

MEMORANDUM

To: Case No. PU-06-421
From: Patrick Fahn
Date: June 9, 2008
Re: RFP for 3rd Party Inspector – Keystone Pipeline

At its June 4, 2008 administrative meeting, the Commission discussed staff's preliminary review of the four RFPs submitted for consideration for the 3rd party inspector on the Keystone Pipeline project. At that time staff indicated that cost proposed by all vendors would exceed the siting application fee amount remaining in PU-06-421. The Commission directed that staff should a recommendation for the contract, after negotiations with bidders if appropriate.

Since that time I have completed a more thorough review, ranking the proposals in accordance with the rating sheets included in the RFP. Generally, two of the vendors rank similarly, with a significant difference in rank between the top two proposals and the others. This memo is not the final staff recommendation, but serves as a cover for docketing my review of the vendor proposals.

Other Notes:

Minnesota does not give preference to in-state bidders of similar work and therefore the proposed rates by the vendor from Minnesota were not increased in accordance with North Dakota preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Kettle Engineers & Consultants, Inc. Mandan ND
 Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Patrick Fahn
 Date of Review 6/4/08 - 6/5/08
 RFP Title/Number _____

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS CONTRACT IS 100

**7.01
Understanding of the Project**

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
 100 Points x 20 **Percent** = 20 **Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES talks about DOT
doesn't review Commission's order

[b] How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Kettle seems to have missed the point of

[c] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the State expects it to provide?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES only reporting mentioned is prompt reporting of noncompliance actions (nothing about daily, weekly) (says periodic on p 9)

[d] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the State's time schedule and can meet it?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES not a description of construction timeline

[e] Is the proposal submitted responsive to all material requirements in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

6

7.02

Methodology Used for the Project

Weight **30 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **30 Percent** = **30 Points**

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-7	Fair. Limited applicability
8-15	Good. Some applicability
16-23	Very Good. Substantial applicability
24-30	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Does the methodology depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES 1 Engineer & 1 biologist

[b] Does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes

[c] Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[d] Does the methodology have provisions for quality assurance?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes

[e] Does it appear that offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes

[f] Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[g] Is the proposal practical, feasible, and with the budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes, yes, no

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02

12

7.03

Experience and Qualifications

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = 20 **Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects? smaller line

EVALUATOR'S NOTES smaller pipeline Timothy Spillman elec & civil engineering (yes)
graduated 2005 — Kathleen chemical engineering (no)
Heather GIS/GPS Biology MDL=smaller pipe
Jaimee GIS/environmental

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes but not the vast experience of other vendors

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES see above

Questions regarding the firm.

[d] Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[e] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES unknown

[f] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor? ^{not}

EVALUATOR'S NOTES not provided

[g] Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES not applicable

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.03

10

7.04

Quality of Written Proposal

Weight **10 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x 10 **Percent** = 10 **Points**

Rating Scale (10 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-2	Fair. Limited applicability
3-4	Good. Some applicability
5-7	Very Good. Substantial applicability
8-10	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] How well is the written proposal presented?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES fair to good, not very good

[b] How well is the proposal completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES fair to good

[c] Is the organization of the written proposal clear?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no tabs

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04

6

7.05

Contract Cost

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Applying Preference Laws

Any prompt payment discounts terms proposed by the offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The preference given to a resident offeror will be equal to the preference given or required by the state of the nonresident offeror (i.e. reciprocal preference).

When evaluating cost proposals from nonresident (out-of-state) offerors, determine whether the offeror's state of residence has a preference law for vendors resident in that state. The cost proposal of the nonresident offeror will be increased by the same percentage of preference given to vendors resident in that state.

For example, if the state law of the nonresident offeror requires a 5% preference for vendors resident in that state, the procurement officer will increase that offeror's cost proposal by 5% before evaluation.

See http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml for a list of States Preference Laws or contact the North Dakota State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683.

Converting Cost to Points

After applying any reciprocal preference, the lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined as follows:

Price of Lowest Cost Proposal

Price of Proposal Being Rated X Total Points for Cost Available = Awarded Points

COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number <i>RFP Number PU-06-421</i>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <i>Keitu Engineers & Consultants, Inc.</i>		
Evaluator Name: <i>Patrick Fahr</i>		
Date:		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	20	<i>6</i>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	<i>12</i>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	20	<i>10</i>
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	<i>6</i>
Cost Evaluation (Maximum 20 Points)		
1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml		
2. Calculated points awarded for price.		
$\frac{\text{Price of Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Price of Proposal Being Rated}} \times 20 \text{ points} = \text{Awarded Points}$		
5. Cost	20	<i>—</i>
Total		<i>34</i>

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name McCain and Associates, Inc. Bismuck ND

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Patrick Fahn

Date of Review 6/4/08

RFP Title/Number RFP Number PU-06-421

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS CONTRACT IS 100

**7.01
Understanding of the Project**

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x 20 **Percent** = 20 **Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES just as thorough as Kadmas
Included welding?

[b] How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES a fair amount more than we thought
repeat of the order

[c] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the State expects it to provide?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES not as good as Kadmas but very good.

[d] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the State's time schedule and can meet it?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[e] Is the proposal submitted responsive to all material requirements in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

13

7.02

Methodology Used for the Project

Weight **30 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **30 Percent** = **30 Points**

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-7	Fair. Limited applicability
8-15	Good. Some applicability
16-23	Very Good. Substantial applicability
24-30	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Does the methodology depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[b] Does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[c] Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES unknown

[d] Does the methodology have provisions for quality assurance?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[e] Does it appear that offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES probably

[f] Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES SomeWhat

[g] Is the proposal practical, feasible, and with the budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES unknown

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02

15

7.03

Experience and Qualifications

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Todd: Alliance Pipeline, Lakehead Pipeline, Northern Natural Gas project manager
Kathie - Ecologist (Yes) Greg - Biologist / Pedologist (Some) Ryan - GIS & Biologist (Yes)

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES appears to be fair - extensive

Questions regarding the firm.

[d] Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Alliance Pipeline no

[e] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Unknown

[f] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES not required

[g] Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES NA

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.03

11

7.04

Quality of Written Proposal

Weight **10 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x 10 **Percent** = 10 **Points**

Rating Scale (10 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-2	Fair. Limited applicability
3-4	Good. Some applicability
5-7	Very Good. Substantial applicability
8-10	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] How well is the written proposal presented?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES fair to good, not very good

[b] How well is the proposal completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES fair to good

[c] Is the organization of the written proposal clear?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no tabs

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04

6

7.05

Contract Cost

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Applying Preference Laws

Any prompt payment discounts terms proposed by the offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The preference given to a resident offeror will be equal to the preference given or required by the state of the nonresident offeror (i.e. reciprocal preference).

When evaluating cost proposals from nonresident (out-of-state) offerors, determine whether the offeror's state of residence has a preference law for vendors resident in that state. The cost proposal of the nonresident offeror will be increased by the same percentage of preference given to vendors resident in that state.

For example, if the state law of the nonresident offeror requires a 5% preference for vendors resident in that state, the procurement officer will increase that offeror's cost proposal by 5% before evaluation.

See http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml for a list of States Preference Laws or contact the North Dakota State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683.

Converting Cost to Points

After applying any reciprocal preference, the lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined as follows:

Price of Lowest Cost Proposal

Price of Proposal Being Rated X Total Points for Cost Available = Awarded Points

COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number <i>RFP No. PU-06-421</i>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <i>McCain and Associates</i>		
Evaluator Name: <i>Patrick Fahn</i>		
Date: <i>6/4/08</i>		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	20	<i>13</i>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	<i>15</i>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	20	<i>11</i>
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	<i>6</i>
Cost Evaluation (Maximum 20 Points) 1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml 2. Calculated points awarded for price. <u>Price of Lowest Cost Proposal</u> Price of Proposal Being Rated X 20 points = Awarded Points		
5. Cost	20	<i>—</i>
Total		<i>45</i>

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Kadmas Lee & Jackson Valley City ND
 Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Patrick Fahn
 Date of Review 6/2/08
 RFP Title/Number PU-06-421

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS CONTRACT IS 100

**7.01
Understanding of the Project**

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
 100 Points x 20 **Percent** = 20 **Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES offeror contacted both pipeline contractors (p4)

[b] How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES in addition to reviewing Order

[c] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the State expects it to provide? Yes

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[d] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the State's time schedule and can meet it? Yes

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[e] Is the proposal submitted responsive to all material requirements in the RFP? Yes

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

20

**7.02
Methodology Used for the Project**

Weight **30 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **30 Percent** = **30 Points**

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-7	Fair. Limited applicability
8-15	Good. Some applicability
16-23	Very Good. Substantial applicability
24-30	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Does the methodology depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES will meet weekly with Keystone & minutes to PSC, digital pictures, daily diary,

[b] Does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[c] Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[d] Does the methodology have provisions for quality assurance?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes p.7

[e] Does it appear that offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes p.6 bottom

[f] Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP? Yes

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[g] Is the proposal practical, feasible, and within the budget? Proposal is not within the budget

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02

25

7.03

Experience and Qualifications

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Paul Bjornson (BS Construction Management) 8 yrs construction inspector (North)
Dave Godahl (Drafting) 10 yrs construction inspection
Shanna Braun: environmental (BS Natural Resources Management)

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES County Engineer for 7 of 8 counties.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES most of education is applicable
all their experience is applicable.

existing offices in
Valley City & Grafton

locally owned

Questions regarding the firm.

[d] Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[e] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES NA

[f] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor? Not required

EVALUATOR'S NOTES NA

[g] Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES NA

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.03

18

7.04

Quality of Written Proposal

Weight **10 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x 10 **Percent** = 10 **Points**

Rating Scale (10 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-2	Fair. Limited applicability
3-4	Good. Some applicability
5-7	Very Good. Substantial applicability
8-10	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] How well is the written proposal presented?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES excellent

[b] How well is the proposal completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES excellent

[c] Is the organization of the written proposal clear?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES excellent

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04

10

7.05

Contract Cost

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Applying Preference Laws

Any prompt payment discounts terms proposed by the offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The preference given to a resident offeror will be equal to the preference given or required by the state of the nonresident offeror (i.e. reciprocal preference).

When evaluating cost proposals from nonresident (out-of-state) offerors, determine whether the offeror's state of residence has a preference law for vendors resident in that state. The cost proposal of the nonresident offeror will be increased by the same percentage of preference given to vendors resident in that state.

For example, if the state law of the nonresident offeror requires a 5% preference for vendors resident in that state, the procurement officer will increase that offeror's cost proposal by 5% before evaluation.

See http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml for a list of States Preference Laws or contact the North Dakota State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683.

Converting Cost to Points

After applying any reciprocal preference, the lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined as follows:

Price of Lowest Cost Proposal

Price of Proposal Being Rated X Total Points for Cost Available = Awarded Points

COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05

unable to calculate

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: <i>RFP No. Pu-06-421</i>		
RFP Number		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <i>Kadmas Lee & Jackson</i>		
Evaluator Name: <i>Patrick Fahn</i>		
Date:		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	20	<i>18</i>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	<i>25</i>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	20	<i>18</i>
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	<i>10</i>
Cost Evaluation (Maximum 20 Points)		
1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml		
2. Calculated points awarded for price.		
<u>Price of Lowest Cost Proposal</u> Price of Proposal Being Rated X 20 points = Awarded Points		
5. Cost	20	<i>0</i>
Total		<i>71</i>

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name ProSource Technologies, Inc.
 Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Patrick Fahn Crown Rapids, MN
 Date of Review 6/5/08
 RFP Title/Number RFP No. PA-06-421

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS CONTRACT IS 100

**7.01
 Understanding of the Project**

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
 100 Points x 20 **Percent** = 20 **Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES believes the RFP is limited to one inspector, but indicates it would be better to have more than one

[b] How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES has identified at least one issue that others didn't (p5, #1)

[c] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the State expects it to provide?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES bottom half of p6 - p7

[d] Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the State's time schedule and can meet it?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES ?

[e] Is the proposal submitted responsive to all material requirements in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

17

7.02

Methodology Used for the Project

Weight **30 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **30 Percent** = **30 Points**

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-7	Fair. Limited applicability
8-15	Good. Some applicability
16-23	Very Good. Substantial applicability
24-30	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

[a] Does the methodology depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[b] Does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[c] Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the proposal?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES ? probably

[d] Does the methodology have provisions for quality assurance?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes by Project Manager or General Counsel

[e] Does it appear that offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[f] Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes

[g] Is the proposal practical, feasible, and with the budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes, yes, no

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02

26

7.03

Experience and Qualifications

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability
6-10	Good. Some applicability
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes, quite extensive

[b] Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

not sure which one inspector would be used and no single inspector has all the background. Some have limited backgrounds.

[c] How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

see [b]

Questions regarding the firm.

[d] Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES no

[e] How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES ?

[f] If references were required, did the references provide information to verify the satisfactory performance of the vendor? no

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Letters of Reference indicate satisfactory performance

[g] Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES see [f]

[h] If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Eagle Sky Patrol
unknown

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.03

15

7.04

Quality of Written Proposal

Weight **10 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x 10 **Percent** = 10 **Points**

Rating Scale (10 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value
1-2	Fair. Limited applicability
3-4	Good. Some applicability
5-7	Very Good. Substantial applicability
8-10	Excellent. Total applicability

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

[a] How well is the written proposal presented?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES excellent

[b] How well is the proposal completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES excellent

[c] Is the organization of the written proposal clear?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES excellent

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04

10

7.05

Contract Cost

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Applying Preference Laws

Any prompt payment discounts terms proposed by the offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The preference given to a resident offeror will be equal to the preference given or required by the state of the nonresident offeror (i.e. reciprocal preference).

When evaluating cost proposals from nonresident (out-of-state) offerors, determine whether the offeror's state of residence has a preference law for vendors resident in that state. The cost proposal of the nonresident offeror will be increased by the same percentage of preference given to vendors resident in that state.

For example, if the state law of the nonresident offeror requires a 5% preference for vendors resident in that state, the procurement officer will increase that offeror's cost proposal by 5% before evaluation.

See http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml for a list of States Preference Laws or contact the North Dakota State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683.

Converting Cost to Points

After applying any reciprocal preference, the lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined as follows:

Price of Lowest Cost Proposal

Price of Proposal Being Rated X Total Points for Cost Available = Awarded Points

COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number <i>RFP No. PU-06-421</i>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <i>ProSource Technologies, Inc.</i>		
Evaluator Name: <i>Patricia Fahn</i>		
Date: <i>6/5/08</i>		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	20	<i>17</i>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	<i>26</i>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	20	<i>15</i>
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	<i>10</i>
Cost Evaluation (Maximum 20 Points) 1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml 2. Calculated points awarded for price: <u>Price of Lowest Cost Proposal</u> Price of Proposal Being Rated X 20 points = Awarded Points		
5. Cost	20	<i>—</i>
Total		<i>68</i>