RFQ – Evaluation/Scoring Guidelines

Services Related to Restoration Engineering and Related Services

The evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines in awarding points to the evaluation criteria and the evaluations of the reference questions.

**Superior:** 675 – 750 Points exceptional – completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFQ; may provide additional information or cover areas not originally addressed within the RFQ and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.

**Good Response:** 600 – 674 Points clearly meets all the requirements of the RFQ and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the category or categories with no deficiencies noted.

**Fair Response:** 525 – 599 Points minimally meets most requirements of the RFQ. Offeror demonstrated some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the category or categories, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

**Failed Response:** 524 Points does not meet the requirements of the RFP. Offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.
RFQ – Evaluation Sheet

First Round Elimination

Services Related Restoration Engineering and Related Services

Procurement Officer: Kathy Coleman

Vendor: ________________________________

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: _____ P/F  TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: _______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Pts Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submittal and Quality of SOQ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pass/Fail</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(MUST PASS FOR CONTINUED CONSIDERATION)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Package submitted by the deadline P/F

B. Package is complete - included all information required in Section II A of RFQ P/F

- Offeror’s company name, business form (i.e., corporation, limited liability company, partnership, sole proprietorship, etc.), name of registered agent and contact information, and tax identification number.

- Name, address, e-mail address, telephone number, fax number and title of Offeror’s contact person for purposes of this RFQ.

- Service category or categories for which Offeror is submitting qualifications under this RFQ
RFQ 413015 – Evaluation Sheet

Second Round Elimination

Services Related Restoration Engineering and Related Services

Team Member: ________________________________

Vendor: ___________________________

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: ___50___

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Pts Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of SOQ (MUST ACHIEVE 35 POINTS FOR CONTINUED CONSIDERATION)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Overall Quality of SOQ (concise and to-the-point)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
RFQ – Evaluation Sheet

Final Evaluation – Ability to Provide Services

Services Related Restoration Engineering and Related Services

Team Member: ________________________________

Vendor: ________________________________

**TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 200**  **TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: ________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Pts Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offeror’s Overall Ability to Provide the Services</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  Narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe Offeror’s ability to meet project deadlines and budget requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe why the State should hire your firm to provide the services required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide the type and number of current projects for which Offeror is the prime contractor; including work for NRDP, DEQ and other State entities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An evaluation of Offeror’s current work load and ability to provide services to NRDP based on projected workloads.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
RFQ – Evaluation Sheet

Final Evaluation – Vendors by Category

Services Related Restoration Engineering and Related Services

Team Member: ________________________________

Vendor: ___________________________ Category ________________________________

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 400 TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Pts Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong> Key Personnel by Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Average years of experience for key personnel proposed specifically relating to service category (yrs of experience / number of key personnel)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Years (50 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Years (25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4 Years (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Names and resumes of professional personnel and staff assigned full-time work, identifying home office, hourly rates, and project managers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Table providing primary area of staff expertise, education, and home office</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong> Project Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Table or matrix listing Offeror’s project experience by category</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of projects for each category demonstrating Offeror’s qualifications and expertise</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
RFQ – Reference Evaluation Sheet

Services Related Restoration Engineering and Related Services

Offeror: ________________________________

Reference: ____________________________  Contact Number: ________________

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: __100____  TOTAL POINTS AWARDED: ________

Offeror must provide NRDP with the names and contact information of at least five references that are available and willing to respond to NRDP’s questions about Offeror’s company and work. NRDP will score a total of three references. It is the Offeror’s responsibility to insure the availability of their designated references. Each reference contacted will be asked the same questions and scored in accordance with the questions below. Only one person from the committee will call and score the responses of each Offeror’s references. References will be contacted in the order provided by Offeror. If a reference is unavailable NRDP will leave a message if possible to do so, and then call the next contact on the list. NRDP will make no more than three attempts to contact each reference over the course of two consecutive working days during the state’s hours of business, after the expiration of which time the scores will be totaled.

NRDP will not attempt to identify additional references should NRDP be unable to make contact with those provided. When completed, or upon the expiration of allotted time, these Reference Evaluation forms will be turned in to the head of the committee. NRDP will calculate Offeror’s Reference Check score by taking the aggregate total of the three individual scores and dividing it by three (the number of references). Each missing reference less than the required three will be assigned a zero score and will cause an overall score reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Question</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How would you rank the overall quality of written work by Offeror?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How would you rank Offeror’s overall quality of non-written work (including technical and fieldwork)?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How would you rank Offeror’s ability to meet deadlines?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How would you rank Offeror’s ability to take direction?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did Offeror operate within budget?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were substantial or significant rewrites of any documents necessary?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How would you rank Offeror’s ability to work harmoniously with others (i.e., public, subcontractors, local officials).</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did Offeror provide any alternatives that would have benefited your firm either with reduction of time or money?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How would you describe your working relationship with Offeror?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Would you hire Offeror again?</td>
<td>10 x3/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Reference Checks were completed by
RFQ – Reference Evaluation Sheet

NOTES

Offeror: __________________________

Reference: __________________________  Reference Score: _______

Call Attempts (Date/Time):

1st __________________________  2nd __________________________  3rd __________________________

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

All Reference Checks were completed by __________________________
RFQ – Reference Evaluation Sheet

NOTES

Offeror: ________________________________

Reference: ____________________________  Reference Score: ________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

All Reference Checks were completed by