

---

Meeting Date: March 19, 2014

Staff Contact: Hobert "H" Warren, Customer Service Division Manager

**TITLE: C-14-8 - Recommendation of Award, P2014000019, Merchant Services**

**ACTION: Recommend Approval**

**SUMMARY:**

The Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority issued the subject Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from qualified vendors to provide fiscal agent services.

The RFP was posted on the Sicomm website and advertised in the local newspaper. Four responses were received and submitted for evaluation. The ad hoc evaluation committee reviewed, evaluated, and scored the responses in accordance with the evaluation criteria published in the RFP.

The responses were reviewed, evaluated and scored by an ad hoc committee consisting of Hobert Warren, Customer Service Division Manager; Cody Stinson, CIO; and; Trina Mooneyham, Application Manager, Yvonne Lara, Assistant Customer Services Manager and Priscilla Stevens, Customer Service Supervisor. The committee recommended the award of a contract to Bank of Albuquerque, as that company had the highest composite score, is qualified to perform the work, and meets the requirements of the RFP.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Fees for merchant services are budgeted in the FY/14 Operating Budget. The final fees will be negotiated as submitted in the cost proposal, but it is anticipated that savings will be realized.



# Memo

**To:** Mark S. Sanchez, Executive Director

**From:** H. Warren, Customer Services Manager *HW*

**Date:** 3/12/2014

**Re:** Recommendation Of Award, P2014000019, Merchant Services

The RFP was posted on the SicommNet website and advertised in the local newspapers. Four (4) responses were received and submitted for evaluation. The ad hoc evaluation committee reviewed, evaluated, and scored the responses in accordance with the evaluation criteria published in the RFP.

Listed are the respondents' composite scores with small and/or local preferences and the NM Resident Preference applied for the offerors with an asterisk. The largest total composite score possible without preferences applied is 5,000.

<u>Offeror</u>	<u>Total Composite Score</u>
Bank of Albuquerque *	4943.4
Bank of America	4234.0
BVAA Compass Bank*	3851.5
Wells Fargo	1882.1

The ad hoc committee selected the top two scoring companies, Bank of America and Bank of Albuquerque, to provide presentations and to answer questions. I concur with the committee's recommendation for presentations and questions.

After completing the presentations and the question and answer sessions, the ad hoc evaluation committee rescored the responses of the top two respondents in accordance with the evaluation criteria published in the RFP. Listed below are the composite scores of Bank of Albuquerque and Bank of America after the rescoring.


<u>Offeror</u>	<u>Total Composite Score</u>
Bank of Albuquerque*	4944.5
Bank of America	4214.0

The committee recommended the contract for Merchant Services be awarded to the Bank of Albuquerque, as that company has the highest composite score and is qualified to perform the work. I concur with the committee's recommendation.

Water Authority Board approval is required for this procurement. Negotiations with the vendor shall begin immediately upon your approval.

Approved:

Recommended:

 3/13/14  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark S. Sanchez Date  
Executive Director

 3/13/14  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stan Allred Date  
Chief Financial Officer

Attachments:

Composite Score Sheets

Original:

Thomas Courtin, Senior Buyer

Copy:

Lorraine Nunez, Purchasing Officer

File:

P2014000019

**Merchant Services**

**P2014000019**

EVALUATOR	EVALUATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION FACTORS	OFFERORS			
			Bank of Alb	Wells Fargo	Compass Bank	Bank of America
HW	Acceptance of Draft Agreement Terms and Conditions	Up to 50	45	45	45	45
YL			40	0	25	40
PS			40	0	25	40
TM			50	50	50	50
CS			40	35	50	40
	SUB TOTAL		215	130	195	215
HW	Qualifications and Experience of the Offeror and personnel, including Offeror's past performance with contracts of a similar scope and size.	Up to 250	234	220	180	245
YL			225	50	235	230
PS			230	50	225	225
TM			250	100	250	250
CS			225	0	220	225
	SUB TOTAL		1164	420	1110	1175
HW	Proposed Approach to Tasks, including the overall ability of the Offeror, as judged by the evaluation committee, to successfully provide the scope of services as required. This judgment will be based upon factors such as the Offeror's processing and billing procedures, reporting capabilities, customer service and availability of staff and resources	Up to 200	190	100	160	190
YL			190	50	100	185
PS			180	60	115	150
TM			200	75	185	200
CS			180	100	170	180
	SUB TOTAL		940	385	730	905
	SUB TOTAL					
HW	Service Capabilities as Indicated in Offeror's responses to Appendix A	Up to 250	240	0	220	240
YL			225	0	225	230
PS			240	0	210	225
TM			245	0	220	250
CS			225	0	200	225
	SUB TOTAL		1175	0	1075	1170
	SUB TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE		3494	935	3110	3465
HW	Cost Proposal - Transaction Costs		200	171.5	148.3	153.8
YL			200	171.5	148.3	153.8
PS			200	171.5	148.3	153.8
TM			200	171.5	148.3	153.8
CS			200	171.5	148.3	153.8
	SUB TOTAL		1000	857.5	741.5	769
HW	Cost Proposal – Additional Costs	Up to 50	50	50	50	50
YL			50	50	50	50
PS			50	50	50	50
TM			50	50	50	50
CS			50	50	50	50
	SUB TOTAL		250	250	250	250
	COST PROPOSAL TOTAL		1250	1107.5	991.5	1019
	SUB TOTAL COMPOSITE SCORE	Up to 5000	4494	1793	3852	4234
	5% LOCAL BUSINESS PREFERENCE		224.7			
	5% SMALL BUSINESS PREFERENCE					
	NM RESIDENT BUSINESS		224.7	89.6		
	TOTAL COMPOSITE SCORE		4943.4	1882.1	3851.5	4234.0

**Merchant Services  
P2014000019**

EVALUATOR	EVALUATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION FACTORS	OFFERORS	
			Bank of Alb	Bank of America
HW	Acceptance of Draft Agreement Terms and Conditions	Up to 50	45	45
YL			40	40
PS			40	40
TM			50	50
CS			40	40
	SUB TOTAL		215	215
HW	Qualifications and Experience of the Offeror and personnel, including Offeror's past performance with contracts of a similar scope and size.	Up to 250	235	235
YL			225	230
PS			230	225
TM			250	250
CS			225	225
	SUB TOTAL		1165	1165
HW	Proposed Approach to Tasks, including the overall ability of the Offeror, as judged by the evaluation committee, to successfully provide the scope of services as required. This judgment will be based upon factors such as the Offeror's processing and billing procedures, reporting capabilities, customer service and availability of staff and resources	Up to 200	190	190
YL			190	185
PS			180	150
TM			200	200
CS			180	180
	SUB TOTAL		940	905
HW	Service Capabilities as indicated in Offeror's responses to Appendix A	Up to 250	240	230
YL			225	230
PS			240	225
TM			245	250
CS			225	225
	SUB TOTAL		1175	1160
	SUB TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE		3495	3445
HW	Cost Proposal - Transaction Costs	Up to 200	200	153.8
YL			200	153.8
PS			200	153.8
TM			200	153.8
CS			200	153.8
	SUB TOTAL		1000	769
HW	Cost Proposal – Additional Costs	Up to 50	50	50
YL			50	50
PS			50	50
TM			50	50
CS			50	50
	SUB TOTAL		250	250
	COST PROPOSAL TOTAL		1250	1019
	SUB TOTAL COMPOSITE SCORE	Up to 5000	4495	4214

	<b>5% LOCAL BUSINESS PREFERENCE</b>		<b>224.8</b>	
	<b>5% SMALL BUSINESS PREFERENCE</b>			
	<b>NM RESIDENT BUSINESS</b>		<b>224.8</b>	
	<b>TOTAL COMPOSITE SCORE</b>		<b>4944.5</b>	<b>4214.0</b>