

PURCHASING VIEW



CITY OF MADISON • FINANCE DEPARTMENT • PURCHASING SERVICES

Non-Competitive Selection Request

Date: 03/13/2019

Requisition Number: (8 characters)

Requestor Name: Janet Schmidt

Requestor Phone Number: 608-261-9688

Requestor Email: jschmidt@cityofmadison.com

Fund: 2120 STORMWATER UTILITY

Agency: 40 ENGINEERING

- Major:
- ☐ 53*** Supplies/Goods
 - ☐ 541** Utilities
 - ☐ 542** Building/Facility Maintenance/Repair
 - ☐ 543** Software/Equipment Maintenance/Repair
 - ☐ 544** Public Works Maintenance/Repair
 - ☐ 545** Training/HR-Related Services
 - ☒ 546** Consulting/Professional Services
 - ☐ 548** Grants/Loans/Insurance/Other Services

Total Purchase Amount: \$300,000.00

Vendor Name: USGS

Product/Service Description: Install and manage rain gauge and flow monitoring stations in conjunction ...

- ☐ **\$50,000 and UNDER**
This form will be sent to the Purchasing Supervisor for review.
- ☒ **OVER \$50,000**
Complete this form and draft a resolution using the sample resolutions provided by the City Attorney to your Budget Analyst. **Your resolution will not be added to the Finance Committee agenda without this form.**

Check the box(es) for the exception criteria you feel are applicable:

- ☐ 1. Public exigency (emergency) will not permit the delay incident to advertising or other competitive processes.
 - ☐ 2. The services or goods required are available from only one person or firm (i.e., **true** sole source).
 - ☐ 3. The services are for professional services to be provided by attorneys.
 - ☐ 4. The services are to be rendered by a university, college, or other educational institution.
 - ☐ 5. No acceptable bids have been received after formal advertising.
 - ☐ 6. Service fees are established by law or professional code.
 - ☒ 7. A particular consultant has provided services to the City on a similar or continuing project in the recent past, and it would be economical to the City on the basis of time and money to retain the same consultant.
 - ☐ 8. Otherwise authorized by law, rule, resolution, or regulation. Explain:
- ☐ If procurement is being paid with Federal or State grant funds, the vendor was identified by name in the approved Grant Application. (OPTIONAL)

REASON FOR REQUEST**WHY A COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS CANNOT BE USED:**

Provide **detailed** explanation below. For a true sole source, provide all information to explain why this product or service can only be purchased from this vendor. For one-of-a-kind items not sold through distributors, explain the unique performance features of the product requested that are not available from any other product. For services, detail the unique qualifications this vendor possesses, or other reason(s) that meet the criteria selected above. Identify specific, measurable factors and qualifications.

The USGS is a federal entity that has performed similar work for the City in the past and most recently and notably they have installed monitoring stations for the City's leaf pilot study. The USGS also has rain gauge and flow monitoring equipment in other locations across the city for their own use and being able to partner with them will result in a cost savings to the City. Some of the existing monitoring locations are not currently active however the equipment is still in place and they would only need to be reactivated by the USGS in order to have them up and running fully, thus saving time and money that would have otherwise needed to be spent on consultants purchasing and setting up equipment for use during the flood studies. The USGS has other equipment on hand that can be utilized for use with the City's data collection efforts, which will also save the City the cost of purchasing the equipment new. The USGS are experts at this type of work and will be able to effectively monitor and manage expensive equipment and provide the necessary level of accuracy for the data to the City for use in our watershed and flood studies.

COMMENTS REGARDING PURCHASES OVER \$50,000

The City of Madison has spent \$385,505 with the US Geological Survey since 2015. Of this, \$383,825 was spent on projects where the vendor was selected through Public Works processes. The remaining \$1,680 was for smaller purchases under \$5,000, which were not subject to competitive selection policies.

Date: