

---

4

## 5 SECTION 5 PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

### 6 5.1 GENERAL

7 Proposals submitted by the Proposers will be judged through the evaluation  
8 process described in this section. The selected Proposers will be chosen based on the  
9 outcome of this evaluation.

10 The following evaluation and selection process will be used:

11 ■ In order to be evaluated, proposals must comply with the following:

12 □ Proposers must have signed and submitted the Process Integrity  
13 Guidelines by March 31, 2000.

14 □ Proposers must have attended the Pre-Proposal meeting.

15 □ Proposals must be received by the submission date.

16 □ Proposals must be submitted in conformance with Section 4 of the RFP  
17 and all forms in Section 7 of the RFP must be completed in full.

18 □ Proposer's work plan must clearly demonstrate the ability to achieve the  
19 minimum diversion requirement specified for each Service Type. If the work plan is deficient in  
20 this area, a Proposer's proposal will be deemed non- responsive.

21 ■ All proposals received by the submission date as indicated in this RFP will be  
22 catalogued and distributed for detailed evaluation. Proposers may be asked to attend personal  
23 interviews to discuss their proposals.

24 ■ Based on the detailed evaluation, the proposals will be ranked in order of  
25 preference and the highest ranked Proposers will be selected to negotiate and enter into an  
26 Agreement for the requested services.

27 ■ If for any reason during the course of negotiations with the selected Proposer, the  
28 City determines that a reasonable Agreement cannot be negotiated, the City reserves the right  
29 to suspend negotiations with the selected Proposer, contact the next ranked Proposer and begin  
30 negotiations for the purpose of signing an Agreement with that selected Proposer. The City  
31 further reserves the right to enter into simultaneous negotiations with two or more Proposers if  
32 reasonably competitive proposals are received for the same Service Types and Service  
33 Districts.

### 34 5.2 PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SELECTION METHODOLOGY

35 Proposal evaluation and Proposer selection will be based on an evaluation of the  
36 six criteria listed alphabetically as follows:

37 ■ Business Risk

- 38 ■ Comparative Assessment
- 39 ■ Cost Evaluation
- 40 ■ Experience
- 41 ■ Strength of Operations
- 42 ■ Technical Capability

43 Final selection and Agreement award will be made by the City Council.

44 The following subsections provide a brief discussion of the evaluation criteria.

45 **5.1.15.2.1 Business Risk**

46 Each proposal will be evaluated to assess the relative business risk associated  
47 with each proposed Proposer. Business risk evaluation criteria will include without limitation:

48 ■ Financing Capacity and Strength: The financing capacity and strength of the  
49 Proposer will be considered in the City's evaluation of proposals. Proposals should address  
50 Proposer's capacity and plans for responding to fluctuations in recyclable material markets, and  
51 for making needed start-up investments in equipment.

52 ■ Environmental Indemnification: The type and degree to which the Proposer is  
53 willing to provide indemnification to environmental liability (CERCLA, hazardous materials, etc.)  
54 will be considered in the City's evaluation.

55 **5.2.2 Comparative Assessment**

56 The comparative assessment will provide a relative measure of how the  
57 proposals compare to each other, based on the evaluation criteria described in this Section.

58 **5.1.35.2.3 Cost Evaluation**

59 The cost evaluation is intended to provide an equitable basis for cost comparison  
60 between proposals. All cost information to be used in this evaluation will be as stated in the  
61 proposal. The proposals will be reviewed to verify that the proposed costs are consistent with  
62 the activities described in the proposal and the Proposer's operations and maintenance plans.  
63 ***Proposers should note that while the cost evaluation is only one of several evaluation***  
64 ***elements, the City strongly seeks to reduce the cost to its customers for Collection***  
65 ***Services while improving the quality of service.***

66 **5.1.45.2.4 Experience**

67 The experience of each Proposer will be evaluated to determine the relative  
68 ability of each Proposer to implement the program elements described in this RFP and to attain  
69 the City objectives for solid waste management diversion. Experience evaluation criteria and  
70 areas of experience to be considered will include without limitation:

---

71           ■       Implementation and administration of complex street sweeping, solid waste,  
72 recyclable materials and yard trimming materials collection systems for single-family and multi-  
73 family households, including equipment selection and route design;

74           ■       Successful operation of residential solid waste programs that achieve high  
75 participation levels and diversion rates;

76           ■       Cost-effective processing and marketing of recyclable and yard trimming  
77 materials, with demonstrated success in attaining highest and best uses for such materials;

78           ■       Demonstrated expertise in implementing and maintaining customer service  
79 programs, including the development and use of performance measures and benchmarking;

80           ■       Previous experience in successfully designing and implementing transition plans,  
81 relevant to this RFP;

82           ■       Proposer's history as an employer;

83           ■       Proposer's labor relations history;

84           ■       Experience in designing, implementing, and operating public education and  
85 information programs that promote high participation and diversion; and

86           ■       Demonstrated expertise in designing and using data management systems to  
87 assure accurate data collection, analysis and reporting.

88           Each Proposer's experience will be evaluated based on the information provided  
89 in each proposal.

#### 90           **5.2.5 Strength of Operations**

91           Each Proposer will be evaluated in terms of demonstrated performance with  
92 regard to several operational considerations. The City is seeking to identify Proposers with  
93 demonstrated commitment to high performance and quality management. These  
94 considerations include, without limitation:

95           ■       Organizational Structure and Management: Proposals should include  
96 qualifications and structure of project management team, relationships between management  
97 team and corporate management, and internal controls;

98           ■       Environmental Stewardship: All environmental management policies and  
99 activities related to the proposed activities should be described, including conversion to  
100 alternative fuel vehicles, use of recycled products throughout operations, internal waste  
101 reduction and reuse protocol, water and resource conservation activities within facilities (design,  
102 construction and operation), and use of non-toxic products when possible. The Proposer's  
103 commitment to adhere to or exceed minimum voluntary standards, such as those of the  
104 California Compost Quality Council (CCQC), or the US Composting Council's Seal of Testing

---

105 Assurance will be assessed and considered by the City. Plans to adhere to these and similar  
106 guidelines should be outlined in the appropriate operational plans;

107 ■ Commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity;

108 ■ Working Condition Commitments;

109 ■ Commitments to labor peace and how the Proposer will protect against labor  
110 discord during the term of the Agreement;

111 ■ Public and Customer Communications (as set forth in the Public Education &  
112 Outreach and Customer Service Plans; and

113 ■ Commitment to Employee and Public Safety.

#### 114 **5.2.6 Technical Capability**

115 The purpose of the technical evaluation is to verify that the Proposer can meet  
116 the proposed performance specifications and criteria on a long-term basis. Technical evaluation  
117 criteria will include without limitation:

118 ■ Review of performance of services similar to those proposed by the Proposer;

119 ■ Review of the Proposer's detailed design and technical support data confirm the  
120 performance predictions as represented in the proposal;

121 ■ Overall soundness of the system design and integration of separate elements of  
122 the system;

123 ■ Demonstrated technical feasibility of equipment;

124 ■ Soundness of operations and equipment plans;

125 ■ Soundness of plan for transition to operations as described in proposal;

126 ■ Specifics of diversion plan(s) to achieve the respective minimum diversion rates  
127 as specified in this RFP; and

128 ■ Ability to meet implementation schedule.

#### 129 **5.3 FINAL SELECTION**

130 After evaluation of the submitted proposals, the City will develop a Qualified  
131 Proposers List, and the City may issue an Invitation to Interview. After the evaluation and the  
132 interview process is completed, City staff will recommend the top ranked Proposers to the City  
133 Council. City Council will then make the final Agreement awards.