

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

Name of RFP: 408.08.11.005 Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. Advance Determination of Prudence						
Date:						
Technical Evaluation Criteria	100 POINTS Maximum	Vendor 1 LaCapra	Vendor 2 Vandage	Vendor 3 Power system	Vendor 4	Vendor 5
1. Understanding of the Project	30					
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30					
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30					
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10					
Grand Total		83.3	80	77.67		

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Totals**

Name of RFP:							
Name of Offeror: <i>haCapra Associates</i>							
Date:							
Technical Evaluation Criteria	100 POINTS Maximum	Evaluator <i>Mike</i>	Evaluator <i>Chris</i>	Evaluator <i>Mark</i>	Evaluator	Evaluator	
1. Understanding of the Project	30	<i>28</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>24</i>			
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	<i>22</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>24</i>			
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	<i>29</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>25</i>			
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	<i>8</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>7</i>			
Evaluator Totals		<i>87</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>80</i>			
Grand Total		Note: Sum of all individual scores.				<i>850</i>	
Total Technical Proposal Score		Note: Total of individual points divided by the number of evaluators (100 POINT MAXIMUM).				<i>83</i>	<i>3</i>

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name La Capra Associates

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Diller

Date of Review 9/26/11

RFP Title/Number MDU Gas Turbine / 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Good

[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 Yes

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.03

28

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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, but limited. Proposal focuses more on qual. + experience.

[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

Yes

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Not Specified as in Vantage Proposal

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04

22

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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

Very

Questions regarding the firm.

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

Yes

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Hard to Tell

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[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 N/A

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.05

29

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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

Good

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Good

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes

8

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number		
Vendor Being Evaluated:		
Evaluator Name:		
Date:		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	28
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	22
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	29
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	8
Total		<u>87</u>

87

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 30% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 30 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0-6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7-12	Fair. Limited applicability
13-18	Good. Some applicability
19-24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25-30	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 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name La Capra Associates

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Mark Gruman

Date of Review 9/22/2011

RFP Title/Number 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] 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 6.03 _____

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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 _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04 _____

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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 6.05 _____

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: MDU ADP SCCT		
RFP Number 408.08.11.005		
Vendor Being Evaluated: La Capra Associates		
Evaluator Name: Mark Gruman		
Date: 9/22/2011		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	24
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	24
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	25
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	7
Total		80

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 30% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 30 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0-6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7-12	Fair. Limited applicability
13-18	Good. Some applicability
19-24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25-30	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 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name La Capra Associates

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Chris Marchi

Date of Review 9-21-11

RFP Title/Number MDU ADP 409.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] 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 6.03 _____

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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 _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04 _____

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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 6.05 _____

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: MDU ADP Application		
RFP Number 408.08.11.005		
Vendor Being Evaluated: La Capra Associates		
Evaluator Name: Chris Marohl		
Date: 9-21-11		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	28
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	26
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	22
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	7
Total		83

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Totals**

Name of RFP:							
Name of Offeror: <u>Vantage Energy Consulting</u>							
Date:							
Technical Evaluation Criteria	100 POINTS Maximum	Evaluator <u>Mike</u>	Evaluator <u>Chris</u>	Evaluator <u>Mark</u>	Evaluator	Evaluator	
1. Understanding of the Project	30	24	28	24			
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	21	26	24			
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	23	26	23			
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	7	6	8			
Evaluator Totals		75	86	79			
Grand Total		Note: Sum of all individual scores.				240	
Total Technical Proposal Score		Note: Total of individual points divided by the number of evaluators (100 POINT MAXIMUM).				80	

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Vantage Energy Consulting

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Diller

Date of Review 9/26/11

RFP Title/Number MDU Gas Turbine / 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Good

[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 Not Addressed

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.03

24

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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, but better breakdown of tasks w/b to follow IRP breakdown: Load, Supply

[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

Not addressed

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04

21

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

Questions regarding the personnel.

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Tatan AQCS + Kentucky AQCS
Mr. Buechel worked develop IRP Reg. in KY

[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

Good

Questions regarding the firm.

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

Limited

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES References

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES yes

[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 N/A

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.05

23

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 Typos but well written

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Good

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

7

Request for Proposal Evaluation Summary

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number		
Vendor Being Evaluated:		
Evaluator Name:		
Date:		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	24
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	28
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	23
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	7
Total		<hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <u>75</u>

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 30% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 30 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0-6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7-12	Fair. Limited applicability
13-18	Good. Some applicability
19-24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25-30	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 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Vantage Energy Consulting, LLC

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Mark Gruman

Date of Review 9/22/2011

RFP Title/Number 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] 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 6.03 _____

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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 _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04 _____

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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 6.05 _____

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: MDU ADP SCCT		
RFP Number 408.08.11.005		
Vendor Being Evaluated: Vantage Energy Consulting, LLC		
Evaluator Name: Mark Gnuman		
Date: 9/22/2011		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	24
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	24
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	23
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	8
Total		79

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 30% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 30 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0-6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7-12	Fair. Limited applicability
13-18	Good. Some applicability
19-24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25-30	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 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Vantage Energy Consulting, LLC
 Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Chris Marohl
 Date of Review 9-21-11
 RFP Title/Number MDU ADP 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] 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 6.03 _____

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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 _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04 _____

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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 6.05 _____

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: MDU ADP Application		
RFP Number 408-08-11.005		
Vendor Being Evaluated: Vantage Energy Consulting, LLC		
Evaluator Name: Chris Marohl		
Date: 9-21-11		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	28
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	26
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	26
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	6
Total		86

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Totals**

Name of RFP:							
Name of Offeror: <u>Power System Engineering</u>							
Date:							
Technical Evaluation Criteria	100 POINTS Maximum	Evaluator <u>Mike</u>	Evaluator <u>Chris</u>	Evaluator <u>Mark</u>	Evaluator	Evaluator	
1. Understanding of the Project	30	22	28	23			
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	23	26	24			
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	18	22	24			
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	8	8	7			
Evaluator Totals		71	84	78			
Grand Total		Note: Sum of all individual scores. <u>233</u>					
Total Technical Proposal Score		Note: Total of individual points divided by the number of evaluators (100 POINT MAXIMUM). <u>77.67</u>					

71

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Power System Engineering
Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Diller
Date of Review 9/26/11
RFP Title/Number MDU Gas Turbine / 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] Has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Good

[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 Not addressed

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Yes

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.03

22

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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

Not Addressed

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Experience / References

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04

23

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

Questions regarding the personnel.

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Some - IRP's, Nuclear IRP

[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 Good

Questions regarding the firm.

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Provided Reference

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES ~~3~~. Can't Tell

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

[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 N/A

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.05

18

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 Good

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Good

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES Yes

8

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number		
Vendor Being Evaluated:		
Evaluator Name:		
Date:		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	22
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	23
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	18
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	8
Total		<u>71</u>

71

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 30% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 30 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0-6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7-12	Fair. Limited applicability
13-18	Good. Some applicability
19-24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25-30	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 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Power System Eng, Inc.
Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Mark Gruman
Date of Review 9/22/2011
RFP Title/Number 409.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] 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 6.03 _____

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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 _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04 _____

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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 6.05 _____

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: MDU ADP SCCT		
RFP Number 408.08.11.005		
Vendor Being Evaluated: Power System Engineering, Inc.		
Evaluator Name: Mark Guman		
Date: 9/22/2011		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	23
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	24
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	24
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	7
Total		78

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 30% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 30 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0-6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7-12	Fair. Limited applicability
13-18	Good. Some applicability
19-24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25-30	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 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name Power System Engineering, Inc.
 Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member Chris March
 Date of Review 9-21-11
 RFP Title/Number MDU ADP 408.08.11.005

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

6.03 Understanding of 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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] 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 6.03 _____

6.04 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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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 _____

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

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 - 6	None. Not addressed or response of no value
7 - 12	Fair. Limited applicability
13 - 18	Good. Some applicability
19 - 24	Very Good. Substantial applicability
25 - 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.

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 6.05 _____

5.04 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 - 2	None. Not addressed or response of no value
3 - 4	Fair. Limited applicability
5 - 6	Good. Some applicability
7 - 8	Very Good. Substantial applicability
9 - 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 completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

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

EVALUATOR'S NOTES _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP: MDU ADP Application		
RFP Number 408.08.11.005		
Vendor Being Evaluated: Power System Engineering, Inc.		
Evaluator Name: Chris Marohl		
Date: 9-21-11		
Technical Evaluation (Maximum 100 Points)	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Understanding of the Project	30	28
2. Methodology Used for the Project:	30	26
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	22
4. Quality of Written Proposal:	10	8
Total		84