reserved the right to give technical approval for a subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline (and not the Manufacturing Discipline as a whole) if such approval was determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

### **Evaluation Factor 2 – Past Performance**

In accordance with the RFQ, Offerors submitting past performance information were to submit at least two (2) relevant previous contracts held with Government agencies or private industry within the past five (5) years. Relevancy determinations were based on contract scope. Required information for this factor included a verified name, email, address, phone number, and facsimile number for each reference.

The Government reserved the right to obtain past performance information from other sources and to utilize this information in the evaluation.

The Government evaluated the past performance of Offerors based on demonstrated recent experience and on-time delivery. Offerors without adequate past performance were given a neutral rating in the Past Performance evaluation section.

### **Miscellaneous Requirements**

In accordance with the RFQ, all Offerors were required to submit the following:

- Signed Copy of the Standard Form (SF) 1449.
- Complete all Offeror Fill-Ins (OFIs) and requested information in the applicable provisions.

### **Mandatory Award Criteria**

In accordance with the RFQ, this procurement is a total small business set-aside competition. Offerors must be a small business within the size standard of NAICS Code 332710 – Machine Shops; 500 employees, respectively; to be eligible for award.

As stated in RFQ Attachment 3 – Statement of Work, Inspection is a required discipline for all Offerors. Offerors must have claimed AS9100 inspection capabilities as a core or subcontracted capability in Attachment 4 – Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form to be eligible for award.

Per Section 4(b) of Attachment 2 to the RFP: “Offerors deemed technically capable of performing at least one (1) Manufacturing Discipline or subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, whose proposals demonstrate adequate and satisfactory past performance experience, and whose proposals include complete and accurate Submittal Requirements, will be awarded a BPA.”

## **Evaluation Process**

---

An initial acceptability evaluation was conducted for all thirty-six (36) proposals. This evaluation looked for the submission of all requirements and mandatory award criteria highlighted in the RFQ and its attachments. After these evaluations, twenty-one (21) proposals (listed below in alphabetical order) were considered acceptable:

- **Applied Fab & Machining, Inc.**
- **Axial Global, LLC**
- **Calspan Systems Corporation**
- **Cardinal Scientific, Inc.**
- **CAV Manufacturing, LLC**
- **Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc.**
- **Coherent Technical Services, Inc.**
- **Conroe Machine**
- **D&D Automation, Inc.**
- **Futuramic Tool and Engineering**
- **Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc.**
- **KCS Advanced Machining Services**
- **Kessington, LLC**
- **Lindquist Machine Corporation**
- **Maritech Machine, Inc.**
- **MSP Aviation, Inc.**
- **Precision Fabricating & Cleaning Co., Inc.**
- **Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc.**
- **Tri Models, Inc.**
- **Unipak Aviation, LLC**
- **WB Industries**

Following initial acceptability, the remaining proposals were technically evaluated. This process was conducted by the FabShop Team. All manufacturing disciplines or subsets were awarded based on capabilities declared in Offerors' RFQ Attachment 4 – Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form. As stated in RFQ Attachment 4, Other Disciplines; including Coatings, Surface Treatments, Plating, Heat Treatments, and Materials; were for market research purposes only, and BPA award would not be influenced by the Offeror's ability to perform any of those disciplines. Per RFQ Attachment 3 – Statement of Work, the Manufacturing Disciplines are Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Welding, Instrumentation, Inspection, and NDT.

Past Performance was evaluated by both the FabShop Team and the COs. The FabShop team reviewed contract scope to determine relevancy. If contracts were determined not relevant, the Offeror was deemed to be without adequate past performance under Section 4(b) of Attachment 2 of the RFQ and was given a neutral rating for the Past Performance evaluation section. Relevant contracts were rated by the COs as Negative, Positive, or Neutral. Where point-of-contact information was available, the COs contacted two (2) Past Performance points of contact per Offeror via email to request on-time delivery information regarding the Offeror's performance on the cited contract. Additional points of contact were reached out to if two (2) responses were not received initially. The COs also searched the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) to find ratings for all Offerors in connection with any cited contracts. Offerors were given a neutral rating for relevant contracts if: fewer than two (2) points of

contact responded with on-time delivery information on the Offeror's performance and no CPARS information was available; the Offeror did not provide past performance point of contact information or the contact information provided proved to be incorrect, out of date, or otherwise ineffective; or the information obtained regarding the Offeror's performance on the relevant contracts otherwise merited a neutral rating. Positive past performance ratings were given to Offerors with relevant experience who exhibited on-time or early past performance on at least two (2) occasions based on point-of-contact responses and/or received at least 50% Good or higher CPARS Schedule ratings for at least one relevant contract. Proposals whose Past Performance was determined to be Neutral or Positive would be considered "adequate and satisfactory" under Section 4(b) of Attachment 2 of the RFQ. Proposals whose Past Performance was determined to be Negative would not be considered "adequate and satisfactory" under Section 4(b) of Attachment 2 of the RFQ.

The COs were also responsible for making responsibility determinations. Per FAR 9.105-1, "the contracting officer shall obtain information regarding the responsibility of prospective contractors... promptly after...receipt of offers." Offerors whose proposals were not missing any other required portions but were missing responsibility determination information were asked to submit it by 5:00 PM EDT May 5, 2022, in order to remain eligible for award. All but one (1) Offeror asked to provide missing responsibility determination information provided it.

Offerors deemed technically capable of performing at least one (1) Manufacturing Discipline or subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, whose proposals demonstrated adequate and satisfactory past performance experience, and whose proposals included complete and accurate Submittal Requirements, were awarded a BPA.

## **Evaluation Results**

---

Twenty (20) Offerors were evaluated, and the following is a summary of their evaluation results (listed in alphabetical order).

|  | <b>Technically Capable</b> | <b>Past Performance Rating</b> | <b>Complete Proposal</b> |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Applied Fab &amp; Machining, Inc.</b> | Yes                        | Neutral                        | Yes                      |
| <b>Axial Global, LLC</b>                 | Yes                        | Neutral                        | Yes                      |
| <b>Calspan Systems Corporation</b>       | Yes                        | Positive                       | Yes                      |
| <b>Cardinal Scientific, Inc.</b>         | Yes                        | Neutral                        | Yes                      |
| <b>CAV Manufacturing, LLC</b>            | Yes                        | Neutral                        | Yes                      |
| <b>Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc.</b>       | Yes                        | Positive                       | Yes                      |
| <b>Coherent Technical Services, Inc.</b> | Yes                        | Positive                       | Yes                      |
| <b>Conroe Machine</b>                    | Yes                        | Positive                       | Yes                      |
| <b>D&amp;D Automation, Inc.</b>          | No                         | Neutral                        | Yes                      |

|   |     |          |     |
|---|-----|----------|-----|
| <b>Futuramic Tool and Engineering</b>                 | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>Integrated Ideas &amp; Technologies, Inc.</b>      | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>KCS Advanced Machining Services</b>                | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>Kessington, LLC</b>                                | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>Lindquist Machine Corporation</b>                  | Yes | Positive | Yes |
| <b>Maritech Machine, Inc.</b>                         | Yes | Positive | Yes |
| <b>MSP Aviation, Inc.</b>                             | Yes | Positive | Yes |
| <b>Precision Fabricating &amp; Cleaning Co., Inc.</b> | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc.</b>                  | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>Tri Models, Inc.</b>                               | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>Unipak Aviation, LLC</b>                           | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |
| <b>WB Industries</b>                                  | Yes | Neutral  | Yes |

#### **Applied Fab & Machining, Inc.**

Applied Fab & Machining, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing three (3) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for a subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Instrumentation, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D and ISO9001 certifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided eleven (11) previous contracts within the past five (5) years and twenty-eight (28) contracts from beyond five (5) years ago. The two (2) most recent contracts were a Blanket Purchase Agreement for general and precision machining and fabrication with NASA Langley, and a cylinder assembly contract with the Defense Logistics Agency. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The remaining contracts identified from within the past five (5) years were retained in

the award file. The 28 contracts identified from beyond five years ago were not considered further because they exceeded the 5-year timeframe set out in Section 4(a) of Attachment 2 of the RFQ. Although two contracts were found relevant, no points of contact were identified in the past performance submission. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, this Applied Fab & Machining, Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Applied Fab & Machining, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Axial Global, LLC**

Axial Global, LLC submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information the Offeror was approved for a subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Inspection, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included ISO9001 certification and an American Petroleum Institute (API) certificate for the distribution and manufacture of multipurpose fastener hardware and ISO 9001 certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with Master Flo for manufacturing with exotic alloys. The second contract was with Sales System Limited for manufacturing with a Teflon top coat. The two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, neither point of contact provided a response. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, Axial Global, LLC was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Axial Global, LLC is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Calspan Systems Corporation**

Calspan Systems Corporation submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing one (1) Manufacturing Discipline, particularly Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for seven (7) subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining and surface grinding equipment under the



Machining discipline; fastening metal components utilizing certified commercial fasteners under the Fabrication discipline; and silver soldering, torch brazing, SMAW shielded metal arc welding, and GTAW- Gas Tungsten Arc Welding under the Welding/Metal Joining Discipline. Disciplines requiring partial subcontracting include Machining, Fabrication, and Welding/Metal Joining. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D, ISO9001 and Nadcap composites certifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided four (4) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with Wartsila Defense, Inc. for the fabrication and assembly of different propulsor design variants. The second contract was with Northrop Grumman Corporation for the design and fabrication of hydraulic test article systems. The two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The remaining contracts were retained in the award file. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor was on-time, and the other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. This contract was with Boeing for the fabrication of an airframe component. The contract was determined to be relevant due to its similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, the point of contact responded that the vendor delivered on-time or early. The CO also was able to find CPARS information on three (3) contracts. The first was a contract with NASA Langley for wind tunnel fan blade fabrication; the second contract was also with NASA Langley for the design and/or fabrication of aerospace model systems and developmental test hardware used for spaceflight, flight, spaceflight development, and ground-based tests; and the third contract was with NASA Armstrong for the design and fabrication of a test article and a ground support cart. These three (3) additional contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The Offeror received 67% Very Good schedule ratings for these contracts. As a result, Calspan Systems Corporation was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Calspan Systems Corporation is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Cardinal Scientific, Inc**

Cardinal Scientific, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing three (3) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for four (4) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining and surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline and visual testing and dye penetrant testing under the Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Instrumentation, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles,



description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AWS Welding Performance Qualifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided four (4) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. Two (2) of the contracts were orders with NASA GRC for rowing and transition duct parts. These two (2) contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The remaining contracts were retained in the award file. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that delivery was four (4) days past due, and the other point of contact responded that delivery was six (6) days past due. The CO found one CPARS record for a Manufacturing Support Task with the NSCW Indian Head Division. Though the work identified is relevant in terms of scope, there were no schedule ratings or other on-time delivery information available on CPARS, and the responses provided by the points of contact indicated moderate delays in delivery. Based on all this information, Cardinal Scientific, Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Cardinal Scientific, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **CAV Manufacturing, LLC**

CAV Manufacturing, LLC submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing one (1) Manufacturing Discipline, particularly Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for four (4) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining under the Machining discipline, fastening metal components utilizing certified commercial fasteners under the Fabrication discipline, and visual testing and dye penetrant testing under the Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included ISO9001 certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with Northrop Grumman for the fabrication of motor, nozzle, and fin attachments. The second contract was with the US Army for the fabrication military-grade equipment. The two (2) contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the Offeror did not make any late deliveries, and the other point of contact did not provide a response. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, CAV Manufacturing, LLC was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided

indicated that Cardinal Scientific, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc.**

Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing four (4) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Instrumentation, Inspection, and NDT. The Offeror was also approved for five (5) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining under the Machining discipline, and silver soldering, torch brazing, GMAW Gas Metal Arc Welding for solid wire and aluminum, and FCAW-Flux Core Arc Welding under the Welding/Metals Joining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining and Welding/Metal Joining. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided four (4) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. One of the contracts was with the United States (US) Navy for the manufacture of items from raw materials. The other was a BPA with NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) for the manufacture of commercial as well as space flight hardware parts. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor was mostly on-time, and the other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. This contract was with P.A.R.T.S., Inc. for the manufacture of discontinued and non-standard parts and components aircraft, helicopters and their associated weapon systems. This contract was determined to be relevant due to the similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, the point of contact responded that the Offeror has delivered every order early. The remaining contract was retained in the award file. The CO was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc. was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Coherent Technical Services, Inc.**

Coherent Technical Services, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing three (3) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for two (2) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining and surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects

such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D certification, ISO9001 certification, and AWS Welding Performance Qualifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. Both examples provided were Multiple Award Contracts (MACs) with the US Navy and Air Force that included engineering, research, design, prototyping, machining, fabrication, installation, integration, inspections, quality assurance, painting, and testing. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, neither point of contact provided a response. The CO also was able to find CPARs ratings on the aforementioned Air Force contract, another manufacturing contract for aircraft equipment, and four (4) research and development (R&D) contracts. The manufacturing contract was determined to be relevant due to similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The Offeror received 50% Very Good schedule ratings for the Air Force contract and the other manufacturing contract for aircraft equipment. As a result, Coherent Technical Services, Inc. was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Coherent Technical Services, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Conroe Machine**

Conroe Machine submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, the Offeror was approved for one (1) subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, namely general and precision machining under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, Inspection, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included ISO9001 certification and API Specification Q1 for Manufacture & Remanufacture of Rotary Drill Stem Equipment.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided three (3) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. One (1) past performance example was a contract with Lockheed Martin for machine parts to assist on an R&D project. Another contract was with Premium Oilfield Technologies for quill machining. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The remaining contract was retained in the award file. asked about on-time delivery, both points of contact replied that the vendor always delivers on time. The CO was not able to find any information from CPARS. Due to the information provided from points of contact, Conroe Machine was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that

Conroe Machine is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **D&D Automation, Inc.**

D&D Automation, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, a capability statement, and ostensibly its current Quality Manual. During the review of this information, however, the FabShop team discovered that the Quality Manual submitted by this Offeror was not a complete Quality Manual but instead was a summary of the Offeror's quality process. While this summary did mention some elements traditionally found in a Quality Manual, it lacked the following: a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. The FabShop team construed and accepted the quality process summary submitted by the Offeror as its current Quality Manual, but because the document lacked the above elements, it was determined not to be a competent Quality Manual. Because the Offeror was determined to lack a competent Quality Manual, it was determined not to be technically capable of performing the work under this BPA. Relevant certifications were not submitted.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided three (3) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with ZF Automotive, Inc. for the development of custom tooling. The next contract was with Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the fabrication of a custom durability and heat transfer setup. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery in regards to the relevant contracts, one point of contact responded that the Offeror delivered on-time with many deliverables arriving early. The other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. This contract was with North American Lighting, Inc. for the development of automated lighting test fixtures, assembly stands, and tooling for manufacturing lines. This contract was determined to be not relevant because of a lack of similarity to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, D&D Automation, Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that D&D Automation, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Futuramic Tool and Engineering**

Futuramic Tool and Engineering submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing four (4) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, Instrumentation, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for four (4) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining and surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline and visual testing and dye penetrant testing under the NDT discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be

competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included a Nadcap certificate of conformance in welding.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first past performance example was a purchase order (PO) with NASA GRC for the fabrication of a single gear tooth bending fixture. The other order was with NASA GFSC for the fabrication and testing of a motorized tilt fixture. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one (1) point of contact replied that delivery was late, and the other replied that the original scope was delivered on time despite three (3) major design changes, but additional testing was performed a week behind schedule. The CO was not able to find any information from CPARS. Though the work identified above is relevant in terms of scope, the responses provided by the points of contact indicated moderate delay in delivery or testing. Based on all this information, Futuramic Tool and Engineering was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Futuramic Tool and Engineering is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc.**

Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing two (2) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for one (1) subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, namely general and precision machining under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided three (3) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with General Dynamics Ordnance and Tactical Systems for multi axis turning with 3-axis mill operation. The next contract was with General Micro Systems, Inc. for 3-axis milling and waterjet cutting. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor was on-time for one order and a week late for another order. The other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. The third contract was with Sierra Nevada Corporation for waterjet cutting. This contract was determined to be relevant due to the similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery,

the point of contact did not provide a response. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **KCS Advanced Machining Services**

KCS Advanced Machining Services submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing one (1) Manufacturing Discipline, particularly Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for two (2) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining and surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring partial subcontracting include Machining. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications were not submitted but were not required for the Manufacturing Disciplines or subset that this Offeror was deemed technically capable of fulfilling.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided four (4) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with a private company machining aluminum components for a classified project. The second contract was with ILC Dover for the fabrication of spacesuit components requiring 5-axis machining capabilities. These two (2) contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor delivered early, and the other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. This contract was with Cobalt Robotics for the general machining of billet aluminum for robotics components. This contract was determined to be relevant due to the similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. Required point of contact information was not provided for this contract. The fourth contract provided was assessed next. This contract was with Artemis Racing for hydraulic control system elements. This contract was determined to be not relevant because of a lack of similarity to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, KCS Advanced Machining Services was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that KCS Advanced Machining Services is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Kessington, LLC**

Kessington, LLC submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality

Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing at least one (1) Manufacturing Discipline, particularly Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for three (3) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining and surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline and water-jet cutting, programmable press brake, programmable rolling machine, hydraulic tube and pipe bending equipment under the Fabrication discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D and ISO9001 certifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with Ametek Aerospace and Defense for aluminum machined parts. The second contract was with Honeywell Aerospace for machined castings and Inconel, titanium, stainless steel, and aluminum parts for aircraft braking systems and fuel regulators. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, neither point of contact provided a response. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, Kessington Aerospace was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Kessington, LLC is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Lindquist Machine Corporation**

Lindquist Machine Corporation submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing two (2) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication and Welding/Metal Joining. The Offeror was also approved for one (1) subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, namely general and precision machining under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Instrumentation, Inspection, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications were not submitted but were not required for the Manufacturing Disciplines or subset that this Offeror was deemed technically capable of fulfilling.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first past performance example was a Basic Ordering Agreement (BOA) with the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the machining of parts. The other example was a BPA with NASA Langley for general and precision machining and fabrication work. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, both points



of contact replied that the vendor has always delivered on time. The CO was not able to find any information from CPARS. Due to the information provided from points of contact, Lindquist Machine Corporation was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Lindquist Machine Corporation is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Maritech Machine, Inc.**

Maritech Machine, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing three (3) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for one (1) subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, namely general and precision machining under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D and ISO 9001 certifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided seven (7) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with ADS, Inc. for a contract consisting of machining, fabrication, welding, coatings, and assembly. The second was with Supply Core for the machining and assembly of equipment racks. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor delivered on-time. The other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. This contract was with Serco N.A., Inc. for CNC machining and fabrication. This contract was determined to be relevant due to the similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, the point of contact responded that the vendor often delivers on-time and communicates early if deliverables are running behind schedule. The remaining contracts were retained in the award file. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, Maritech Machine, Inc. was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Maritech Machine, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **MSP Aviation, Inc.**

MSP Aviation, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality

Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing one (1) Manufacturing Discipline, particularly Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for four (4) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining under the Machining discipline; fastening metal components utilizing certified commercial fasteners and water-jet cutting, programmable press brake, programmable rolling machine, hydraulic tube and pipe bending equipment under the Fabrication discipline; and visual testing under NDT. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D and ISO 9001 certifications.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided twenty-six (26) previous contracts within the past five (5) years; however, only two of them included point of contact information. Both contracts were with the US Navy. The first was for Build-to-Print (B2P) machined parts, and the second was for a machine shop BPA. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor met or exceeds the delivery requirements on most occasions, but the COVID-19 pandemic caused supply chain issues and subsequent late deliveries for a few deliverables. The other point of contact was not able to provide delivery information as the vendor was not listed in the contract file. Though the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, no other contracts included point of contact information. For that reason, the additional twenty-four (24) contracts were not assessed. The CO also was able to find CPARS information on the two contracts, as well as a case assembly contract and an aircraft equipment machining contract. These two additional contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The Offeror received 75% Very Good schedule ratings for these contracts. As a result, MSP Aviation, Inc. was given a positive rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Integrated MSP Aviation, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Precision Fabrication & Cleaning Co., Inc.**

Precision Fabrication & Cleaning Co., Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, relevant certifications, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing three (3) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for two (2) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including general and precision machining under the Machining discipline and visual testing under the NDT discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Instrumentation, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of

internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided ten (10) previous contracts within the past five (5) years. One (1) was with Gas Turbine Efficiency for the structural welding, pipe and tube fabrication, and testing of Power Generation Skids. Another contract was with NASA for the fabrication, installation, and testing of Vehicle Assembly Building (VAB) handling and access equipment. These two contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The remaining contracts were retained in the award file. No points of contact were identified in the past performance submission. The CO was able to find CPARS ratings for a contract with NASA Kennedy Space Center (KCS). The scope of this contract was for the manufacture and modification of space vehicle equipment. This contract was determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The Offeror received 75% Satisfactory schedule ratings for this contract. As a result, this Precision Fabrication & Cleaning Co., Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Precision Fabrication & Cleaning Co., Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

#### **Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc.**

Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, relevant certifications, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing two (2) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, and Welding/Metal Joining. The Offeror was not approved for any subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Instrumentation, Inspection, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included ISO 9001 certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided two (2) previous contracts within the past five (5) years. The first one was with KUKA Robotics for milled and lathed plates. The other contract was with GVSC Labs (previously TARDEC Labs) for bending, machining, welding, and fabrication of the safety cage for its tire test system. These contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. However, no points of contact were identified in the past performance submission. The CO found one CPARS record for a B2P fabricated metal product manufacturing contract with the US Army. Though this work is relevant in terms of scope, schedule ratings and other on-time delivery information were not reported. As a result, Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry

size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Tri Models, Inc.**

Tri Models, Inc. submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, relevant certifications, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing five (5) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, Instrumentation, and Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for two (2) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including visual testing and dye penetrant testing under the NDT discipline. Disciplines requiring partial subcontracting include NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided four (4) previous contracts within the past five (5) years. One (1) of the contracts was with the Boeing Company for a rudder test stand. Another was with the US Air Force in the design, fabrication, facility installation and testing support of a Freejet test model. These contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. The remaining contracts were retained in the award file. No points of contact were identified in the past performance submission. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, this Tri Models, Inc. was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Tri Models, Inc. is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Unipak Aviation, LLC**

Unipak Aviation, LLC submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing one (1) Manufacturing Discipline, particularly Inspection. The Offeror was also approved for three (3) subsets of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, including surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline, fastening metal components utilizing certified commercial fasteners under the Fabrication discipline, and Gas Tungsten Arc Welding under the Welding/Metal Joining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining, Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, and NDT. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 Revision D certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided five (5) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The contracts were for catch clamping, elevating shafts, and the assembly of an arresting brake carrier piston. Each contract was deemed outside the

scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work and not relevant to the BPA. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, Unipak Aviation, LLC was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that Unipak Aviation, LLC is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **WB Industries**

WB Industries submitted all of the required information for the Technical evaluation, including a complete Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, its current Quality Manual, and a capability statement. Based on a review of this information, this Offeror was deemed technically capable of performing four (4) Manufacturing Disciplines, particularly Fabrication, Welding/Metal Joining, Inspection and NDT. The Offeror was also approved for one (1) subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline, namely surface grinding equipment under the Machining discipline. Disciplines requiring full or partial subcontracting include Machining and Instrumentation. The Quality Manual submitted was determined to be competent because it included traditional quality manual aspects such as a quality policy and objectives, a description of organizational structure and roles, description of internal processes, monitoring of customer satisfaction, a continuous improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. Relevant certifications included AS9100 certification.

For the Past Performance evaluation, this Offeror provided three (3) previous contracts within the past five (5) years with associated contact information. The first contract was with Boeing Company for the manufacturing and inspection of cockpit stands. The next contract was with the US Army for the production and inspection of twenty-eight (28) palletized load systems. These two (2) contracts were determined to be relevant due to their similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, one point of contact responded that the vendor delivered on-time. The other point of contact did not provide a response. Since the minimum of two (2) points of contact did not respond to the inquiry, the third contract was assessed. This contract was with Lockheed Martin for the design, production, testing, and shipping of wing skin transpiration dollies. This contract was determined to be relevant due to the similarities to the scope provided in Attachment 3 – Statement of Work. When asked about on-time delivery, the point of contact did not provide a response. The CO also was not able to find any information from CPARS. As a result, WB Industries was given a neutral rating and was deemed to have provided adequate and satisfactory past performance.

The Offeror also completed the miscellaneous submittal requirements, namely a signed SF-1449 and completion of all Offeror Fill-ins and requested information. The information provided indicated that WB Industries is a small business within the applicable industry size requirements and is otherwise a responsible Offeror.

### **Selection Decision**

---

Based on the information presented above, I fully understand the evaluation process, the evaluation results, and concur with the overall evaluations. I am in agreement with the information presented and take no exception to the actions or determinations of the team.

I understand that there were two (2) Evaluation Factors: Technical; which was comprised of the

Attachment 4 – Vendor Manufacturing Discipline Capabilities Declaration Form, the Offeror’s current quality manual, relevant certifications (if applicable), and a capability statement; and Past Performance in which the Government asked for two (2) or more relevant contracts within five (5) years. There were also miscellaneous requirements, including a signed SF 1449 and complete OFIs, and mandatory award criteria comprised of small business status under the Machine Shops NAICS code and AS9100 inspection capabilities. I also understand that award should be made to the responsible Offerors whose proposals meet the requirements of the RFQ.

In the Technical factor, I note that the RFQ required Offerors to be found technically capable of performing at least one Manufacturing Discipline (or subset of requirements within a Manufacturing Discipline if it was found to be in the best interest of the Government) in order to receive an award. In addition, I note that the RFQ required Offerors to submit a current Quality Manual. The D&D Automation, Inc. proposal did not include a traditional Quality Manual but instead included a summary of its quality process. Even regarding this document as a Quality Manual, the evaluation team found that it lacked important aspects such as a Quality Policy and Objectives, an Organizational Structure Chart, a Continuous Improvement plan, and a plan for the control of non-conforming parts. As such, the evaluation team reasonably determined that D&D Automation lacked a competent Quality Manual and that without a competent Quality Manual, it could not, and did not, receive technical approval. I concur with the team’s evaluation of the D&D Automation proposal.

In the Past Performance factor, I note that all Offerors received either neutral or positive ratings and thus were deemed to have adequate and satisfactory past performance pursuant to the RFQ. I understand that Offerors without adequate past performance were given neutral ratings, and positive past performance ratings were assigned to Offerors that provided two instances of on-time or early past performance and/or had a majority of Good or higher CPARS Schedule ratings. The seven (7) Offerors that received positive ratings were Calspan Systems Corporation; Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc.; Coherent Technical Services, Inc.; Conroe Machine; Lindquist Machine Corporation; Maritech Machine, Inc.; and MSP Aviation, Inc. I concur with the results of the past performance evaluation.

Finally, all initially acceptable Offerors provided proposals that met the miscellaneous and mandatory requirements of the RFQ including signed SF 1449s, OFIs representing small business status within the applicable industry size standards, and declarations of AS9100 inspection capabilities.

Therefore, in accordance with the RFQ requirements, I find that the following Offerors (listed in alphabetical order) met the criteria for award and are therefore selected to receive awards to participate in the General and Precision Machining and Fabrication II BPA as outlined in the request for quotation, 80GRC022Q0001:

- **Applied Fab & Machining, Inc.**
- **Axial Global, LLC**
- **Calspan Systems Corporation**
- **Cardinal Scientific, Inc.**
- **CAV Manufacturing, LLC**
- **Coastal Mechanics Co., Inc.**
- **Coherent Technical Services, Inc.**
- **Conroe Machine**
- **Futuramic Tool and Engineering**
- **Integrated Ideas & Technologies, Inc.**
- **KCS Prototype & Design, LLC**

- Kessington, LLC
- Lindquist Machine Corporation
- Maritech Machine, Inc.
- MSP Aviation, Inc.
- Precision Fabricating & Cleaning Co., Inc.
- Rose-A-Lee Technologies, Inc.
- Tri Models, Inc.
- Unipak Aviation, LLC
- WB Industries

Approval:

*Leahmarie Koury*



*08/15/2022*

---

Leahmarie Koury  
Exploration Systems Branch Chief, NASA  
GRC Source Selection Authority

Date