

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

B-179410

40143

October 29, 1973

Service Engineering Co. Pier 22 Sen Francisco, California 94105

> Attention: Mr. Ray J. Helaspina President

Contlemen:

We refer to your letter of July 5, 1973, protesting against award of a contract to Colberg, Inc. (Colberg), under invitation for bids (IPB) DAAGO8-73-B-0364. It is your contention that your firm submitted the low, responsive and responsible bid and that the bid submitted by Colberg was nourasponsive and should have been rejected.

On June 6, 1973, the Sacramento Army Nepot issued IFB DAAGOS-73-B-0364 covering a requirement for paint storage and spot painting. Four bids were received and were opened on June 25, 1973. Upon examination of the bids, the bid of Colberg was found to have an error in the grand total for the definite and indefinite items specified in Section B of the IFB.

The partiment portions of Section %, together with Colberg's pricing responses, are as follows:

"IMM NO. SUPPLIES/SERVICES AND PRICES QUANTITY UNIT UNIT AMOUNT PRICE

SCOPE OF WORK - DEFINITE TTEM:

0001 Preservation for Storage XXXXXXX XXX \$

Total Definite Itam XXXXXXX XXX XXXX \$49,536.00

. .

SCOPE OF WORK .. INDEPINITE 7.TAM:

0002 Interior Spot Painting

[Protest Alleging Awardee's Bid Was Nonresponsive]

71845 091805

ETEN MO,	SUPPLIMS/SERVICES AND PRECES QUANTITY UN	IT UNIT	AMOUNT.
	Unit Trice for One (1) Ng. Ft.	\$0.67	XXXXXXX
	Total Price for Fifther Thousand (15,000) Sq. Ft.	<i>2017.</i> X	\$10,050.00
	*** .		
0003	Exterior Spot Palacing		
	Unit Price For One (1) Sq. Ft.	90.43	XXXXXX
	Total Frice for Fifty-Five Thousand (55,000) Eq. Ft.	XXXX	\$ 23,650.00
	Total for Indefinite Items Grand Total Definite and Indefinite Items	XXXX	\$33,7 00.00
		XXXX	\$116,963.00

The correct total for items 0001, 0002 and 0003 is \$81,236. Culbarg correctly extended and totaled indefinite items 0002 and 0003 and arrived at a "Total for Indefinite Items" of \$33,700. This correct subtotal was then mistakenly included in the computation of the grand total price. This caused items 0002 and 0003 to be "double-sided." In addition, a transpositional error in Colberg's grand total price was found. The correct grand total price is \$116,936, rather than \$116,963, as shown on the bid.

The contracting officer, racognizing the apparent cherical mistakes, contacted Colberg to verify the errors as required by Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) 2-406.2. By telegram dated June 26, 1973, Colberg acknowledged the cherical errors and confirmed the original item prices. Colberg also verified its intention to complete the contract at the corrected total price of \$83,236.

The Deputy General Counsel's latter states that acceptance of Colberg's bid at \$83,236 had the effect of displacing your hid in the amount of \$114,000 for the three items.

It is your contention that the Colberg bid should have been rejected due to the discrepancy between the grand total price shown in the bid and the total of the item prices. You allege that Colberg could have quoted different prices for items and the grand total and pick either figure that would be advantageous to it.

m Ì m

In B-179222, August 3, 1979, our Office recently restated the rule applicable here:

The general rule is that correction of an erroneous bid will not be permitted if the correction would displace another. bidder as the successful bidder, unless the error is obvious and the intended bid price can be accertained from the bid invest, 50 Comp. Gen. 497 (1971), 4 * **

Ym our opinion, Colberg's bid was properly corrected. Paragraph D-4 of the enlicitation, entitled "BASIS OF AWARD," provided that;

"Bide will be evaluated by considering the notal bid for initialite work plus the amount bid on the Indufinite items. Rawaver, contract will be awarded on the Definite work prescribed. The indefinite work will be performed by Change Order authorized by the Contracting Officer at the Unit Price or amount quoted in the Invitation. * * ***

Since paragraph D-4 indicates that the total bid for the definite quantity (item 0001) and the "amounts" shown for the indefinite quantities (items 0002 and 0003) would be controlling, the further requests for a total price for the indefinite items and a grand total price were for the turpose of determining the apparent low bidder. Moreover, since payment for the indefinite items is to be based on the work actually performed and estimated quantities were used for calculating the "amounts," the unit prices for items 0002 and 0003 were to be controlling. (The unit prices for items 0002 and 0003 are not in issue here and the amounts shown in Colberg's bid are a corract extension of the unit prices shown.)

The contracting officer, therefore, properly focused on the amounts shown on Colberg's bid for items 0002 and 0003 and the price quoted for item 0001. We agree and conclude that the error was obvious and the intended bid was ascertainable from the bid itself. The "double-added" amount was clearly labeled "Total for Indefinite Items." And, apart from the obvious transpositional error, the grand total price for all items is the sum of all prices listed by Colberg in the amount column of the schedule. The intended total bid price is arrived at simply by deleting the smount shown as the "Total for Indefinite Items" from the grand total price.

Since the provisions of ASPR 2-406.2 have been fully complied with, and no basis is apparent from the record that the evidence was not sufficiently clear and convincing to variant correction of Colberg's bid, we have no objection to the source of the contract to Colberg.

Accordingly, your protest is deuled.

Sincerely yours,

Paul G. Donding

For the Comptroller General of the United States