

June 9, 2006

To: John M. Lamerato, Acting City Manager

From: Jeanette Bennett, Purchasing Director  
Cindy Stewart, Community Affairs Director

Subject: **Agenda Item:** Standard Purchasing Resolution 8 – Best Value Award  
Photographic Services

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

On May 17, 2006, two (2) proposals were opened for a three-year contract with an option to renew for three additional years to provide Photographic Services. It is respectfully recommended that a contract be awarded to **Laura Freeman Photography** of Dearborn, MI, the bidder providing the best value with a final weighted score of 88, at an estimated cost of \$24,070.00 per year, which included insurance. If approved by Council, this proposal shall be awarded to the recommended bidder contingent upon submission of proper proposal and contract documents, including insurance certificates and all other specified requirements.

Although Laura Freeman is the lowest total bidder, price is just one component in the “Best Value” approach to a Request for Proposal process. The award recommendation was based upon the vendor offering the best combination of a variety of factors, and not simply the lowest bidder meeting certain minimal requirements. A best value approach addresses ability, experience, and quality issues leading to a successful contract and reduction in risk of poor service for high profile photographic work for such projects as informational brochures, the Website, City Calendar/Annual Report and *Troy Today*.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

After completing the evaluation process, Laura Freeman Photography received the highest recommendations from the committee. In an effort to achieve the most positive image for our City publications and personnel working in the field, and supply the best service, proper quality at the right price; a best value approach was used to evaluate and award the contract.

Laura Freeman’s attributes include being reliable, prompt, professional, personable and effective in coaching subjects to achieve quality photos of people at events and in portraits. She is attentive to image content detail, flexible and willing to meet deadlines with or without extensive notice. All her equipment is in excellent operating condition. She is excellent in photographing a wide range of subject matter including but not limited to road construction, landscape, candid shots of people at events and activities, portrait, architecture, workplace activities and varied lighting conditions. She is able to work independently on multi-location assignments throughout the City. She has never disappointed our demands for deadlines, quality photography, delivery of prints, challenging multi-location requests. Laura has a full understanding of the multiple

June 9, 2006

To: John M. Lamerato, Acting City Manager  
Re: Bid Award – Photographic Services

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION** - continued

purposes for which photos are used (website, city calendar, quarterly newsletter, program and departmental brochures, financial reports, City facility artwork, news releases, etc.)

The effective date of the contract will be July 1, 2006, or upon City Council approval whichever is later, through June 30, 2009, with the option to renew the contract for an additional three (3) years.

**SELECTION PROCESS**

The Request for Proposal (RFP) documents were available from the City of Troy Purchasing department or through the Michigan Intergovernmental Trade Network (MITN) e-procurement website at [www.mitn.info](http://www.mitn.info).

The selection of the Photographic Services provider was based upon mandatory and weighted criteria including but not limited to compliance with proposal requirements, photographic samples, and price. Initially, if a bidder successfully passed all the mandatory requirements, the evaluation committee consisting of three City staff members evaluated the remaining bidders using a rating tool to review the photographic samples on a 100-point scoring scale. Prices were converted to a rating based upon one of the pricing tools that is acceptable to the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing. The equation used and the calculations are available in the Executive Summary attached. The final composite score was determined as follows—

50% Price  
40% Sample Photos Score  
10% Other  
  
100% = Total Average Weighted Score

**BUDGET**

Funds are available from the operating budget in the Community Affairs Department.

52 Vendors Notified via the MITN System  
33 Notices Distributed by Mail and E-mail  
2 Proposals Received

CITY OF TROY  
 TABULATION  
 PHOTOGRAPHIC SERVICES

Opening Date -- 5/17/06  
 Date Prepared -- 5/26/06

FIRM NAME:

|    |                         |                           |
|----|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| ** | <b>Laura K. Freeman</b> | Brendan Ross Photographer |
|    | <b>Photography</b>      | LLC                       |
|    |                         |                           |
|    |                         |                           |

**PROPOSAL: TO PROVIDE THREE YEAR REQUIREMENTS OF PHOTOGRAPHIC SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF TROY WITH AN OPTION TO RENEW FOR THREE (3) ADDITIONAL YEARS**

| VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE (Yes or No) |           | Yes                       | Yes        |              |             |              |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| SAMPLES (Yes or No)              |           | Yes                       | Yes        |              |             |              |
| ITEM                             | Est. Qty. | Description               | Unit Price | Extension    | Unit Price  | Extension    |
| A.                               | 55 Each   | Half-Day Shoots           | \$ 225.00  | \$ 12,375.00 | \$ 650.00   | \$ 35,750.00 |
| B.                               | 10 Each   | Full-Day Shoots           | \$ 400.00  | \$ 4,000.00  | \$ 1,000.00 | \$ 10,000.00 |
| C.                               | 130 Rolls | Develop 36 Exposure       | \$ 10.00   | \$ 1,300.00  | \$ 25.00    | \$ 3,250.00  |
| D.                               | 130 Rolls | Roll of 4 x 6 reprints    | \$ 30.00   | \$ 3,900.00  | \$ 14.50    | \$ 1,885.00  |
| E.                               | 120 Each  | 5 x 7 Enlargements        | \$ 6.00    | \$ 720.00    | \$ 1.50     | \$ 180.00    |
| F.                               | 30 Each   | 8 x 10 Enlargements       | \$ 10.00   | \$ 300.00    | \$ 7.50     | \$ 225.00    |
| G.                               | 5 Each    | 11 x 14 Enlargements      | \$ 25.00   | \$ 125.00    | \$ 15.00    | \$ 75.00     |
| H.                               | 5 Each    | 16 x 20 Enlargements      | \$ 40.00   | \$ 200.00    | \$ 28.50    | \$ 142.50    |
| I.                               | 6 Each    | Albums per Specifications | \$ 25.00   | \$ 150.00    | \$ 55.00    | \$ 330.00    |
| ESTIMATED GRAND TOTAL            |           |                           | **         | \$ 23,070.00 |             | \$ 51,837.50 |
| INSURANCE: Can Meet              |           |                           |            |              | XX          |              |
| Cannot Meet                      |           |                           | XX         | +\$1,000.00  |             |              |
| DELIVERY Can meet schedule       |           |                           | XX         |              | XX          |              |
| Cannot meet but offers           |           |                           |            |              |             |              |
| TERMS:                           |           |                           | Blank      |              | Blank       |              |
| EXCEPTIONS:                      |           |                           | Blank      |              | Blank       |              |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Y or N          |           |                           | Yes        |              | Yes         |              |

\*\* DENOTES BEST VALUE PROPOSAL

ATTEST:  
 Laura Campbell  
 Susan Davis  
 Linda Bockstanz

Jeanette Bennett  
 Purchasing Director



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY PHOTOGRAPHIC SERVICES

### STATISTICS:

- ◆ 52 Vendors notified via the MITN System
- ◆ 33 Notices were distributed by mail and e-mail to prospective bidders
- ◆ 2 responses were received
- ◆ Laura McGuire was the most qualified bidder by receiving the highest weighted score

**The following bidders submitted a proposal and received the indicated final scores:**

| COMPANY                       | SCORE |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Laura McGuire                 | 88    |
| Brendan Ross Photographer LLC | 19.5  |

Attachments:

Weighted Final Scoring Including "Sample" Photo and Price Scoring  
Evaluation Process

## WEIGHTED FINAL SCORING PHOTOGRAPHIC SERVICES

### Final Score Calculation:

**50% x Price Score**  
**40% x Sample Photo Score**  
**10% x Other Score**

**100% Final Weighted Score**

\* In order to equate the price to the weighted evaluation process scoring, the prices had to be converted into a score with the base of 100

### SAMPLE PHOTO SCORE:

| Raters:                             | 1   | 2   | 3  | AVERAGE    |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|------------|
| Vendors:                            |     |     |    |            |
| 1. Laura McGuire                    | 100 | 100 | 88 | 96         |
| 2. Brendan Ross<br>Photographer LLC | 68  | 64  | 68 | 66.67 = 67 |

### PRICING SCORES

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Vendors:                            | FORMULA: $[1 - (\text{Proposal price} - \text{low price}) / \text{low price}] \times \text{available points}$ |
| 1. Laura McGuire                    | $[1 - (24,070 - 24,070) / 24,070 = 0 / 24,070 = 0] 1.0 \times 100 = 100$                                      |
| 2. Brendan Ross<br>Photographer LLC | $[1 - (51,837.50 - 24,070) / 24,070 = -1.15] = -0.15 \times 100 = -15$  |

### FINAL WEIGHTED SCORE:

| VENDORS:                      | Laura McGuire        | Brendan Ross<br>Photographer LLC |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Score                         |                      |                                  |
| PRICE SCORE: (x .50) =        | 100 x .50 = 50       | -15 x .50 = -7.5                 |
| SAMPLE PHOTO SCORE: (x .40) = | 96 x .40 = 38.4 = 38 | 67 x .40 = 26.8 = 27             |
| OTHER: (x .10) =              | N.A.                 | N.A.                             |
| Final Score:                  | 88**                 | 19.5                             |

Note: Raters did not assess "Other" points

\*\* HIGHEST RATED VENDOR – RECOMMENDED AWARD



## SELECTION PROCESS

### CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The identified City Committee will review the proposals. The City of Troy reserves the right to award this proposal to the company considered the most qualified based upon a combination of factors including but not limited to the following:

- A. Compliance with qualifications criteria
- B. Completeness of the proposal
- C. Financial strength of the photographer
- D. Correlation of the proposals submitted to the needs of the City of Troy
- E. Any other factors which may be deemed to be in the City's best interest
- F. Evaluation Process

#### Phase 1: Qualifications Evaluation.

Bidders will be required to meet minimum established criteria in order to go to the second phase of the process. (Evaluation Sheet Proposal)

#### Phase 2: Sample Evaluation Process.

- o The City Committee will use a weighted scoring sheet to evaluate the required submitted samples.
- o Each Committee Member will calculate a weighted score.
- o The scores of the three Committee Members will be averaged into one score for each bidder for this phase of the process.

#### Phase 3: Price

Points for price will be calculated as follows:

##### **FORMULA:**

$$[1 - (\text{Proposal price} - \text{low price}) / \text{low price}] \times \text{available points}$$

#### Phase 4: Other

Proposals may be assessed "Other" points for items not specified, but for which the Evaluation Committee deems as outstanding.

#### Phase 5: Final Scoring and Selection

The highest final weighted scored will be the photographer recommended to the Troy City Council for Award.

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 50% x Price Score (100 pt. Base)         | =                    |
| 40% x Sample Photos Score (100 pt. Base) | =                    |
| <u>10% x Other (100 pt. Base)</u>        | =                    |
| 100%                                     | Final Weighted Score |

Note: The City of Troy reserves the right to change the order or eliminate an evaluation phase if deemed in the City's best interest to do so.