

ORDINANCE NO. 2019-2

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE CRESTLINE SANITATION DISTRICT
ESTABLISHING PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES FOR
CONTRACTS WITH ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERING, LAND
SURVEYING, AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGEMENT FIRMS**

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Crestline Sanitation District finds as follows:

A. The Crestline Sanitation District (“the District”) is a sanitation district organized and operating pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 4700 et seq.

B. On or about January 17, 2013, the District’s Board of Directors (“the Board”) adopted Resolution No. 25 establishing general purchasing policies and procedures for the District (“the Purchasing Policy”).

C. Pursuant to Section 6.D.3. of the Purchasing Policy, contracts for the procurement of professional services for the District are exempt from competitive bidding requirements.

D. The Board now wishes to formally establish polies and procedures for the procurement of certain professional services for the District pursuant to the requirements set forth in California Government Code Section 4525 et seq.

THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the Crestline Sanitation District does hereby ordain as follows:

1. The District’s selection for professional services of private architectural, landscape architectural, engineering, environmental, land surveying, or construction project management firms shall be on the basis of demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the services required in accordance with the statutory provisions of California Government Code Section 4525 et seq.

2. In order to implement the method of selection described above, the Board hereby adopts the “CSD RFQ Evaluation Criteria and Ranking” policies and procedures that are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as the District’s formal procurement process for the retention of professional services agreements with private architectural, landscape architectural, engineering, environmental, land surveying, and construction project management firms to assure that these services are engaged on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualifications for the types of services to be performed and at fair and reasonable prices with maximum participation of small business firms.

3. The procedures adopted herein specifically prohibit practices which might result in unlawful activity, including but not limited to rebates, kickbacks, or other unlawful consideration, and also specifically prohibit District employees from participating in the selection process when those employees have a relationship with a person or business entity seeking a contract under this policy which would subject those employees to the application of the District’s Conflict of Interest Code.

4. The provisions of this Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon adoption.

Adopted this 15th day of October, 2019.

ROLL CALL

AYES:


NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:


Chairman, Board of Directors

ATTEST:


Secretary, Board of Directors

CSD RFQ Evaluation Criteria and Ranking

The purpose of this outline and ranking values is to characterize the attributes of the strongest candidates to support the District goal of best firm for the District. The process has been structured to separate low or average capabilities of firms and point out the strong points of each proposer, as they specifically apply to the District interests and features. In this manner, the criteria can be prioritized with the hope of identifying the strongest candidate. The next step will be to interview one or more of the candidates and begin structuring a scope of work and work plan for the ensuing work.

When the District has a reasonable number of candidates to evaluate the process will begin. In the first step, one or more of the candidates may rank low enough to be discounted from the next step. However, if all candidates rank well, it will be prudent to interview all. The span of 20 points or more be used as a criterion for distinction or separation. The District, however, may choose to waive this criterion and automatically interview all, using this procedure solely to develop questions or comments to be incorporated into the interview process.

Further, it is expected that review of the separate RFQs will provide a basis for questions, comments and further exploration of elements and ideas presented in, or missing from, the RFQ to be brought forward in the ensuing interview(s).

1. *Meets submittal requirements (Go/No Go)* – Failure here leads to immediate disqualification from the next steps.
 - a. Submitted on time
 - b. Addresses and appears capable of meeting all scope requirements
 - c. Can meet the time and schedule requirements of the RFQ
 - d. Meets insurance requirements
 - e. Has no serious negative comments from references
2. *Quality of RFQ Document (10%)* – Ability to communicate clearly and succinctly
 - a. Clear, clean, readable, professionally prepared presentation (1 pt)
 - b. Accurate description and understanding of District intent (2 pts)
 - c. Accurate enumeration of District facilities and environment (2 pts)
 - d. Appropriate and useful graphics (2 pts)
 - e. Appearance of additional independent research and investigation (2 pts)
 - f. Appropriate and succinct description of Company & resources appropriate to the Scope of Service (1 pts)
3. *Qualifications (40%)* – Possesses the capability and capacity to perform the work professionally and in a timely manner
 - a. Depth of applicable experience, including reclamation and environmental assessment (i.e. 2 pts per qualifying projects with proposed team) (Corporate experience outside of team = 0); (max 10 pts)

- b. Appropriateness of presented projects (#Qualifying Project/#Total Project) (10 pts)
 - c. Array and quantity of team skills for the described project (covers the bases) (10 pts)
 - d. Experience of team members (Years/10); (Max 10 pts, total of key members performing the bulk of the work; excludes the PIC)
4. *Scope & Approach* (50%) – Presents a clear and aggressive approach to meet the District’s objectives in a timely manner
- a. Clear, direct presentation of approach (10 pts)
 - b. Innovative and compelling experience and ideas (beyond the RFQ) (15 pts)
 - c. Familiarity with mountain, desert, climatic, hydraulic and geographic environment (10 pts)
 - d. Familiarity and experience with local, State and Federal regulatory and environmental constraints and requirements (15 pts)
5. *District Impression* – based upon interaction during pre-RFQ submittal (Added Points) (Max 10 pts)
- a. Sincerity and engagement of Site Visit Team
 - b. Sense of depth beyond the Principle-in-Charge
 - c. Confidence and demeanor of proposed Project Manager
 - d. Apparent inquisitiveness and quality of questions, concepts, understanding and comments by SVT
 - e. Apparent familiarity of SVT with types of District processes and assets