

Central Utah Water Conservancy District
RFP for Bond Counsel Services
Summary of Scores Awarded, Justification Statement, and Applicable Cost-Benefit Analysis

The Board of Trustees awarded a contract for bond counsel services to Chapman Cutler LLP "Chapman" on June 19, 2019.

Evaluation committee recommendation: Chapman Cutler LLP
Score received: 97.90 Points

Summary of Scores Awarded:
Offeror Firm A – 97.90 Points
Offeror Firm B – 86.75 Points

Justification Statement:

Criterion 1 – Demonstrated qualifications and ability to provide bond counsel services: Chapman scored 38.5 out of 40 points for this category.

- Chapman's qualifications, expertise, and support team were rated "superior" by all members of the evaluation team.
- All members of the support team proposed by Chapman have more than 18 years of experience.
- The demonstrated qualifications, expertise of Chapman's support team will be an advantage to the District.

Criterion 2 – Responsiveness of work plan: Chapman received 9.5 out of 10 possible points for this section.

- Chapman delivered a well written and concise proposal that showed an understanding of the key issues surrounding the District, clearly defined deliverables, and clearly defined the ability of Chapman to meet the demands of bond counsel services. Chapman was rated "above average" or "superior" by all members of the evaluation team.
- The demonstrated past performance of Chapman will be an advantage to the District.

Criterion 3 – Past performance: Chapman received 40 out of 40 possible points for this section.

- Chapman was rated as having "superior" experience with public water districts of similar size and situation to the District, including with state agencies managing federal water projects.
- Chapman also has no conflicts of interest or perceived conflicts.
- The demonstrated past performance and lack of conflicts of interest of Chapman will be an advantage to the District.

Note - Before cost proposals were opened, the committee noted that the difference between Chapman's cumulative score for criteria 1 through 3 and Firm B's cumulative score for criteria 1-3 exceeded the maximum points possible from criterion 4. It was determined by the committee to open the cost proposals to fully evaluate the proposals.

Criterion 4 – Cost proposal: Chapmans received 9.9 out of 10 maximum points possible on its cost proposal.

- The RFP requested costs of bond counsel services for multiple potential bond sizes and types. Other scope-basis, bond-counsel services, hourly rates were also requested for future reference if needed. The procurement officer and the committee used select costs (combined bond/disclosure counsel and additional expense) from the table of potential bond sizes to evaluate costs. The costs evaluated were based on budgeted bond issuances for each type of bond. The difference between Chapman and the lowest cost proposal received was only \$400 or 1%. Since Chapman's proposal was not more than the greater of 5% or \$10,000 higher than that of the lowest cost proposal received, an informal cost-benefit analysis did not need to be performed per Utah Code 63G-6a-708. Based on the analysis above, it was determined by the committee that it is in the District's best interest to award the contract to Chapman since they provide the best overall value to District.

Cost-Benefit Analysis:

Not applicable- see criterion 4 above.