



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

TO: Mayor & City Council

DATE: November 14, 2013

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

AGENDA ITEM: Recommendation for RFP CC-FY14-01, Call Center Services for the City of Sandy Springs

MEETING DATE: For Submission onto the November 19, 2013, City Council Regular Meeting Agenda

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: (Attach additional pages if necessary)

See attached:

Memorandum
Source Evaluation Memorandum
Resolution

APPROVAL BY CITY MANAGER: JPM APPROVED

PLACED ON AGENDA FOR: 11/19/2013

CITY ATTORNEY APPROVAL REQUIRED: () YES () NO

CITY ATTORNEY APPROVAL: [Signature]

REMARKS:



TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

DATE: November 12, 2013 for submission on the Agenda of the November 19, 2013 City Council Meeting

ITEM: Recommendation for RFP CC-FY14-01, Call Center Services for the City of Sandy Springs

Background

The City of Sandy Springs issued RFP CC-FY14-01, Call Center Services on August 12, 2013 to request proposals from offerors to provide Call Center Services to the City.

Discussion

See attached Source Evaluation Memorandum.

Alternatives

Council could choose not to award a contract.

Financial Impact

See attached Source Evaluation Memorandum.

Attachment

1. Source Evaluation Memorandum.
2. Resolution.

*City
Manager*

SOURCE EVALUATION MEMORANDUM

Call Center Services
RFP CC-FY14-01
City of Sandy Springs, Georgia

1. Introduction.

The City of Sandy Springs (“City”) issued a Request for Proposals for Call Center Services, RFP CC-FY14-01 on August 12, 2013 (“RFP”). The purpose of the RFP was to solicit proposals for a firm to deliver Call Center Services to the City’s citizens and key stakeholders. The RFP contained a detailed Statement of Work (“SOW”), which outlined the services deemed necessary and essential to the City for this procurement.

Section 1.8.4 of the RFP identified the City’s Most Important Requirements for this RFP. These were:

- *Accountability* – Effective measures for meeting contract requirements
- *Responsiveness* – Timely response to requests and inquiries
- *Transparency* – Insight into contractor cost of services
- *Continuity* – Continuous high-level of service
- *Capability* – Increase capability and opportunity for innovation in functional areas

Offerors were instructed to submit proposals in four (4) volumes: Volume I – Capabilities and Approaches Proposal; Volume II – Performance Confidence Proposal; Volume III – Cost/Price Proposal; and Volume IV – Model Contract.

This procurement was conducted using the Performance Price Trade-Off model described in Section 1.2.1 of the Instructions to Offerors. Section 2 of the Instructions to Offerors set forth the following areas for evaluation: technical acceptability; performance confidence; and cost/price. Offerors’ Capabilities and Approaches Proposals were evaluated for technical acceptability against both General (Factor 1) and Task Specific (Factor 2) requirements and assigned ratings of “Acceptable”, “Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable” and “Unacceptable”. Offerors’ Performance Confidence Proposals were evaluated based on: (a) the description of past and present performance provided by the Offeror; (b) questionnaire responses provided by the Offeror’s references; and (c) data independently obtained from other sources. The Offeror’s ability to perform the effort described in the RFP was assessed and the proposal was assigned an overall confidence rating of “Substantial”, “Satisfactory”, “Limited” or “No” confidence. Offeror’s Cost/Price Proposals were evaluated for reasonableness and realism and ranked based on the originally submitted Cost/Price Proposal.

On Monday, September 23, 2013, the City received six (6) proposals in response to the RFP from the following six (6) firms (“Offerors”):

- Calls Plus;
- CH2M HILL;
- Computer Data Services;
- ENCO Utility Services;
- Etech Global Services; and
- Faneuil.

The proposals were initially examined for administrative compliance with the RFP submittal instructions, with compliance issues documented. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

2. **Evaluation.**

Submitted proposals were evaluated by individuals selected by the City Manager (“Evaluation Committee”). The Evaluation Committee was divided into three (3) separate evaluation panels to correspond with the following basic areas of proposal evaluation: (a) Capabilities and Approaches; (b) Performance Confidence; and (c) Cost/Price. Members of each of the three (3) evaluation panels were:

- Capabilities and Approaches:
 - Eden Freeman, City of Sandy Springs, Assistant City Manager
 - Dan Coffey, City of Sandy Springs, Community Relations Manager
 - Raquel Gonzalez, City of Sandy Springs, Executive Assistant
- Performance Confidence:
 - Kathy Williams, City of Sandy Springs, City Attorney’s Office
 - Jeff Allen, City of Sandy Springs, Purchasing Manager
- Cost/Price:
 - Karen Ellis, City of Sandy Springs, Finance Director
 - D’Wayne Hulbert, City of Sandy Springs, Accounting Manager

Evaluations were performed by the evaluation panels using the criteria set forth in Section 2 of the Instructions to Offerors. Proposals were generally evaluated based on:

- Capabilities and Approaches;
- Past Performance; and
- Cost/Price

After selecting Offerors within the competitive range, as described in Section 2.1.F of the Instructions to Offerors of the RFP, the Evaluation Committee conducted formal interviews to provide the selected Offerors an opportunity to: (a) make a formal presentation of the Offeror’s proposal; (b) demonstrate the Offeror’s understanding of RFP project requirements; (c) explain the Offeror’s approach and methods of meeting RFP project requirements; and (d) respond to any questions or requests for clarification by representatives of the Evaluation Committee.

3. **Rating of Proposals.**

An Offeror's Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was evaluated for technical acceptability and assigned a rating of "Acceptable", "Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable" or "Unacceptable." Issues identified by the evaluators were documented and clarifications to those items deemed "Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable" were sought from Offerors found to be within the competitive range.

An Offeror's Performance Confidence Proposal was evaluated based on: (a) description of past and present performance provided by the Offeror; (b) questionnaire responses provided by the Offeror's references; and (c) data independently obtained from other sources. The Offeror's ability to perform the effort described in the RFP was assessed and the proposal was assigned an overall performance confidence rating of "Substantial", "Satisfactory", "Limited" or "No" confidence. Offerors were required by Section 2.1.C of the Instructions to Offerors of the RFP to seek and have representatives of prior contracts submit questionnaires in the form attached to the RFP as *Attachment 2* ("Performance Confidence Questionnaires"). The Performance Confidence panel utilized these Performance Confidence Questionnaires along with other due diligence research and inquiry to make a performance confidence assessment of the Offeror.

An Offeror's Cost/Price proposal was evaluated for reasonableness and realism by the Cost/Price panel based upon the originally submitted Cost/Price Proposal.

4. **Initial Evaluation and Competitive Range Decisions.**

The evaluation panels completed their independent evaluation of proposals and reported their findings on October 29, 2013. The Evaluation Committee determined that two (2) of the submitted proposals had a reasonable expectation of receiving an award and therefore were moved forward for further consideration. The proposals submitted by Calls Plus, Computer Data Services, ENCO Utility Services and Etech Global Services were determined by the Evaluation Committee to be non-responsive to the RFP requirements and therefore "Unacceptable" and were eliminated from further consideration.

5. **Request for Formal Interviews.**

On November 4, 2013, following determination of the competitive range, the Evaluation Committee sent letters to two (2) Offerors requesting clarification of certain portions of their proposals and inviting them to meet with representatives of the Evaluation Committee for formal interviews on Friday, November 8, 2013.

6. **Analyses.** As described in the Introduction section of this memorandum, the RFP included the following Most Important Requirements:

- *Accountability* – Effective measures for meeting contract requirements

- *Responsiveness* – Timely response to requests and inquiries
- *Transparency* – Insight into contractor cost of services
- *Continuity* – Continuous high-level of service
- *Capability* – Increase capability and opportunity for innovation in functional areas

Using these requirements as a guide, the three (3) evaluation panels completed their evaluations and reported their findings on Friday, November 8, 2013. The following table summarizes the results of the analyses that led to the selection decision:

Offeror	Technical Acceptability	Performance Confidence	Six Month Cost	Year 1 Cost	Phase In Costs	Burden %	Annual Escalator
Calls Plus	RSOBMA	Limited	\$313,274.62	\$626,549.25	\$35,724.00	69.00%	5.0%
CH2M HILL	Acceptable	Satisfactory	\$304,637.31	\$609,274.63	---	98.50%	3.0%
Computer Data Services	Non-responsive	No Rating	\$231,893.51	\$463,787.01	\$89,748.00	43.17%	5.25%
ENCO Utility Services	RSOBMA	Limited	\$377,111.80	\$754,223.60	\$65,016.00	86.47%	2.5%
Etech Global Services	Non-responsive	Limited	\$196,584.96	\$393,169.92	\$9,841.00	92.00%	3.0%
Faneuil	Acceptable	Satisfactory	\$225,268.99	\$450,537.98	\$67,303.00	98.72%	4.88%

Calls Plus' Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was deemed "Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable" as there were numerous required items that were not fully addressed in the proposal. Calls Plus' Performance Confidence Proposal did not demonstrate the firm's experience with projects of similar scope and services to the RFP requirements; therefore, evaluators lacked evidence necessary to be confident in the firm's ability to provide the services required under this RFP. As a result, the Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a "Limited" performance confidence assessment. The Offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was found to be reasonable and realistic.

CH2M HILL's Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was deemed "Acceptable." CH2M HILL's Performance Confidence Proposal presented evidence of the firm's ability to provide the scope of services required under this RFP. The Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a "Satisfactory" performance confidence assessment. The Offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was found to be reasonable and realistic.

Computer Data Services' Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was deemed "Non-responsive" as the Offeror did not demonstrate a thorough understanding of the requirements of the RFP. Computer Data Services' Performance Confidence Proposal did not provide relevant references to demonstrate the firm's experience with projects of similar nature, scope and services to the RFP requirements; therefore, the Performance Confidence Proposal was unable to rate performance confidence and assigned a "No Rating" performance confidence assessment. The Offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was found to be unreasonable and unrealistic.

ENCO Utility Services' Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was deemed "Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable" as there were numerous required items that were not fully addressed in the proposal. ENCO Utility Services' Performance Confidence Proposal did not demonstrate the firm's experience with projects of similar scope and services to the RFP requirements; therefore, evaluators lacked evidence necessary to be confident in the firm's ability to provide the services required under this RFP. As a result, the Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a "Limited" performance confidence assessment. The Offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was found to be reasonable and realistic.

Etech Global Services' Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was deemed "Non-responsive" as the Offeror did not demonstrate a thorough understanding of the requirements of the RFP. Etech Global Services' Performance Confidence Proposal did not demonstrate the firm's experience with projects of similar scope and services to the RFP requirements; therefore, evaluators lacked evidence necessary to be confident in the firm's ability to provide the services required under this RFP. As a result, the Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a "Limited" performance confidence assessment. The Offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was found to be unreasonable and unrealistic.

Faneuil's Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was deemed "Acceptable." Faneuil's Performance Confidence Proposal presented evidence of the firm's ability to provide the scope of services required under this RFP. The Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a "Satisfactory" performance confidence assessment. The Offeror's Cost/Price Proposal was found to be reasonable and realistic.

Based on the submitted proposals, subsequent interviews and demonstrated prior successful delivery of Call Center Services, the Evaluation Committee finds the solution proposed by Faneuil to represent the best value to the City of Sandy Springs.

6. Summary and Recommendation.

Using the evaluation procedure described in Section 2 of this memorandum and the evaluation methodology described in Section 2 of the Instructions to Offerors, the Evaluation Committee submits the following recommendation:

- Award **Faneuil** a contract to provide Call Center Services for the City of Sandy Springs and execute the base six (6) month task order authorizing Faneuil to performance Call Center Services.
- Award **CH2M HILL** a contract to provide Call Center Services for the City of Sandy Springs and, thereby, establish the firm's eligibility to compete for future task order awards under the terms of the contract.