



District of Lantzville

Request for Proposals

Consultant or Contractor Opportunity – Bylaw Enforcement Services

Closing Date: 4:00 pm, Friday, January 3, 2025

The District requires the services of a qualified consultant or contractor with expertise in bylaw enforcement and conflict resolution for the provision of bylaw enforcement services within the District of Lantzville.

The services are proposed to start March 1, 2025, for 21 hours per week (between the hours of 7:00 am and 11:00 pm), except in emergencies or on occasions pre-authorized with the District or on an “on-call” basis. Flexibility is required for some weekend and evening coverage and special events. Regular scheduled meetings may be held during business hours. The Term of the contract is proposed for a two-year period, with the option to extend one-year post end of contract upon mutual agreement from both parties.

Scope of work: fulfill the purpose of enforcing the bylaws of the District of Lantzville, including responding to public enquiries; investigating and resolving complaints; enforcement actions (e.g. warning letters, tickets, court action); public education; maintaining related records; drafting reports and recommendations; liaising with District staff and other enforcement agencies; and miscellaneous other actions required to achieve bylaw enforcement. The District will provide limited materials (e.g. copies of bylaws, brochures, ticket books, ID, shirt, vehicle decal, PPE, and access to municipal facilities as appropriate). Mileage for vehicle use can be included in the submitted proposal. Liaising with other Departments and coordination with the Director of Planning is required.

Proposals will be evaluated on multiple factors including, but not limited to, education, price, and relevant/applicable experience. The District encourages bidders to include innovative creative ideas in their proposal. The successful proponent will be expected to enter into a contract with the District of Lantzville.

Submit your proposal (including general overview of your company and capability to perform the work required, personnel assigned to provide the services and their skills, abilities and knowledge of bylaw enforcement, examples of previous similar work, references, and estimate of fees and disbursements, and contact information) in a sealed envelope, quoting “Bylaw Enforcement Services”, **by 4:00 pm Friday, January 3, 2025** to the District’s Representative managing the Contract for the District:

George Robinson, Director of Planning and Community Services
District of Lantzville, PO Box 100, 7192 Lantzville Road, Lantzville, BC V0R 2H0

All inquiries relating to the RFP shall be directed to the District’s representative at grobinson@lantzville.ca.

This is a request for proposals only and will not give rise to a Contract. The District is free to negotiate with any of the proponents and that as a result of the negotiation process the District is not required to treat all proponents equally. This process is not a tendering process. No legal relations are intended to arise from the RFP process. The District is NOT contractually bound to any matters until such time as the District has negotiated a contract. The District’s is not responsible for costs on claims relating to the RFP process including the costs of preparation of the RFP document.

Proposals received after the Closing Date and Time for receipt of Proposals will be considered as “Late Proposals”. Late proposals may, in the sole discretion of the District, be evaluated by the District, or may be rejected on that basis by the District. The District reserves the right to accept or reject any and all proposals and to waive irregularities and informalities at its discretion, including acceptance of non-compliant proposals. By submitting a proposal, the Proponents waive any right to contest, in any proceedings or action, the right of the District to accept or reject any proposal in its sole and unfettered discretion. The District also has the right to negotiate with all Proponents, qualified or not, or to cancel this Request for Proposals or accept the proposal that is deemed most advantageous to the District if it is in the best interests of the District to do so. The District reserves the right to award this Proposal in whole or part and retains sole discretion not to award at all. The decision of the District shall be final.

RFP - EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Proposals are used to obtain submissions for specific works, services, solutions and equipment. Request for Proposals will be evaluated based on a variety of factors which are detailed in the RFP.

A minimum of two staff members will typically do the evaluation of the Request for Proposals. These employees will collaborate to complete a consensus rating. Occasionally, more than two evaluators may be used.

The evaluation will consider several key items, weigh them according to our interpretations of relevance, and then develop a total point structure for each. It is not the intent of this evaluation to remove subjectiveness from the evaluation process, but the intent is to guide those individuals reviewing the submissions, so they do not miss important criteria or give excessive weight to items of less importance.

Each Request for Proposal call may have different categories for evaluation and each may be weighted differently. Typically, the evaluation criteria used will be provided as part of any Request for Proposal call. The District also recognizes that evaluations that score within 5% of others may be essentially equivalent and therefore selections will be made with emphasis on key personnel, work plan, schedule and availability.

DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Key Personnel

The details and expertise of the Key Personnel will be evaluated as related to the scope of work. Subcontractors or other personnel other than the proponent may be permitted at the discretion of the District. Emphasis will be placed on personnel demonstrating similar experience, including abilities and knowledge of bylaw enforcement. This is to also include the following:

- a. Sub-consultants
- b. Assigned staff

2. Experience

Corporate experience should demonstrate the degree of involvement with similar projects. Local experience should indicate involvement with projects on Vancouver Island. The bidding firms' experience must demonstrate involvement with projects of similar scope, size and complexity. Demonstrate capability to perform the work required.

3. Work Plan

The details required in the work plan have been identified in the Request for proposal. Provide general overview of your company and capability to perform the work required. The evaluation will determine if the firm/individual has met the requirements. Innovative procedures and better project understanding will also be evaluated here. Identification of the level of effort for each team member, in each phase of the project, is required.

4. Schedule

The details required in the schedule plan have been identified in the Request for Proposal. The evaluation will determine if the firm/individual has met the minimum schedule requirements.

5. Fee and Level of Effort

This section may be submitted in a separate, sealed envelope, marked "Fee Proposal".

An estimated fee for the contract administration has been requested. Fees for key personnel, support staff and disbursements must be identified. The corporate fee schedule must also be included should additional work beyond the terms of reference be requested. The evaluation will be based on a comparison to the other consultants. Obvious imbalances in the fee breakdowns may result in rejection of the consultant's submission.

The Level of Effort will be evaluated with the Work Plan and will be based on the methodology, innovation and recommendations of the proposal.

EVALUATION CRITERIA WEIGHING

Each category will be rated at one of five levels – Poor, Fair, Acceptable, Good and Excellent. The evaluator may assign mid-point marks to properly assess the proposal's ranking.

- **KEY PERSONNEL**

Poor - Lacks experience in comparable projects and objectives. Does not have adequate resources and expertise to make qualified recommendations based on the terms of reference.

Fair - Minimal experience in comparable projects and objectives.

Acceptable - Adequate experience in comparable projects and objectives. May make recommendations based on assumptions and results of similar projects without direct involvement in them.

Good - Demonstrates a solid understanding and considerable level of expertise in terms of accomplishing objectives. May make recommendations based on a similar project experience.

Excellent - Excellent understanding of objectives and terms of reference. Experience and expertise demonstrated in numerous past projects. Recommendations would be based on experience gained from direct involvement in a wide variety of projects similar in criteria.

- **EXPERIENCE**

Poor - No experience related to proposed project.

Fair - Minimal experience related to proposed project.

Acceptable - Some experience related to proposed project.

Good - Experienced related to proposed project.

Excellent - Significant experience related to proposed project.

- **WORK PLAN**

Poor - Lacks information to determine if the consultant understands the assignment and/or written statements indicates the consultant clearly does not understand the project.

Fair - Minimal information – consultant uses generic terminology that could be used to describe the project or any project of similar nature.

Acceptable - Adequate information to show the consultant understands the basic project.

Good - Details indicate a full and complete understanding of the project.

Excellent - Details indicate a full and complete understanding of the project. Information shows the consultant has included some innovative ideas that demonstrate the depth of understanding.

- **SCHEDULE**

Poor - Schedule provided is not in requested format and/or is of an unacceptable duration.

Fair - Minimal detail, no indication of actual resources dedicated to the project, duration is at or over expected completion date.

Acceptable - Detail sufficient to show adequate resources, duration is at expected completion date.

Good - Detail sufficient to show adequate resources, duration is shorter than the expected completion date.

Excellent - Extensive amount of detail – suitable for terms of reference level, duration is significantly shorter than the expected completion date. Availability to start the project immediately on the required date is a significant criteria.

- **FEE**

Fee rating will be assessed from lowest to highest with a provision for inspection personnel and possible reduced onsite hours of inspection.

Poor - Greater than 10 % higher than middle fee submission.

Fair - Up to 10 % higher than middle fee submission.

Acceptable - Middle fee submitted.

Good - Up to 10 % lower than middle fee submission.

Excellent - Greater than 10 % lower than middle fee submission.