

Legislation Text

File #: 16-1028, Version: 1

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR BOARD MEETING OF OCTOBER 6, 2016

COMMITTEE ON PROCUREMENT

Mr. David St. Pierre, Executive Director

Report on rejection of proposals for 16-RFP-27, Pre-Employment Physical Examination and Drug/Alcohol Testing Services, estimated cost \$140,000.00

Dear Sir:

On August 4, 2016, the report on advertisement for the request for proposal 16-RFP-27, Pre-employment Physical Examination and Drug/Alcohol Testing Services, was sent to the Board of Commissioners.

On August 10, 2016, the request for proposal was advertised and one proposal was received on August 26, 2016.

One hundred fifty-two (152) firms were notified of this request for proposal (RFP) and seventeen (17) firms requested proposal documents. The tabulation of proposers is as follows:

AURICO REPORTS, LLC

A review of the proposal revealed that the vendor could not provide the required services listed under the Scope of Work. The request for proposal required vendors to provide four types of physical examinations: basic pre-employment physical examinations; return-to-work physical examinations; return-to-work physical examinations with physician-dictated report; and specialized, "independent" medical evaluations. Aurico Reports, LLC states in its proposal that it does not provide return-to-work examinations with physician-dictated report; and specialized, "independent" medical evaluations.

The request for proposal also required that vendors provide on-site drug and alcohol testing related to the District's random drug testing program and any post-accident or reasonable suspicion testing that is needed. Aurico Reports, LLC states in its proposal that it does not provide any on-site or mobile unit services for drug and alcohol testing. These services are a critical component of this contract. Therefore, the sole bid received is considered non-responsive and rejected in the public's best interest. The Director of Procurement and Materials Management has informed Aurico Reports, LLC of this action.

A review of the planholders' responses from vendors that did not provide a proposal revealed the following reasons for not bidding: some of the service requirements listed were outside of their standard work process and they could not provide a bid for all services required by the District.

The request for proposal 16-RFP-27 will be revised prior to a re-advertisement.

Respectfully Submitted, Darlene A. LoCascio, Director of Procurement and Materials Management, DAL:SEB:cm