

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET

## RFP FOR INFORMATION VERIFICATION AND REVIEW SERVICES (2007-AN010)

PROPOSER: TCM Group in association with MSW Consultants

EVALUATION CRITERIA (Total Possible Points)	POINTS AWARDED	COMMENTS
<b>PROPOSED PRICE (65 Points)</b> Lowest Total Proposed Annual Price on Schedule of Prices receives full weight. Remaining proposals rated as follows: Lowest Total Proposed Annual Price / this proposer's Total Proposed Annual Price x 65 points = score  \$ 308,500 This Proposer's Total Proposed Annual Price \$ N/A Local SBE Preference Adjustment Amount \$ N/A Adjusted Total Proposed Price \$ 308,500 Lowest Total Proposed Annual Price	65	308,500/308,500 x 65 = 65
<b>REFERENCES (5 POINTS)</b> Contract Services staff will check a minimum of three references for overall satisfaction with the Proposer's services, with priority given to services provided to County departments. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, work quality, completion of work on schedule and within budget, and responsiveness. Each reference is rated as 1.66 points (3 references for a total of 5 points). Each reference survey is comprised of 10 questions rated on a scale of 0-10. The reference score is calculated as follows:  (1) For each individual reference survey: (total number of points given / 100) x 1.66 (2) Add up the scores for all three surveys = overall score for References criteria	4.51	96/100x1.66 = 1.59 97/100x1.66 = 1.61 79/100x1.66 = 1.31
<b>EXPERIENCE (5 POINTS)</b> Factors to be considered are: experience in providing the type of services requested to large organizations with demonstrated quality and reliability standards having been met in the service provided. Additional weight may be given to experience providing services to agencies of similar size and nature. The score will be determined from staff and proposers experience as documented by the proposer in the proposer's own comprehensive description of its capabilities and as described by proposer's references. A score of zero in this evaluation category may result in rejection of the proposal. Assign the score matching the paragraph that best describes the proposer:  • Extensive related experience: = 5 points Proposer 's staff has extensively engaged in similar services requested. Overall, Proposer's experience is highly extensive when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP  • Meets minimum experience: = 3 points Proposer 's staff has engaged in the services requested. Overall, Proposer's experience meets the minimum requirement when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP.  • Little or no related experience: = 0 points Proposer's staff experience is not stated. Overall, Proposer's experience does not meet minimum requirement when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP. This may include lack of CPA on staff.	3	Main contractor, TCM Group doesn't seem to have extensive experience performing similar services.  Similar experience with Mid Valley Landfill is not listed as reference only mentioned under experience section, therefore cannot confirm experience.  Subcontractor's staff (MSW) has extensive experience performing the services requested.
<b>STAFFING PLAN (5 POINTS)</b> The evaluators may award up to maximum of 5 points based on their evaluation of the adequacy of the Proposer's staffing plan to meet all of the requirements of the Scope of Work.  Significant unacceptable weakness in any of the Staffing Plan may result in a low or zero score. A score of zero in this evaluation category is unacceptable and may result in rejection of the Proposal as nonresponsive.  • Extensive staffing plan: = 5 points Staffing is appropriate to service and sufficient to ensure full coverage and prompt response at all times. Staff is highly skilled and can be relied on to furnish the most prompt and accurate results. Strong supervision is reflected in staffing plan and will likely result in the most effective service.	3	Page 1 provides biography on 3 primary staff members and 5 support staff members.  Only 2 staff have extensive experience in solid waste, the others have more project management experience.  Contract is for 2 years and only 1500 hours, which rounds out to about 60 hours per month. 2 Staff members is sufficient for the amount of hours requested.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET

## RFP FOR INFORMATION VERIFICATION AND REVIEW SERVICES (2007-AN010)

PROPOSER: TCM Group in association with MSW Consultants

EVALUATION CRITERIA (Total Possible Points)	POINTS AWARDED	COMMENTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets minimum staffing plan requirements: = 3 points Staffing is appropriate to the requested service and sufficient to avoid gaps in coverage and delayed response, except in the most unforeseeable situations. Staff has fair skills and can avoid error and delay. Supervision is reflected in staffing plan and will usually result in effective service.</li> <li>Inadequate staffing plan: = 0 points Staffing is seriously deficient and will probably result in insufficient coverage or delayed response. Staff lacks skill and will probably not be able to produce adequate results. Lack of significant supervision is reflected in staffing plan and will likely result in unacceptable service.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>WORK PLAN (20 POINTS)</b></p> <p>Scoring of the Proposer's detailed Work Plan will be based on the extent to which it demonstrates that the Proposer is likely to fulfill the tasks and requirements as set forth in Exhibit A, Scope of Work; demonstrates creativity and innovation that exceed the minimum requirements of the Scope of Work; responds to contingencies and emergencies; renders timely and responsive service to Public Works; and exceeds a workmanlike level of quality in the service and work product produced. The evaluation committee may make this determination from all relevant information presented or obtained, which may include, but is not limited to, Proposer's written Work Plan, Quality Assurance Program, schedules, procedures, techniques, and methods that will be employed in meeting the objectives outlined in Exhibit A, Scope of Work. These may include personnel management, training, subcontracting, recruitment and replacement, supervision, supplies, equipment, uniforms, identification badges, safety, and communications. The review will include the sample final report(s) submitted by the Proposer. A score of zero in this evaluation category can result in the rejection of the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very Comprehensive = 20 points Detailed and thorough work methodology that is highly likely to be successful on this project, producing a high level of confidence that needs will be promptly, carefully and appropriately addressed. Demonstrates creativity and innovation that exceed the minimum requirements of the Scope of Work; responds to contingencies and emergencies; renders timely and responsive service; and exceeds a workmanlike level of quality in the service and work product produced. Activities likely to be carefully coordinated to ensure excellent control of level of service when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP or obtained.</li> <li>Comprehensive = 10 points Work methodology is good and produces a reasonable degree of confidence that needs will be promptly and appropriately addressed. Activities likely to be sufficiently coordinated to ensure adequate control of level of service when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP or obtained.</li> <li>Meets Minimum Requirements = 5 points Work methodology is adequate and produces a somewhat reasonable degree of confidence that needs will be promptly and appropriately addressed. Activities likely to be coordinated to ensure somewhat adequate control of level of service when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP or obtained.</li> <li>Does Not Meet Requirements = 0 points Work methodology is not known or is inappropriate and likely to be unsuccessful. Activities likely to be poorly coordinated, resulting in delay and/or error when considering all relevant information presented in the RFP or obtained.</li> </ul>	20	<p>Detailed Flow Chart (Work Plan, pg 2) provides clear path on how contract objectives could be met.</p> <p>Final sample report provided very detailed and organized.</p> <p>Company provided a comprehensive approach for proposed methods used to research, identify and prioritize site visits.</p>
<b>TOTAL POINTS =</b>	95.51	