



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA LETTER

Agenda Number:

#2

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

2019 FEB -7 PM 1:30
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Department Name: General Services
Department No.: 063
For Agenda Of: February 12, 2019
Placement: Departmental
Estimated Time: 30 Minutes
Continued Item: Yes
If Yes, date from: January 29, 2019
Vote Required: Majority

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: General Services Janette D. Pell, Director, (805) 560-1011 *Janette Pell*
Contact Info: Joseph D. Toney, Assistant Director, (805) 568-2678
SUBJECT: Local Vendor Preference Policy Update, All Districts

County Counsel Concurrence

As to form: Yes

Other Concurrence: Risk Management

As to form: Yes

Auditor-Controller Concurrence

As to form: Yes



Recommended Actions:

That the Board of Supervisors:

- a) Approve the recommended update to the Local Vendor Preference policy that authorizes the Chief Procurement Officer (Purchasing Manager) to allow the lowest bidding local vendor that bid within 6% of the lowest, non-local bidder the opportunity to match the lowest bid; and
- b) Determine that the above recommended actions do not constitute a project subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4), finding that the actions are the creation of a governmental funding mechanism or other government fiscal activity, which do not involve any commitment to any specific project which may result in a potentially significant physical impact on the environment.

Summary Text:

As part of the County's Renew 2022 initiative to transform and improve services, the General Services Department explored the existing Local Vendor Preference policy. Currently, a local vendor can be awarded a contract for tangible good purchases having submitted a bid that is 6% higher than a non-local vendor. The Chief Procurement Officer is authorized to provide a 6% local vendor preference for all bids for tangible goods (formal bids on tangible goods required over \$25,000). While the preference has been seldom used in recent years, it is unknown how many missed opportunities occurred due to the disincentive for a non-local vendor to offer a bid based on the lack of competitive ability to beat a 6% margin. The recommended policy change set forth today will not remove the preference towards local businesses, but will change the application of the policy to allow for more market competition. The

ultimate goal is two-fold, continue to stimulate local business and to maximize use of public funding by ensuring the best value of acquired goods is achieved. The preference is only for tangible goods and will not apply to any purchases funded in whole or in part with Federal funding. Furthermore, the local vendor preference will not be applied in any situation that conflicts with local, state or federal laws or regulations.

Background:

Beginning in 1994, the County's Purchasing Division of General Services implemented an informal 1.5% preference for local vendors applied to bids on tangible goods. In 2005, the Board of Supervisors (Board) formalized the definition of a local vendor and also provided a directive authorizing the Purchasing Manager to provide a 6% local vendor preference. At that time, input from a committee of local businesses was for a 5% preference, but the Board chose a 6% preference for increased support to local businesses.


The "Local Vendor" definition criteria is as follows:

1. Occupy an actual business facility whose address is within the County.
2. Hold a valid business license as issued within the County and the address matches that of their local facility.
3. Hold a valid resale license (where sales tax will be applied to the purchase) as issued from the State Franchise Tax Board and the address matches that of their local facility.
4. They staff their local facility with employees during normal business hours, they have standard business utility services and the office is fully operational.

Over the years, there has been feedback received from external vendors notifying the County that they did not submit quotes based on the 6% requirement because their profit margin was less than 6%. Quantifying how many times a bid was not received due to the preference is not possible since there is no way to track businesses that did not submit bids or quotes. The number of times the preference is used will be tracked subsequent to the policy modification. The most likely area of impact will be in bids involving such goods as vehicles and heavy equipment where margins are small and no external bids have historically been received.

The recommended change will allow for more competition and the potential for savings to the County. Furthermore, there is the possibility for acquisition of higher quality products and goods due to a larger pool of providers and products being bid. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in bid replies but it is not clear what the ultimate volume will be. The policy change should have minimal impact on the Purchasing Division and outlying departments since there is already a practice in place.

The County also has a performance goal that 60% of funds spent annually in the County be with local vendors for services and supplies. The County has attained that goal for the past six years. This policy change only applies to local vendor preference on tangible good spend, an estimated \$16.7 million of the County's \$215 million spend. The Local Vendor Preference policy modification is not anticipated to significantly impact the local spend, thus still maintaining support for local businesses.



Updated Process:

On any bid for a tangible good, if the lowest bid is non-local and a local vendor’s bid is within 6%, then the lowest local vendor bid will be given the opportunity to match the lowest overall bid. Only the lowest local responsive bidder will be extended the opportunity to submit a matching bid. Once this scenario has been identified, both the lowest non-local and local bidders will be notified. The local bidder will be given 72 business hours to match. If the local vendor is able to match the lowest bid then that local business will be awarded the contract.

The suggest policy modification is similarly used in Santa Cruz, Solano, Kern and Contra Costa counties. This change will ensure the County is receiving the lowest cost whereas the current policy is conceivably costing the county an additional 6% on tangible items. The preference is only for tangible goods and will not apply to any purchases funded in whole or in part with Federal funding. Furthermore, the preference will not be applied in any situation that conflicts with local, state or federal laws or regulations.

Comparable Counties:

The first eight counties are considered comparable counties. The last three agencies are for additional comparison.

Agency	Preference	Notes
County of Santa Barbara	6%	Tangible Goods
Marin	5%	Tangible Goods and Services
Placer	5%	Services and Supplies 5% local vendor preference not to exceed \$5,000 in additional cost
San Luis Obispo	5%	
Sanislaus	5%	Tangible Goods and Services: 5% local vendor preference not to exceed \$5,000 in additional cost
Santa Cruz	5%	Tangible Goods and Services: When local supplier is within 5%, local vendor has a chance to match lowest bid
Solano	5%	Tangible Goods and Services; When local supplier is within 5%, local vendor has a chance to match lowest bid
Sonoma	5%	Services 5% Local Vendor Preference
Kern	5%	Tangible Goods and Services: When local supplier is within 5%, local vendor has a chance to match lowest bid
Contra Costa	5%	Tangible Goods and Services: When local supplier is within 5%, local vendor has a chance to match lowest bid
City of Santa Barbara	N/A	No Local Vendor preference

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

Budgeted: Yes

Fiscal Analysis:

Narrative: There will be no incremental costs associated with the policy change. Current operations will not change, only the application of how the policy is administered.

Attachments:

1. Presentation

Authored by:

Joseph D. Toney, Assistant Director, General Services

Mark Masoner, Purchasing Team Project Leader, General Services

CC:

Brandon Davis, Chief Procurement Officer, General Services

