

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: <i>Otter Tail Rate Case</i>		
RFP Number: <i>PU-08-862</i>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <i>King</i>		
Evaluator Name: <i>Diller</i>		
Date: <i>12/18/8</i>		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 70 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	20	15
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	20
3. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	4
4. Experience and Qualifications:	20	20
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> <u>Price of Proposal Being Rated</u> X 20 points = Awarded Points		
5. Cost	20	20
Total		79

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Snawely King
Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member ~~E~~ Mike Diller
Date of Review 12/16/2008
RFP Title/Number PU-08-862

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

5.01 Understanding of the Project

Maximum Point Value for this Section **20 Points**

15

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 5.01 _____

**5.02
Methodology Used for the Project**

20

Maximum Point Value for this Section **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 _____

[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 and feasible?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.02 _____

**5.03
Quality of Written Proposal**

4

Maximum Point Value for this Section **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 _____

[b] How well is the proposal defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.03 _____

**5.04
Experience and Qualifications**

20

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 _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

[g] 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 5.04 _____

**5.05
Contract Cost**

Maximum Point Value for this Section **20 Points**

20

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 5.05

79

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: <u>OTP Rate Case</u>		
RFP Number <u>08-862</u>		
Vendor Being Evaluated: <u>Snaveley</u>		
Evaluator Name: <u>Annette Bendisi</u>		
Date: <u>12/15/08</u>		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 80 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	20	16
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	25
3. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	8
4. Experience and Qualifications:	20	19
		68
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> <u>Price of Proposal Being Rated X 20 points = Awarded Points</u> <u>68,025</u>		
5. Cost	20	14
Total		82

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Sharely King Mayors O'Connor & Bedall
Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Annette Bendist
Date of Review 12/15/08
RFP Title/Number RFD NO PU-08-802

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

**5.01
Understanding of the Project**

Maximum Point Value for this Section **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 typical issues

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes

[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 5.01

16

**5.02
Methodology Used for the Project**

Maximum Point Value for this Section *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 _____

[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 and feasible?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.02

25

5.03

Quality of Written Proposal

Maximum Point Value for this Section **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 _____

[b] How well is the proposal defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.03

8

**5.04
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

[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 _____

Questions regarding the firm.

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES references - no letters

[g] 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 5.04

19

**5.05
Contract Cost**

Maximum Point Value for this Section **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

68,025

COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.05
