



Olga Hugelmeyer
Superintendent of Schools

Mario Rodrigues
District Purchasing Agent

June 15, 2016

Evaluation Report of Proposals Received on June 10, 2016 in Response to Request for Proposals for District-Wide Collection and Testing for the Presence of Lead in Water.

Prepared for: Elizabeth Board of Education (the “Board”)
By: Evaluation Team

This Report is being provided pursuant to the requirements of the competitive contracting provisions of the Public School Contracts Law, specifically, N.J.S.A. 18A:18A-4.1(k).

The purpose of the Report is to provide the Elizabeth Board of Education with an evaluation of the proposals received for the District-Wide Collection and Testing for the Presence of Lead in Water in the Elizabeth school facilities.

As set forth in the RFP, the successful respondent and the Board will enter into an agreement under which the Respondent will collect and analyze water samples from each school in the district in accordance with the protocols established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for the testing of the presence of lead in drinking water in schools.

The Evaluation Team consisted of the Board Purchasing Agent, Director of Plant, Property and Equipment and a Board counsel.

Overview of RFP

The RFP was issued on May 21 requesting proposals for District-wide collection and testing for the presence of lead in water in the Elizabeth school facilities, with a Bid Opening date of June 10, 2016. The proposal calls for collection of approximately 2,425 water samples throughout the District facilities, including every water fountain/cooler, sinks where food preparation is conducted, sinks in classrooms, all common area sinks and one random sink in each bathroom.

Pricing was requested on a unit basis to determine the cost of collection and analysis per sample. Proposals were evaluated on the basis of price and non-price criteria, in accordance with competitive contracting provisions of the Public School Contracts Law, specifically N.J.S.A. 18A:18A-4.1(k).

District Purchasing Agent



The RFP included the following matrix upon which the evaluation was determined:

Technical criteria (25%):

- 1) Proposed methodology:
 - a. Does Respondent's proposal demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of work and related objectives?
 - b. Is Respondent's proposal complete and responsive to the specific RFP requirements?
 - c. Has the past performance of Respondent's proposed methodology been documented?
 - d. Does Respondent's proposal use innovative technology and techniques?

Management criteria (25%):

- 1) Project management:
 - a. How well does the proposed scheduling timeline meet the Board's needs?
 - b. Is there a project management plan?
- 2) History and experience in performing the work:
 - a. Does Respondent document a record of reliability of timely delivery and on-time and on-budget implementation?
 - b. Does Respondent demonstrate a track record of service as evidenced by on-time, on-budget, and contract compliance performance?
 - c. Does Respondent document industry or program experience?
 - d. Does Respondent have a record of moral integrity?
- 3) Availability of personnel, facilities, equipment and other resources:
 - a. To what extent does Respondent rely on in-house resources vs. contracted resources?
 - b. Are the availability of in-house and contract resources documented?
- 4) Qualification and experience of personnel:
 - a. Documentation of experience in performing similar work by employees and when appropriate, sub-contractors?

District Purchasing Agent



- b. Does Respondent make use of business capabilities or initiatives that involve women, the disadvantaged, small and/or minority owned business establishments?
- c. Does Respondent demonstrate cultural sensitivity in hiring and training staff?

Cost criteria (50%):

- 1) Cost of services to be performed:
 - a. Relative cost: How does the cost compare to other similarly scored Proposals?
 - b. Full explanation: Is the price and its component charges, fees, etc. adequately explained or documented?
- 2) Assurances of performance:
 - a. Does the proposal include quality control and assurance programs?
- 3) Respondent's financial stability and strength:
 - a. Does Respondent have sufficient financial resources to meet its obligations?

Responses

Reponses were received from six (6) Respondents, listed below:

Pars Environmental, Inc. of Robbinsville, NJ
NJAL of Ewing, NJ
LEW Corporation of Mountainside, NJ
Chemtech of Mountainside, NJ
Aqua Pro-Tech Laboratories of Fairfield, NJ
Whitman of Cranbury, NJ

Proposals were evaluated by the evaluation team on the basis of the methodology outlined above.

Pars Environmental presented a complete plan on the methodology of collecting the samples with attention to detail and documented the broadest experience in lead in water testing for school districts. While a full timeline was not included, the willingness to a demanding schedule to meet the district's goals was manifested. The resources and staff qualifications were considered adequate.

NJAL's plan was very brief and very limited with regard to school district experience. It was believed that the timeline documented may exceed the district's goal. The resources documented

District Purchasing Agent



were limited.

LEW Corporation resources and staff qualifications documented appears adequate. Sampling plan details were not specified and a timeline was not included. Experience with school districts' water testing is very limited.

Chemtech did not show evidence of handling a full sampling and testing projects but as a sub laboratory only. The plan was not delineated and a timeline was not mentioned. Their representation that all sample collection could be completed in one to three days did not seem realistic.

Aqua Pro Tech Laboratories plan details are brief and their documentation regarding experience with school districts appears very limited. Resources and staff qualifications are adequate. Mentioned 500ml samples instead of 250ml.

Whitman's plan was adequate but brief in description of resources. Their staff qualifications were adequate. Their timeline appeared adequate. Their experience with water lead testing appeared light.

Following is the final scoring of the Evaluation Matrix:

EVALUATION OF WATER TESTING RFP 6/14/2016

	Price	Cost Criteria	Technical Criteria	Management Criteria	Total Score
PARS	\$99,279.50	28.1	25	18	71.1
NJ ANALYTICAL	\$55,775.00	50.0	5	5	60.0
LEW	\$93,241.25	29.9	10	10	49.9
CHEMTECH	\$140,650.00	19.8	15	15	49.8
AQUA PRO	\$97,000.00	28.8	18	15	61.8
WHITMAN	\$127,918.75	21.8	15	20	56.8

Recommendation

The RFP process attracted a competitive range of proposals. Based upon a legal and technical review of each proposal, all of the proposals were determined to be compliant with the requirements of the RFP.

Each of the proposals were ranked by the Evaluation Team based upon all of the factors set forth in the Evaluation Matrix and Pars Environmental, Inc. has ranked the highest and is recommended for the award.

District Purchasing Agent



It is important to note that the cost criterion as set forth in the RFP was for evaluation purposes and based on an estimated number of water sources and analyses. As additional water sources may be determined during the process and additional sampling may be required in the event initial test results reveal lead in excess of DEP guideline maximums of 0.015 mg/L, it is recommended that, for budgeting purposes, the contract be established at the unit price per sample, but that the maximum amount of the contract be increased by five percent (5%) to allow for such additional water sources and resampling costs.

LRC/am

District Purchasing Agent