MULTNOMAH COUNTY PURCHASING

Value Added

Procurement Number:

4000002428

Procurement Title:

Psychological and Psychiatric Services on a Continuing Basis

Award Date:

June 16, 2014

Procurement Analyst:

Sherry Taylor

Was this previously competed?

Value

What Purchasing Did

The Details

IMPROVED PROGRAM/ **PROCUREMENT** RELATIONSHIP

and talked about how to handle this procurement. Out of that meeting we decided to only open annually as opposed to twice yearly. We also talked about the proposal process and how onerous it was for the Psychologists and Therapists providing services and decided to use an application instead.

We met with department and program staff Because the main qualifications for the Psychologists and Therapists are covered by their licensing process, and because most are sole-source vendors without paid staff, we decided to go with an application process. Worked closely with program and department staff to come up with an application that would cover the pertinent program needs where the score was selfevident by which box(es) they checked.

EASE OF **SCORING** Rather than have subjective criteria which requires a formal evaluation panel, the applicant checked boxes which were worth Contracts Specialist and myself. This a specific amount of points. After adding their scores they were required to make 70% to qualify to move to the allocation process.

Verification of scoring was done by both Program Managers, the Department process, for 7 applicants took less than an hour. The Program especially appreciated not having to form an evaluation panel and the simplicity of the process.

Background:

Prior RFPQ closed twice a year and requested a proposal from vendors.

Outcome(s):

Simplified process.

Other Notable Factors:

Prepared by: Sherry Taylor

6/27/14 Date:

POTENTIAL 6HICS EVALS

* & PEOPLE @ 39.00/HZ

\$120

NOT CASH RELEASING

Procurement Value Summary

Procurement Title Procurement Number Award Date (or cancelled date) Lead Procurment Analyst

If this was cancelled, state the reason Was this Previously Competed?

Multnomah Building Water Repellent, Sealant and Brick Repair Cost Savings

4000002418 5/5/2014

Paula Rickman

No

D & R Masonry First Cascade Corp Engineer's Estimate

Average of Non-Awarded Bids/Proposals

Savings Percent Savings

Savings Period

\$618,727 \$52,227

\$566,500

\$639,681

\$650,000

.8%

One-Time

Value

What Purchasing Did

The Details

Extra upfront attention to process requirements results in award to low bidder

process and forms submission requirements.

Proactively oversaw the Prequalification process via phone calls and emails prior to deadline. Extra emphasis at pre-bid Gave extra attention to Prequalification meeting to prequal and the fact that the contractors needed to submit State of OR Subcontractors Disclosure form and Multco's Form 1 even if not hiring subcontractors. The low bidder isn't using any subs and turned in forms timely.

Value- What was the value this provided (the headline)

What Purchasing Did- Describe in 1-3 sentences that my mom would understand (the elevator speech) The Details- citation to include enough information that I could follow up to check on your claim (prove it)

KEY IDEA: What would it have been had you not done what you did?

Areas where Purchasing adds value

- > Improvements in purchasing processes
- includes process improvements, legal compliance activities, and risk management activities
- > Improved product quality and service for internal customers
 - includes tools and templates, efforts to implement social and economic policy
- > Closer and more cooperative relationships with suppliers
- > Cost Reductions

MULTNOMAH COUNTY PURCHASING

Value Added

Procurement Number:

4000002078

Procurement Title:

Secure Transport for Mental Health Clients for Multnomah and Marion

County

Award Date:

Multnomah County: 12/4/13

Marion County: 2/12/14

Procurement Analyst:

Sherry Taylor

Was this previously competed? Not as a formal procurement and not as a cooperative

Value

What Purchasing Did

The Details

IMPROVED INTER-AGENCY RELATIONSHIP

Went down to Marion County and met with Found that the two counties provide some a team from their Purchasing and Program similar services and established a staff to discuss their needs and come up with a mutual solution through a joint cooperative procurement with Multnomah County as the lead agency.

relationship so we can cooperate on future projects.

IMPROVED PROGRAM/ **PROCUREMENT** RELATIONSHIP

Because this procurement had to go out twice, we were able to sit down with the program staff (from Multnomah County) and candidly go over our lessons learned and bring those lessons to the re-do in such a fashion that we had a much stronger procurement and a much more defendable selection process.

Purchasing was not involved in the planning process the first time around. As the evaluations took place it was easy to see that we were not going to be able to make a sound, defensable selection without protest. Program staff debriefed the process and discussed what to do better going forward, including getting more involvement from Marion County program staff and a better method to evaluate pricing.

IMPROVED VENDOR RELATIONSHIP

Advocated for and held a pre-proposal meeting in order to meet directly with interested parties and to get their feedback needs of both Counties and better serve and questions.

Because we held this conference we were able to gain a better understanding of the Mental Health clients.

Background:

These services had historically been procured using an intermediate process. Marion County expressed a desire to do a joint procurement for similar services. The same vendors had contracts for many years without a strong competitive process.

Outcome(s):

Improved direct client services for Mental Health clients in Marion and Multnomah Counties.

Other Notable Factors:

Prepared by: Sherry Taylor

Date: 2/13/14

Logged

MULTNOMAH COUNTY PURCHASING

Value Added

4000001535 Bearing Analysis, Repair and Maintenance

Value ₋	What Purchasing Did	The Details
TRAINING	Worked with the department on the best procurement method. Department wanted to add BAFO as a step.	Made department aware of the additional time needed for BAFO step and would it gain any additional value if we were to utilize BAFO?
TRAINING	Worked with vendors on how to	
1 1 72 (11 411 4	format a proposal	their proposal so they could be more successful

Background:

Program had been using intermediate procurements for this type of service. Since they would be exceeding the intermediate limit, they determined that they should use a formal procurement process.

Outcome(s):

The vendors of this service are not familiar with how to write a proposal submission. More outreach with training on how to write proposals may be of benefit for future RFPs.

Other	Votable Fa	ctors:
\mathcal{O}_{U}	volubio i a	CiOIO.

Prepared by: Kathi Braeme-Burr	
Date: 9/12/13	

Date:	9/12/13			
			_	
Award D	ate	8/27/2013		•

Lead Procurement Analyst	Nathi braeme-bun	

Was this Previously Competed?	no	

Bidder 1	\$ 2549.50
Bidder 2 (low bid)	\$ 2375.00

Savings Period	One-Time

100,000 Jupi.

Procurement Value Summary

Procurement Title

Energy Savings Performance Contracting

Procurement Number

4-1150

Award Date

2/14/2013

Lead Procurment Analyst

Gerald Jelusich

Was this Previously Competed?

No

AmerescoQuantum (Awd) \$47,304 Johnson Controls \$68,000 McKinstry \$65,435

Siemens

\$61,200

Average of JC, M, S

\$64,878

Difference between Bidder 1 and

Avg of Non-Awarded Bids

\$17,574

Savings Period

One-Time

5 Years

Other

64,878 47304

77 F 411

NOTE: AQ selected on basis of points earned, not sole cost.