

Item 11



Date: December 4, 2013

To: GCT Board of Directors

From: Marlena Kohler *MK*
Purchasing Manager/ DBE Officer

RE: CONSIDER APPROVAL OF A CONTRACT WITH U.S. SECURITY FOR UNIFORMED SECURITY SERVICES

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Request for Proposal (RFP) for Uniformed Security Services at the Gold Coast Transit facility was issued on May 20, 2013. The services are for a one-year period commencing January 1, 2014 and included options for two additional one-year periods. The RFP was posted on our website and was sent to several vendors. A non-mandatory pre-proposal conference was attended by six (6) firms. One (1) non-responsive and seven (7) responsive proposals were received.

The RFP required proposals to include technical input as well as prices. The technical evaluation criteria covered client references, general information and personnel hiring criteria. Prices for the entire three-year period for unarmed guards for both non-holidays and holidays were included in the evaluation.

Rob Lurie, Director of Fleet and Facilities, Juan De La Rosa, Maintenance Administration Supervisor and Tanya Hawk, Buyer conducted the technical evaluation. A price analysis of the proposed rates was also conducted. Evaluation scoring was based on a maximum of 100 points with 60 points allocated to price and 40 points allocated to technical.

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Board of Directors authorize contract award to U.S. Security Associates for, Uniformed Security Services for a one-year period starting January 1, 2014 with two one-year options for a total price of \$152,907.12 , if both options are exercised, plus an Authorized amount of \$20,000 to cover possible use of overtime and armed guards.

II. BACKGROUND

a. Basic Requirements and History. GCT has contracted for the services of unarmed uniformed security personnel for several years with service provided 365 days per year. GCT operates seven days a week except for six holidays a year. Non-holiday guard service covers from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM and holiday coverage is 24 hours. The guard is required to monitor a closed circuit television system, tour the facility, be alert to unusual or safety conditions and report to staff as needed.

b. Technical Evaluation. Evaluation of technical proposals was more subjective than the price evaluation in that it required assessment of the written technical proposals and verbal clarification from proposers were considered necessary. In addition contact was made with current clients of each proposer to better determine how well they perform. Scoring was based on a total of 40 points allocated among three categories which proposers were advised were listed in the relative order of importance for the evaluation process. Following is a list of the categories and the maximum point value of each used in the evaluation.

- Client References – 20
- General Information – 10
- Personnel Hiring Criteria – 10
- Price of Service -60

c. Price Evaluation. Under the current contract with G4S Wackenhut, the hourly non-holiday rate for an unarmed guard is \$15.62 and the holiday rate is \$21.87 whereas the rates proposed by U.S. Security Associates for the first year of the new contract period are \$16.41 for non-holidays and \$23.80 for holidays. U.S. Security only goes up by \$86.88 per second year, and G4S goes up \$1,506.64 per the second year.

The RFP allowed different rates to be proposed for each year so prices will escalate to higher amount in future years. Pricing for all three years will be included in the contract for both unarmed and armed guards to cover non-holidays and holidays and overtime situations. However, since the final two years are only applicable at GCT's option, staff will ensure proposed pricing for those years are still fair and reasonable prior to exercising the options. If it is not, a new solicitation can be issued to seek competition for a follow-on contract.

Evaluation of prices took into consideration the total cost to GCT based on the number of regular time non-holiday and holiday hours for the entire three-year period. The numbers of hours were multiplied by the proposed hourly rates to determine annual prices which were summarized for the three-year period for each proposal. The scoring system for the price evaluation divided the three-year total price for each proposal into the total price for the lowest proposal and multiplied the result by the 60 points allocated to price as part of the overall evaluation.

Although rates for armed guards were obtained; they were not used in the evaluation because prices were requested on a contingency basis only. GCT has not required the use of armed guards for several years.

d. Overall Evaluation Results. The following table indicates the overall results of price and technical evaluations:

<u>Proposer</u>	<u>Total Price (Three Years)</u>	<u>Technical Score</u>	<u>Price Score</u>	<u>Total Score</u>
G4SWackenhut	\$157,335.12	69.6	48.85	118.4
U.S. Security	\$152,907.12	68.0	50.27	118.3
Access Control Security	\$136,767.60	54.5	56.20	110.7
CSI Contact Security, Inc.	\$149,815.36	61.8	51.31	113.1
Ceed Security Services, Inc.	\$128,109.44	56.2	60.00	116.2
Guard-System	\$140,896.80	56.0	54.55	110.6
Nu-Way Security	\$148,734.72	68.5	51.68	120.2

Based on the Evaluation Results the following companies were selected to be interviewed.

- U.S. Security
- Nu-Way
- G4S Wackenhut

Scoring was based on a total of 90 points allocated among six (6) evaluation questions worth 5 points each.

The following table indicates the overall results of the interviews and in conjunction with the Evaluation Results:

<u>Proposer</u>	<u>Total Evaluation Score</u>
U.S. Security	73.5
Nu-Way	54.0
G4S Wackenhut	62.5

U.S. Security received the highest overall score and their proposal is considered fair and reasonable.

U.S. Security is considered a responsible firm. It is not listed in the Excluded Parties List System for Award Management (SAM) maintained by the Federal government, and it submitted financial data which indicates it is an on-going business financially able to handle this project. The firm maintains an office in Ventura and is the current contractor for other clients in Ventura County including the County of Ventura General Service Agency (GSA) and Ventura County Medical Center.

e. Funds/Savings/Budget. Based on the results of the competition, there are some savings the first year of the new contract compared to the current contract. Adequate funds are budgeted for the first contract year and are anticipated to be available for option years.

III. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GCT requires the contract services of an unarmed guard at specified times. The recent solicitation for those services resulted in adequate competition among three (3) firms. After evaluation of price and technical proposals, the proposer with the highest overall score was

U.S. Security, It is a responsible firm whose proposed price is determined to be fair and reasonable.

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Board of Directors authorize contract award to U.S. Security for Uniformed Security Services for a one-year period starting January 1, 2014 with two one-year options for a total price of \$152,907.12, if both options are exercised, plus an authorized amount of \$20,000 to cover possible use of overtime and armed guards.

General Manager Concurrence: Steven P Brown