



3

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

CITY HALL
ROOM 207
915 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA
95814-2673

916-449-5283

ADMINISTRATION
916-449-8747

September 4, 1990

Transportation and Community Development Committee
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: **ALTERNATIVE TO DIRECT HAUL PROPOSERS' SELECTION EVALUATION
CRITERIA**

SUMMARY

This report recommends that the Transportation and Community Development Committee accept the evaluation criteria established by the Committee to select proponents to the Alternative to Direct Haul of Municipal Solid Waste and recommend its approval by the City Council.

BACKGROUND

The attached report was presented to the City Council on August 21, 1990. The City Council forwarded the report to the Transportation and Community Development Committee for its review and approval.

FINANCIAL DATA

See the attached City Council report dated August 21, 1990.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

See the attached City Council report dated August 21, 1990.

MBE/WBE


The MBE/WBE guidelines do not apply to this recommendation.

September 4, 1990
Transportation and Community Development Committee


RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Transportation and Community Development Committee recommend that the City Council approve the Selection Committee's evaluation criteria for selection of an Alternative to Direct Haul of Municipal Solid Waste.


Respectfully submitted,


Reginald Young
Deputy Director of Public Works

Recommendation Approved:


David Martinez
Deputy City Manager

Approved:


Melvin H. Johnson
Director of Public Works

Contact Person
Reginald Young, Deputy Director of Public Works
449-5283

September 4, 1990
All Districts

EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROPOSERS TO ALTERNATIVE TO DIRECT HAUL

OVERALL EVALUATION

1.	RFQ Response	10%
2.	RFP Response	70%
3.	Proposers Interview	10%
4.	Site Visit	10%

RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA

70%

Criteria

Weight

1.	Performance in Material Recovery	22
	(a) Contribution Toward AB 939 (16 Points)	
	(b) Landfill Avoidance (6 Points)	
2.	Costs	20
	(a) Tipping Fee (17 Points)	
	(b) Capital Costs (3 Points)	
3.	Flexibility/Expansion	18
4.	Experience	10
5.	Risks and Guarantees	10
6.	Markets	8
7.	Environmental Mitigation	8
8.	Financial Strength	<u>4</u>
		100



3.26

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

CITY OF SACRAMENTO
CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

CITY HALL
ROOM 207
915 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA
95814-2673

916-449-5283

ADMINISTRATION
916-449-8747

August 21, 1990

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: ALTERNATIVE TO DIRECT HAUL PROPOSERS' SELECTION EVALUATION
CRITERIA

SUMMARY

This report recommends that the City Council approve the evaluation criteria established by the Committee to select proponents to the Alternative to Direct Haul of Municipal Solid Waste.

BACKGROUND

On April 17, 1990, the City Council informed staff that the Alternative to Direct Haul's Selection Committee, in making its ultimate selection among proposals that meet the criteria (the six firms invited to submit proposals), will give weight to the following factors: tipping fee, financial risk, performance in recovery of recyclables, landfill avoidance, and environmental impacts, as well as the ability to support the City's efforts to meet its AB 939 requirements.

In response to the Council's direction, the Selection Committee has established proponent selection evaluation criteria as follows:

RFQ Response (Previously Rated)	10%
Cost Proposal Response	70%
Proponents Interview	10%
Site Visit	10%

The Selection Committee has also prescribed relative importance to elements of the proposal evaluation as shown on attached Table 1.

FINANCIAL DATA

This report has no financial impact.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Selection Committee's actions are consistent with the direction of the City Council.


MBE/WBE EFFORTS

None.


RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council approve the evaluation criteria for selection of an Alternative to Direct Haul of Municipal Solid Waste, as shown on attached Table 1.


Respectfully submitted,


Reginald Young
Deputy Director of Public Works

Recommendation Approved:


Walter J. Slipe
City Manager

Approved:


Melvin H. Johnson
Director of Public Works

Contact Person

Reginald Young, Deputy Director of Public Works
449-5283

August 21, 1990
All Districts

EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROPOSERS TO ALTERNATIVE TO DIRECT HAUL

OVERALL EVALUATION

1.	RFQ Response	10%
2.	RFP Response	70%
3.	Proposers Interview	10%
4.	Site Visit	10%

RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA

70%

Criteria

Weight

1.	Performance in Material Recovery	22
	(a) Contribution Toward AB 939 (16 Points)	
	(b) Landfill Avoidance (6 Points)	
2.	Costs	20
	(a) Tipping Fee (17 Points)	
	(b) Capital Costs (3 Points)	
3.	Flexibility/Expansion	18
4.	Experience	10
5.	Risks and Guarantees	10
6.	Markets	8
7.	Environmental Mitigation	8
8.	Financial Strength	<u>4</u>
		100