



STAFF REPORT

City of Dripping Springs

PO Box 384

511 Mercer Street

Dripping Springs, TX 78620

Submitted By: Ginger Faught, Deputy City Administrator
Aniz Alani, City Attorney

Council Meeting Date: October 20, 2026

Agenda Item Wording: Discuss and consider action to approve the issuance of competitive procurement packages, as applicable, for professional and related services needed for the City's Texas Water Development Board-funded wastewater system improvements, including geotechnical engineering, environmental review, TPDES/TCEQ permitting, land surveying, easement and right-of-way acquisition, appraisal, appraisal review, and electrical/SCADA engineering services; and to authorize City staff to finalize, publish, and distribute those packages after verifying the applicable procurement method, funding requirements, and scope of existing contracts.

Agenda Item Sponsor: Mayor Bill Foulds, Jr.

A. Requested Council action

Council is asked to review eight proposed consultant-service packages supporting wastewater improvements and provide direction on their scope, evaluation criteria, and procurement route. **The decision at this stage concerns how the City will seek and evaluate firms—not which firm will receive a contract.**

B. Background and purpose

The proposed services cover several distinct needs: subsurface engineering, licensed survey work, environmental documentation, property-acquisition coordination, independent valuation and review, electrical/controls design, and potentially additional permitting administration. They should not be treated as one undifferentiated "consultant RFQ." The applicable method depends on the actual service and funding requirements.

The project team has identified potential service needs and firms, including environmental, geotechnical, surveying, permitting, acquisition, and possible electrical/SCADA services.

C. Procurement approach at a glance

Approach	Proposed services	Role of price	Source / selection authority (Tex. Gov't. Code)
Qualifications-based RFQ	Geotechnical engineering; land surveying; electrical/SCADA engineering if separately procured	No prices or rates in SOQs; fair and reasonable compensation negotiated after qualifications ranking	§ 2254.003; § 2254.004
Other professional-service RFQ	Independent appraisal; independent appraisal review subject to final classification	No competitive price ranking proposed; negotiated fair and reasonable compensation; funding-method resolution required before issue	§ 2254.002; § 2254.003
Competitive sealed proposal RFP	Nonengineering environmental review; nonlegal acquisition support; discrete administrative permitting support if approved	Price evaluated with published technical factors; separate cost proposal	§ 252.042; § 252.043(h)

D. Proposed scopes and qualifications requested

1. Qualifications-based packages

Procurement / proposed type	Principal scope and deliverables	Qualifications and evidence requested
Geotechnical engineering RFQ	Authorized exploration, drilling, sampling and laboratory analysis; subsurface/groundwater evaluation; design recommendations; signed/sealed reports, logs and supporting data	Texas engineering firm registration and responsible PE; field/laboratory team; three relevant wastewater or linear-infrastructure assignments; QA/QC approach, staffing, capacity and references

Procurement / proposed type	Principal scope and deliverables	Qualifications and evidence requested
Land surveying RFQ	Boundary/title research; survey control/datum; topographic and corridor mapping; easement exhibits and metes-and-bounds descriptions; signed/sealed and editable survey files	Responsible Texas RPLS and applicable firm credentials; crews and CAD/GIS team; three relevant utility/easement assignments; title/boundary reconciliation, QA/QC, capacity and references
Independent easement appraisal RFQ	Appraise authorized property interests; review title/survey inputs; inspect with lawful access; analyze market evidence and required remainder impacts; signed report, workfile and response to review comments	Appropriate Texas appraiser credentials; three easement/partial-taking assignments; method, independence, QA, availability and references
Independent appraisal review RFQ	Review assigned estate/date, evidence, assumptions, adjustments, calculations and applicable standards; reasoned review, correction requests, acceptance recommendation and workfile	Appropriate reviewer credentials; three comparable public-project reviews; review method, assignment-level conflict screening, capacity and references
Electrical/SCADA engineering RFQ	Power/load analysis; instrumentation, control narratives and interfaces; engineering drawings/specifications; authorized submittal/testing support; record inputs, backups and operator handover	Texas engineering firm registration and lead electrical/controls PE; controls/integration personnel; three wastewater electrical/SCADA projects; integration/security approach, capacity and references

2. Price-and-quality proposal packages

Procurement / proposed type	Principal scope and deliverables	Qualifications and evidence requested	Important exclusions / safeguards
Environmental review and clearance support RFP	Work plan and study-gap assessment; environmental documentation appropriate to the established pathway; agency/comment coordination; approved public-participation support; final/editable files and clearance-status memorandum	Three comparable water/wastewater reviews, preferably TWDB/SRF; assigned personnel and resumes; environmental method, agency sequence, QA/QC, schedule and references	No guaranteed FONSI or clearance date; licensed engineering, surveying, permit design and existing prime-engineer work excluded; specialty fieldwork separately defined and ordered
Easement/ROW acquisition support RFP	Parcel intake and status logs; owner contact; delivery of City-approved offers; negotiation reporting; coordination with surveyor/counsel; closing/recording logistics and complete files	Three comparable municipal utility-corridor acquisitions; project manager/negotiator roles; respectful owner-contact method; quality/records controls, workload and references; credentials appropriate to assigned services	City controls offers and commitments; no authority to bind City, dictate value, threaten eminent domain or give legal advice; appraisal, review, surveying and relocation scopes excluded unless separately authorized
TPDES/TCEQ administrative support RFP	Proposed option: regulatory-file organization, responsibility/calendar tracking, routing approved communications, administrative public-notice/meeting logistics and status records	Three comparable Texas wastewater regulatory-administration/public-notice engagements; assigned administrative/regulatory personnel; records QA, communications controls, availability and references	Not a procurement of B&N's existing application or administrative-review work; excludes engineering/modeling, technical opinions, certifications and legal advocacy; exact discrete need must be established

3. **Common response requirements**

The eight drafts generally propose a 20-page technical/SOQ narrative, excluding the cover letter and required forms, with resumes limited to two pages per key person. Each requests relevant personnel, comparable assignments, capacity, references, conflict disclosures, addenda acknowledgment and an authorized signature. RFQs prohibit price information in the SOQ. RFPs separate technical and cost submissions.

E. Proposed evaluation criteria and cost variables

1. **Qualifications-only criteria**

The following point allocations are proposals for Council review. Each package presents a 100-point model with no price points. Required licensure and scope-specific eligibility should be distinguished from comparative scoring of professional experience and the proposed team.

Procurement	Proposed criteria and point allocations	Price treatment
Geotechnical engineering	Comparable work 30 ; professional competence/key personnel 25 ; approach/QA 20 ; capacity 15 ; past performance/municipal experience 10	No fees/rates in SOQ; negotiate after ranking
Land surveying	Comparable utility/easement work 30 ; professional competence/team 25 ; technical/records method 20 ; capacity/schedule 15 ; references/municipal performance 10	No fees/rates in SOQ; negotiate after ranking
Independent appraisal	Easement/partial-taking experience 30 ; appraiser competence 25 ; method/independence 20 ; capacity 15 ; references/quality/municipal experience 10	No competitive price ranking proposed; method must be resolved before issue
Independent appraisal review	Comparable independent reviews 30 ; reviewer competence 25 ; method/independence controls 25 ; capacity 10 ; references/quality/municipal experience 10	No competitive price ranking proposed; classification and funding method must be resolved
Electrical/SCADA engineering	Comparable electrical/SCADA work 30 ; professional competence/team 25 ; integration/interoperability/testing 25 ; capacity 10 ; references/municipal performance 10	No fees/rates in SOQ if direct procurement selected

2. RFP criteria

Each RFP model allocates 15 of 100 points to evaluated price and price realism. The permitting model remains only a scope option.

Procurement	Proposed criteria and point allocations	Cost-comparison variables requiring final definition
Environmental review	Method/review sequence 30 ; comparable TWDB/SRF performance 25 ; personnel/capacity/QA 20 ; schedule/agency coordination 10 ; price/realism 15	One defined review with draft, consolidated comment round and final; separately priced biological/wetland and cultural-resource studies, extra comment round, public meeting and capped expenses
Easement/ROW support	Comparable experience 25 ; parcel/owner method 25 ; personnel/capacity/controls 20 ; schedule/reporting 10 ; references 5 ; price/realism 15	Standard parcel scope, complex increment, additional meeting, closing/recording coordination and capped direct expenses/fees; prevent duplicate meeting/file charges
TPDES/TCEQ administrative option	Defined assignment/boundaries 30 ; comparable regulatory administration 25 ; personnel/records/capacity 20 ; work plan/communications 10 ; price/realism 15	Identified permit/action; file setup, administrative notice cycle, correspondence compilation, additional reporting cycle and capped expenses/publication charges; final cycles and exclusions not yet set

F. Proposed RFP price scoring

The three draft RFP models propose **12 comparative-price points** and **3 price-realism points**:

- Comparative-price score: 12 multiplied by the lowest responsive evaluated total divided by the proposer's evaluated total, rounded to two decimals.
- Realism score: 3 points for a supported deliverable/staffing/expense breakdown, 1 point for partial support, and 0 for materially unsupported assumptions.
- Evaluated totals use the common pricing basket stated in the final RFP. Comparison quantities do not guarantee purchases or actual task volumes.

G. Applicable selection processes

1. Engineering and land surveying: qualifications first, price second

This process applies to the proposed geotechnical and surveying RFQs and, if separately procured, electrical/SCADA engineering. These services fall within the professional-service categories described by Texas Government Code § 2254.002. The City selects on demonstrated competence and qualifications and obtains a fair and reasonable price under § 2254.003. The negotiation sequence is mandatory for engineering and land surveying under § 2254.004.

The proposed workflow is:

1. Solicit SOQs without prices, fee schedules, billing rates, or cost proposals.
2. Review responsiveness and credentials, document conflict checks, and evaluate qualifications using the published criteria. If interviews/reference checks are used, administer them consistently using the disclosed factors.
3. Identify and rank the most highly qualified providers. Do not use price to establish or alter the qualification ranking.
4. Request a scope and compensation proposal from the most highly qualified provider and attempt to negotiate a satisfactory contract at a fair and reasonable price.
5. If negotiation fails, formally end it before selecting and negotiating with the next most highly qualified provider. Continue the statutory sequence as needed.
6. Present the resulting selection and negotiated agreement for City Council approval. Performance begins only after agreement execution and required written task authorization.

An RFQ ranking does not approve compensation or award a contract. Council can review whether the scope and criteria will identify the right team without prejudging the later fair-and-reasonable-price negotiation.

2. Appraisal and appraisal review: professional selection with a separate method gate

Real-estate appraising is included in § 2254.002, with competence/qualifications selection and a fair and reasonable price under § 2254.003.

3. Nonprofessional services: evaluate price with other published factors

Texas Local Government Code § 252.021 authorizes the proposal method for goods/services and, where applicable, requires the governing body or an appropriately designated representative to determine the best-value purchasing method **before notice**. Its general competitive-procurement expenditure trigger is **more than \$100,000**. Estimated aggregate contract values are not yet established.

Under § 252.042, an RFP must solicit quotations and disclose the relative importance of price and other factors. Discussions and revisions must follow the RFP and governing-body regulations and treat reasonably qualified offerors fairly and equally. Under § 252.043(h), the award standard is the responsible offeror whose proposal is most advantageous considering the disclosed factors—not simply the lowest fee. Applicable federal proposal requirements are addressed separately under 2 C.F.R. § 200.320(b)(2).

The proposed workflow is:

1. Resolve classification, aggregate value, method authority, applicable pre-notice determination, and funding conditions.
2. Define objective base deliverables and equal comparison quantities; publish all factors, weights, pricing rules, agreement terms and technical exhibits.
3. Receive the technical proposal and separately sealed cost proposal using the final authorized receipt/opening procedures.
4. Evaluate responsiveness and technical merit using the published factors. The drafts propose completing nonprice scoring before cost-envelope review; this separation does not eliminate the required price evaluation.
5. Evaluate the disclosed price basket and supporting cost realism. Conduct only permitted clarifications, discussions, interviews or revisions, giving fair and equal opportunity where required.
6. Document the recommended responsible proposer and why its offer is most advantageous under the published criteria; present the award and agreement for applicable City approval.
7. Execute the agreement and authorize written tasks before performance. Preserve the procurement, evaluation, discussion and approval record.

H. Fiscal impact and implementation

No contract price or expenditure approval is requested in this report. RFP pricing fields are blank for future proposers; RFQ compensation is negotiated after the lawful qualifications selection.

I. Proposed motion for Council consideration

Approve the proposed scopes and qualifications criteria for geotechnical engineering and land surveying as the basis for finalizing their RFQs, subject to project-specific scope, funding-method, agreement, and release review; approve in concept the environmental-review and easement/right-of-way acquisition-support scopes and evaluation models; endorse the appraisal and independent appraisal-review scopes; and direct staff to finalize and issue those packages.