



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

TO: Mayor & City Council

DATE: March 31, 2011

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

AGENDA ITEM: Source Selection Recommendation for 12-035IS2, Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs

MEETING DATE: For Submission onto the April 5, 2011, City Council Regular Meeting Agenda

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: (Attach additional pages if necessary)

See attached:

Memorandum
Source Evaluation Memorandum
Resolution

APPROVAL BY CITY MANAGER: JMW APPROVED

_____ NOT APPROVED

PLACED ON AGENDA FOR: 4/5/11

CITY ATTORNEY APPROVAL REQUIRED: () YES () NO

CITY ATTORNEY APPROVAL: SMW

REMARKS:



TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: John McDonough, City Manager

DATE: March 31, 2011 for submission on the Agenda of the April 5, 2011 City Council Meeting

ITEM: Source Selection Recommendation for 12-035IS2, Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs

Background

The City of Sandy Springs issued Solicitation 12-035IS2, Information Services on December 15, 2010 to request proposals from offerors to provide Information 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

Solicitation Number: 12-035IS2

Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs, Georgia

1. This procurement was conducted using the Performance Price Trade-off procedures described in Section M of the solicitation. As the Chairman of the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) for this acquisition, I carefully considered the findings of the Capabilities and Approaches, Performance Confidence and Cost/Price evaluation panels and, in conjunction with the panel chairs, have determined the proposal submitted by InterDev, LLC. (InterDev) provides the best overall value to satisfy the City of Sandy Spring's Information Services requirement. This decision is based on the criteria established in Section M of the solicitation and the panels' assessments of InterDev's capability to provide the subject services, confidence in their ability to perform the requirement and the proposed price.
2. Evaluation Process. Section M of the solicitation 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 original submission cost/price and Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) cost/price, as applicable.
3. Best Value Award. Under the Performance Price Trade-off procedure, if the lowest priced evaluated technically acceptable proposal is judged to have a "Substantial Confidence" performance confidence assessment, that offer represents the best value for the City and receives the SSET's award recommendation. If the lowest priced offer is judged to have a performance confidence assessment of "Satisfactory Confidence" or lower, the SSET bases its award recommendation on an integrated best value assessment of considering performance confidence and cost/price.
4. Proposal Receipt. Information Services proposals were received on Friday, February 4, 2011 from four offerors: Elsym Consulting, Inc.; Virtual Management Technologies, Sophicity and InterDev, LLC. The proposals were examined for compliance with the solicitation submittal instructions and compliance issues were documented. A random selection procedure was used to determine the order in which the proposals were evaluated for technical acceptability with the following results:

Offer A – Elsym Consulting, Inc.
Offer B – Virtual Management Technologies
Offer C – Sophicity
Offer D – InterDev, LLC.

*City
Manager*

5. Elsym Consulting, Inc. – This offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal presented a sound approach to perform the information services requirement; an appropriate organizational structure, staffing level and skill mix; and an appreciation for the required customer relationships. Their Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated “Acceptable.” The offeror’s Performance Confidence Proposal presented convincing evidence of their ability to provide information services support to a broad range of State and international lottery corporations, a customer environment somewhat different than the City’s. Elsym was given an opportunity to expand on their performance history and, as a result, their Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a “Satisfactory” performance confidence assessment. The offeror’s Cost/Price Proposal presented a competitive price supported by a responsive cost/price narrative.

6. Virtual Management Technologies (VMT) – This offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal presented a minimal on-site staff supported by remote technical resources, an approach that did not satisfy the City requirements. Their Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated “Unacceptable.” The offeror’s Performance Confidence Proposal did not present the required reference contract information and list of references to which performance confidence questionnaires had been sent. Absent this information, neither contract relevance nor overall performance confidence could be assessed. The offeror’s Cost/Price Proposal did not present a cost/price narrative as required by the RFP. Considering these significant deficiencies, VMT’s initial proposal was judged to be non-responsive and was eliminated from consideration.

7. Sophicity – This offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal presented an organizational strategy and staffing plan centered on the firm’s “total support” concept. While an interesting approach to provide information services in many environments, it did not address the City’s staffing and customer relationship requirements. Therefore, Sophicity’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated “Unacceptable.” Sophicity’s Performance Confidence Proposal clearly demonstrated their ability to provide information services using their proposed model and was assigned a “Substantial” performance confidence assessment. The offeror’s Cost/Price Proposal presented a cost/price narrative supporting a base year task order price significantly higher than the City’s independent estimate. Considering the proposed price, strongly influenced by their “total support” model, and the unacceptability of this approach, Sophicity’s initial proposal was excluded from the competitive range.

8. InterDev, LLC. – This offeror’s Capabilities and Approaches Proposal presented a sound approach to perform the information services requirement; an appropriate organizational structure, staffing level and skill mix; an excellent process for managing customer relationships; an well-thought-out phase-in plan and schedule, and an exceptional corporate commitment to achieve the City’s transition requirements. Their Capabilities and Approaches Proposal was rated “Acceptable.” The offeror’s Performance Confidence Proposal clearly demonstrated very relevant performance and exceptional quality work. Their Performance Confidence Proposal was assigned a “Substantial” performance confidence assessment. The offeror’s Cost/Price Proposal presented a competitive price supported by a responsive cost/price narrative.

9. Evaluation Results. The following table shows the results of the evaluation:

| Offeror | Technical Acceptability | Cost | Performance Confidence |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| InterDev, LLC. | Acceptable | \$1,040,853 | Substantial |
| Elsym Consulting, Inc. | Acceptable | \$1,162,803 | Satisfactory |

10. In summary, based on the assessment of proposals described herein, it is the SSET's conclusion that the proposal submitted by InterDev, LLC represents the best value to the City of Sandy Springs. We recommend the City award InterDev, LLC a contract to provide Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs and execute the base year task order authorizing InterDev to perform these services. In addition, it is the SSET's conclusion that Elsym Consulting, Inc. represents a valuable resource for the City of Sandy Springs and we recommend Elsym be awarded a contract to provide Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs and be eligible to compete for future task order awards under the terms of that contract.

11. In addition to the Year One Task Order price referenced in paragraph 9 above, I recommend a contract be awarded to InterDev for the Phase-In period beginning April 15, 2011 and ending June 30, 2011 in the amount of \$299,037.

John McDonough
City Manager and Chairman, Source Selection Evaluation Team
March 31, 2011

10. In summary, based on the assessment of proposals described herein, it is the SSET's conclusion that the proposal submitted by InterDev, LLC represents the best value to the City of Sandy Springs. We recommend the City award InterDev, LLC a contract to provide Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs and execute the base year task order authorizing InterDev to perform these services. In addition, it is the SSET's conclusion that Elsym Consulting, Inc. represents a valuable resource for the City of Sandy Springs and we recommend Elsym be awarded a contract to provide Information Services for the City of Sandy Springs and be eligible to compete for future task order awards under the terms of that contract.

11. In addition to the Year One Task Order price referenced in paragraph 9 above, I recommend a contract be awarded to InterDev for the Phase-In period beginning April 15, 2011 and ending June 30, 2011 in the amount of \$299,037.



John McDonough
City Manager and Chairman, Source Selection Evaluation Team
March 31, 2011

**STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY FULTON**

**A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT
AND TASK ORDER IN CONNECTION WITH THE CITY'S
SOLICITATION FOR INFORMATION SERVICES**

WHEREAS, the City of Sandy Springs ("City") currently has a contract with a vendor for information services ("Contract"), which will expire June 30, 2011; and

WHEREAS, in anticipation of the expiration of the Contract, the City issued a request for proposals for information services, dated December 15, 2010, and received proposals from various vendors; and

WHEREAS, the proposals were evaluated by the Source Selection Evaluation Team ("SSET"), consistent with criteria established by the terms of the request for proposals, to determine the best overall value for the City and its residents; and

WHEREAS, as the result of its evaluation, the SSET has provided its Source Evaluation Memorandum, in the form attached to this resolution, presenting the results of its evaluation for information services and recommending: (a) a contract award to InterDev, LLC; (b) a contract award to Elsym Consulting, Inc. (c) a task order award in the amount of \$1,040,853 to InterDev, LLC for the first year, beginning July 1, 2011; and (d) an award to InterDev, LLC in the amount of \$299,037 for the phase-in period for information services, beginning April 15, 2011 and ending June 30, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to make such awards based on the recommendations of the SSET consistent with the attached Source Evaluation Memorandum;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Sandy Springs, Georgia while in regular session on April 5, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. as follows:

1. InterDev, LLC. is hereby awarded:
 - (a) A contract for information services;
 - (b) The first year task order for information services, beginning July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,040,853; and
 - (c) Costs for phase-in for information services, beginning April 15, 2011 and ending June 30, 2011, in the amount of \$299,037;
2. Elsym Consulting, Inc. is hereby awarded a contract for information services; and
3. The City Manager and appropriate City officials are hereby authorized to take any and all actions necessary to effectuate the intent of this resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this the 5th day of April, 2011.

Approved:

Eva Galambos, Mayor

Attest:

Michael Casey, City Clerk

(Seal)