Albuquerque Bernalillo County
Water Utility Authority

Agenda Item No. 8c

Meeting Date: April 23, 2014
Staff Contact: Stan Allred, Chief Financial Officer

TITLE: C-14-12 - Recommendation of Award, RFP Audit Services P2014000053

ACTION: Recommend Approval

SUMMARY:
The Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority issued the referenced Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit proposals from qualified vendors to provide Audit Services.

The RFP was posted on the Sicomm website and advertised in the local newspaper. Three 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 Stan Allred, Chief Financial Officer; Cliff Wintrode, Accounting Officer; Susan Lander, Fiscal Officer; and H. S. Warren, Customer Service Division Manager. The committee recommended the award of a contract to REDW, as that firm had the highest composite score, is qualified to perform the work, and meets the requirements of the RFP. Once a contract has been entered into, it must be submitted to the State Auditor's Office for their approval. Once approval has been granted REDW can begin work on the FY/14 CAFR.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The cost for this Audit work will be approximately $59,000 a year, with the contract covering a three year period. This amount is appropriated in the FY/15 Operating Budget.

Albuquerque Bernalillo County
Water Utility Authority

PO Box 568
Albuquerque, NM 87103-0568
505-768-2500
www.abcwua.org

Memo

To: Mark S. Sanchez, Executive Director

From: Stan Allred, Chief Financial Officer

Date: April 17, 2014

Re: Recommendation of Award, P2014000053, Audit Services

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

The RFP was posted on the Sicomm website and advertised in the local newspapers. Three (3) 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 all the respondents' composite scores with small and/or local preferences and the NM Resident Preference applied for the offerors with asterisks. The largest total composite score possible without preferences applied is 4,000.

Offeror	Total Composite Score
Accounting Consulting Group	3955.6*
Moss Adams	3675.0
REDW	4117.3*

The committee recommended the award of contract to REDW as that company had 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:

4/17/14
Mark S. Sanchez Date
Executive Director

Recommended:

4/17/14
Stan Allred Date
Chief Financial Officer

Attachments: Composite Score Sheet

Original: Thomas Courtin, Senior Buyer
Copy: Lorraine Nunez, Purchasing Officer
File: P2014000053

P2014000053

EVALUATOR	EVALUATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION FACTORS	OFFERORS		
			Acounting Consulting Group	Moss Adams	REDW
SA	The Offeror's general approach and plans to meet the requirements of the RFP; the organization and completeness of the proposal.	Up to 100	100	100	100
CW			100	100	100
SL			80	80	85
HW			90	95	95
	SUB TOTAL		**370**	**375**	**380**
SA	The Offeror's detailed plans to meet the objectives of each task, activity, etc. on the required schedule.	Up to 150	150	150	150
CW			150	150	150
SL			130	120	130
HW			145	140	150
	SUB TOTAL		**575**	**560**	**580**
SA	Experience and qualifications of the Offeror and personnel as shown in the documentation submitted in response to Part 2.	Up to 150	140	140	150
CW			140	140	150
SL			120	130	135
HW			130	150	150
	SUB TOTAL		**530**	**560**	**585**
SA	Adequacy of proposed project management and resources to be utilized by the Offeror.	Up to 100	100	100	100
CW			100	100	100
SL			85	80	85
HW			90	95	100
	SUB TOTAL		**375**	**375**	**385**
SA	The Offeror's past performance on projects of similar scope and size.	Up to 150	130	120	145
CW			130	120	140
SL			130	130	140
HW			135	130	150
	SUB TOTAL		**525**	**500**	**575**
SA	The overall ability of the Offeror, as judged by the evaluation committee, to successfully complete the project within the proposed schedule. This judgment will be based upon factors such as the project management plan and availability of staff and resources.	Up to 150	**130**	**125**	**145**
CW			**120**	**120**	**140**
SL			**130**	**120**	**135**
HW			**145**	**140**	**150**
	SUB TOTAL		**525**	**505**	**570**
	SUB TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE		**2900**	**2875**	**3075**
SA	Cost Proposal – The costs proposed by the Contractor as described in Section 2.2 of this RFP to perform the tasks listed in Part3, Scope of Services. The evaluation of this section will occur after the technical evaluation, based on a cost/price analysis.	Up to 200	174	200	167
CW			174	200	167
SL			174	200	167
HW			174	200	167
	SUB TOTAL		**696**	**800**	**668**
	SUB TOTAL COMPOSITE SCORE	**Up to 4000**	**3596**	**3675**	**3743**
	5% LOCAL BUSINESS PREFERENCE		179.8	0.0	187.2
	5% NM RESIDENT BUSINESS		179.8	0.0	187.2
	5% SMALL BUSINESS PREFERENCE		0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL COMPOSITE SCORE		**3955.6**	**3675.0**	**4117.3**