

# ATTACHMENT 1

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

All proposals will be reviewed for responsiveness and then evaluated using the criteria set out herein.

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATORS

Each evaluation criterion has been assigned a specific number of points. The questions under each evaluated area help you measure the quality of the offeror's response. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

### RATING SCALE FOR ASSESSING VENDOR RESPONSES

This rating scale is intended to establish guidelines within that range to ensure members of the RFP evaluation committee perform their evaluation with consistency. You may assign any value for a given criteria from 0 to the maximum number of points. A zero value typically constitutes no response or an inability of the vendor to meet the criterion. In contrast, the maximum value should constitute a high standard of meeting the criterion. If a specific criterion would only yield a yes or no response (e.g., offeror can submit an electronic report in required format by noon Friday), the evaluator should award either the maximum points or a zero.

For Example: "Experience and Qualifications" is an evaluation criteria receiving a weighting of 20% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 20 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

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

### COST PROPOSAL

If offerors were required to place cost proposals in a separate sealed envelope, do not open the cost proposal until the technical proposals have been evaluated.

Not all members of the evaluation need to evaluate the cost proposal. The cost proposals may be evaluated by selected members of the evaluation committee, reviewed by group, and recorded on the evaluation summary sheets.

Any prompt payment discounts terms offered by the vendor are not taken into consideration in evaluating cost. However, the cost proposals of nonresident offerors may be adjusted by the application of preference laws, if applicable. Contact the State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Shawdy King

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Diller

Date of Review 1/15/2008

RFP Title/Number NSP Rate Case PU-07-776

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 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

14

**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 ( <b>30 POINT</b> Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-7</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>8-15</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>16-23</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>24-30</b>	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 \_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02

18

**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
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-5</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>6-10</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>11-15</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>16-20</b>	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 \_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Questions regarding the firm.**

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[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?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**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 <b>POINT</b> Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-2</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>3-4</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>5-7</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>8-10</b>	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 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04**

\_\_\_\_\_ 

**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](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:

$$\frac{\text{Price of Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Price of Proposal Being Rated}} \times \text{Total Points for Cost Available} = \text{Awarded Points}$$

### COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05

20

**Request for Proposal  
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: <b>NSP Rate Case</b>		
RFP Number: <b>PU-07-776</b>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <b>Snaveley King</b>		
Evaluator Name: <b>Dilher</b>		
Date: <b>1/15/2008</b>		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Cost Evaluation (Maximum 20 Points)</b>  1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: <a href="http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml</a>  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	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
Total		<b>75</b>

**Request for Proposal  
Evaluation Totals**

Name of RFP: <b>XISP Rate Case PU-07-776</b>						
Name of Offeror: <b>\$ Snavely King</b>						
Date: <b>1/15/8</b>						
Technical Evaluation Criteria	80 POINTS Maximum	Evaluator	Evaluator	Evaluator	Evaluator	Evaluator
		<b>Diller</b>	<b>Edin</b>			<b>Aug</b>
1. Understanding of the Project	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>			<b>13</b>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>			<b>17</b>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>			<b>17</b>
4. Quality of Written Report:	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>			<b>5</b>
Evaluator Totals		<b>55</b>	<b>49</b>			<b>52</b>
Grand Total		Note: Sum of all individual scores.				
Technical Proposal Score		Note: Total of individual points divided by the number of evaluators ( <b>80 POINT MAXIMUM</b> ).				
Cost Propose Score		Note: ( <b>20 POINT MAXIMUM</b> )				
TOTAL						

**Request for Proposal  
Summary of Evaluation Committee Totals**

Name of RFP: <b>NSP Rate Case PA-07-776</b>						
Date:						
Technical Evaluation Criteria	80 POINTS Maximum	Vendor 1	Vendor 2	Vendor 3	Vendor 4	Vendor 5
1. Understanding of the Project	20	13				
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	17				
3. Experience and Qualifications:	20	17				
4. Quality of Written Report:	10	5				
Technical Proposal Score						
Cost Proposals Score		20				
Grand Total		72				

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM**

All proposals will be reviewed for responsiveness and then evaluated using the criteria set out herein.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATORS**

Each evaluation criterion has been assigned a specific number of points. The questions under each evaluated area help you measure the quality of the offeror's response. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

**RATING SCALE FOR ASSESSING VENDOR RESPONSES**

This rating scale is intended to establish guidelines within that range to ensure members of the RFP evaluation committee perform their evaluation with consistency. You may assign any value for a given criteria from 0 to the maximum number of points. A zero value typically constitutes no response or an inability of the vendor to meet the criterion. In contrast, the maximum value should constitute a high standard of meeting the criterion. If a specific criterion would only yield a yes or no response (e.g., offeror can submit an electronic report in required format by noon Friday), the evaluator should award either the maximum points or a zero.

For Example: "Experience and Qualifications" is an evaluation criteria receiving a weighting of 20% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 20 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

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

**COST PROPOSAL**

If offerors were required to place cost proposals in a separate sealed envelope, do not open the cost proposal until the technical proposals have been evaluated.

Not all members of the evaluation need to evaluate the cost proposal. The cost proposals may be evaluated by selected members of the evaluation committee, reviewed by group, and recorded on the evaluation summary sheets.

Any prompt payment discounts terms offered by the vendor are not taken into consideration in evaluating cost. However, the cost proposals of nonresident offerors may be adjusted by the application of preference laws, if applicable. Contact the State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683 for assistance in applying preference laws.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING**

Person or Firm Name Snively King Majoras O'Connor & Lee, Inc.

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Patrick Fahn

Date of Review 01/15/08

RFP Title/Number R.F.P. No. PK-07-776 MSP Electric Rate Increase Application

**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 <b>POINT</b> Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-5</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>6-10</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>11-15</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>16-20</b>	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 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.01

12

**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 ( <b>30 POINT</b> Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
<b>0</b>	None. Not addressed or response of no value
<b>1-7</b>	Fair. Limited applicability
<b>8-15</b>	Good. Some applicability
<b>16-23</b>	Very Good. Substantial applicability
<b>24-30</b>	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 \_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

---

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

---

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

---

**EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.02**

16

**7.03**

**Experience and Qualifications**

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

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

---

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

---

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Questions regarding the firm.**

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[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?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_

[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 \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.03**

16

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

### 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](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:

$$\frac{\text{Price of Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Price of Proposal Being Rated}} \times \text{Total Points for Cost Available} = \text{Awarded Points}$$

### COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.05

20

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 \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 7.04**

\_\_\_\_\_ 5

**7.05**

**Contract Cost**

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

**Request for Proposal  
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: <i>NSP Electric Rate Increase Application</i>		
RFP Number <i>PK-07-776</i>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <i>Snively King Majoros O'Connor &amp; Lee, Inc.</i>		
Evaluator Name: <i>Patrick Fahn</i>		
Date: <i>01/15/08</i>		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	<b>20</b>	<i>12</i>
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	<b>30</b>	<i>16</i>
3. Experience and Qualifications:	<b>20</b>	<i>16</i>
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	<b>10</b>	<i>5</i>
<b>Cost Evaluation</b> (Maximum 20 Points)  1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: <a href="http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/SSD/SPO/reciprocal_detail.shtml</a>  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	<b>20</b>	<i>20</i>
Total		