

# **APPENDIX A**

## **APPENDIX A PHASE 1 EVALUATION MANUAL**

### **1. GENERAL**

The purpose of this document is to establish a uniform evaluation procedure for Phase 1 of the solicitation based on contractually defined criteria. The Evaluation Team will evaluate each proposal individually using the qualitative/quantitative procedures which follow. Each proposal will be reviewed and rated by each of the evaluators. During this process, discrepancies between evaluations will be discussed and resolved within the team. Following the completion of the individual evaluations, a consensus evaluation will be derived. The results of this consensus evaluation will determine which proposals proceed into Phase 2 of the solicitation process.

### **2. EVALUATION PROCEDURES.**

- a. Security. Each evaluator is responsible for maintaining security of offerors' proposals and Government evaluation documents. No material is permitted to be removed from the evaluation room during the evaluation or after completion of the evaluation. The evaluation room will be locked when not in use. Proposals are not to be discussed outside of the evaluation room.
- b. Procurement Integrity and Non-disclosure. Evaluators must sign a non-disclosure statement as required by the procurement integrity regulations. This also applies to anyone who looks at the proposals, even if not actually involved in the evaluation process.
- c. Written Comments. Written comments are required of each evaluator identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal on the rating worksheets. These comments are essential to the Contract Specialist (CS) in preparing the Phase 1 Selection Memorandum, and debriefing of unsuccessful offerors.
- d. Additional Information. Additional information may be needed to complete the evaluation process, or to assure that all proposals in the competitive range are conforming to the Request for Proposals (RFP). The Contracting Division will request the information or clarification be provided by the offeror in writing.
- e. Prior to beginning the review or evaluation of any of the Offeror's proposals, the evaluators must familiarize themselves with the solicitation statement of work, proposal submission requirements (Section 00110) and the proposal evaluation criteria (Section 00120).
- f. Evaluators shall review and evaluate all proposals independently. No discussions of proposals between the evaluators shall take place before the final consensus discussions.
- g. Substitutions for evaluators will not be allowed once the evaluation process has begun. No consensus sessions may be held unless all evaluators are present as well as the non-rating board Chairperson.

### **3. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS**

- a. Section 00110, Proposal Submission requirements identifies all the necessary submittal information to be included in the Contractor proposals. Proposals that reach the evaluation stage have passed an initial Contracting Division review to assure that they are complete and responsive. All proposals that are provided to the evaluation team must be evaluated and rated.
- b. Past Performance Questionnaires. Each proposal shall include at least three completed questionnaires from previous offeror projects. If more than three questionnaires have been returned the evaluation team shall determine which three questionnaires are to be evaluated. If less than three questionnaires have been

returned for a particular proposal, that proposal shall receive an "NEUTRAL" rating for each of the questionnaires not received.

#### 4. INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEETS

a. On the following pages individual worksheets are provided for use by the evaluators to review and rate the individual proposals. During the consensus evaluation, a single "consensus rating" worksheet shall be completed for each proposal and signed by all the evaluators. It is imperative that all comments and supporting rationale for the rating assigned be included on this consensus sheet. Comments are required to support all ratings above or below "Satisfactory".

#### 5. RATING METHODOLOGY

a. Proposals will be evaluated in each evaluation Factor based on the following rating scheme:

<u>RATING</u>	<u>EXPLANATION</u>
Neutral Performance Risk	If an Offeror is without a record of past performance or when past performance information is not available. The offeror may not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably on past performance.
Outstanding/Very Low Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Above Average/Low Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory/Moderate Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Normal contractor emphasis should preclude any problems.
Marginal/High Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unsatisfactory/Very High Performance Risk	Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

b. Yes - No Items. Where the specific evaluation sheets indicate a YES – NO Rating these items shall be treated as informational items. They are included in the evaluation worksheets to assure a similar focus among the evaluators and to ensure that individual evaluators do not overlook proposal information provided.

#### 6. EVALUATION FACTORS

a. As indicated in Section 00120, PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND CONTRACT AWARD, the following factors will be evaluated and rated for each proposal:

FACTOR 1-1: OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE: This factor is the most important factor in the evaluation or Phase 1 proposals.

FACTOR 1-2: OFFEROR PROJECT KEY PERSONNEL: This factor is slightly less important than Factor 1-1 but represents a significant level of importance in evaluating proposals.

FACTOR 1-3: TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE: This factor is equal in importance to Factor 1-2.

FACTOR 1-4: OFFEROR RELEVANT EXPERIENCE: This factor is less important than Factor 1-2.

## **7. OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING**

a. Following completion of the consensus rating, each proposal will be assigned a single overall adjectival rating. This final overall rating will be the determinant as to which offerors proceed into Phase 2 of the solicitation. In no case will more than five (5) proposals be included in the Phase 2 process.

b. It is the responsibility of the evaluation team to provide and document sufficient strengths, weaknesses, and omissions to suitably support the assigned rating in each Factor as well as the overall Phase 1 rating. Documentation/comments are required for all ratings other than "SATISFACTORY".

c. Following the completion of the consensus discussions and rating assignments, the individual rating worksheets from each of the evaluators will be collected by the Chairperson and destroyed. Each evaluator shall sign the final rating assignment sheet.

**PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET**

**FACTOR 1-1**

**OFFEROR PAST PERFORMANCE**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

1. General: Evaluators will use this factor to evaluate the success of the offeror based on the satisfaction of previous customers and clients as illustrated on the completed questionnaires. These completed questionnaires shall be used as a basis to begin the evaluation of this factor.

Has Government Received Three Completed Questionnaires for this Offeror \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

Do All the Questionnaires Received Reflect Projects Completed Within the Last 3 Years \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

2. ACASS – CCASS Ratings: Contract Specialist shall provide ACASS and CCASS Ratings for the offeror and the principle subcontractor (design firm or construction firm) if the offeror is not a single entity. Evaluators shall list below the names of the firms reported on the resultant ratings.

Construction Rating (CCASS)

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Ratings: Outstanding \_\_\_\_\_  
Above Average \_\_\_\_\_  
Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
Marginal \_\_\_\_\_  
Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

Design Rating (ACASS)

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Ratings: Outstanding \_\_\_\_\_  
Above Average \_\_\_\_\_  
Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_  
Marginal \_\_\_\_\_  
Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

Select an appropriate overall rating for the CCASS and ACASS evaluation information available:

/\_\_ / Outstanding /\_\_ / Above Average /\_\_ / Satisfactory /\_\_ / Marginal /\_\_ / Unsatisfactory

/\_\_ / Neutral

3. Relevant Evaluator Personal Knowledge: Has this evaluator had documented personal experiences with the offeror or the prime subcontractors? If so, describe below:

4. Quality of Products Produced: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the quality of the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Quality of the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/\_\_ / Outstanding /\_\_ / Above Average /\_\_ / Satisfactory /\_\_ / Marginal /\_\_ / Unsatisfactory

/\_\_ / Neutral

4a. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to final product quality.

4b. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to final product quality.

4c. Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

5. Timeliness of Products Produced: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain customer satisfaction with the timeliness of the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Timeliness of the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/\_\_ / Outstanding /\_\_ / Above Average /\_\_ / Satisfactory /\_\_ / Marginal /\_\_ / Unsatisfactory

/\_\_ / Neutral

5a. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to timeliness.

5b. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to timeliness.

5c. Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

6. Offeror Management Processes. Offeror Management Processes will be evaluated in terms of the Offerors Documentation, Cooperation with the Customer/Client Personnel, and the Management of Subcontractors.

6a. Offeror Documentation: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the documentation, reports, and other written materials completed by the offeror on the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror Documentation Skills of the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/\_\_ / Outstanding /\_\_ / Above Average /\_\_ / Satisfactory /\_\_ / Marginal /\_\_ / Unsatisfactory

/\_\_ / Neutral

6a.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Documentation and production of written materials.

6a.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Documentation and production of written materials.

6a.3 Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

6b. Offeror Cooperation with Customer/Client Personnel: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the offeror cooperation and interactions on the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror Cooperation on the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror the and proposed project team.

/\_\_ / Outstanding /\_\_ / Above Average /\_\_ / Satisfactory /\_\_ / Marginal /\_\_ / Unsatisfactory

/\_\_ / Neutral

6b.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Customer/Client Cooperation.

6b.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Customer/Client Cooperation.

6b.3 Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

6c. Offeror Management of Subcontractors: Evaluators shall carefully review the information provided in the completed questionnaires to ascertain a level of customer satisfaction with the offeror Management of Subcontractors on the past projects. Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror Subcontractor Management Skills on the Past Completed Projects below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

/\_\_ / Outstanding /\_\_ / Above Average /\_\_ / Satisfactory /\_\_ / Marginal /\_\_ / Unsatisfactory

/\_\_ / Neutral

6c.1 Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

6c.2 Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

6c.3 Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

**Factor 1-1 Summary and Overall Rating**

<b>FACTOR 1-1 SUMMARY RATING CHART</b>			
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rating*</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1.	Questionnaire Receipt	YES NO	
2.	ACASS/CCASS Rating		
3.	Personal Experience	N/A	No rating permitted here
4.	Quality Products Produced		
5.	Timeliness of Execution		
6a.	Offeror Documentation		
6b.	Offeror Cooperation		
6c.	Offeror Subcontractor Management		
<b>OVERALL FACTOR 1-1 RATING**</b>			
<p>* Ratings may be either: Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory</p> <p>** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating.</p>			

**PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET**  
**FACTOR 1-2**  
**OFFEROR PROJECT KEY PERSONNEL**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

1. General: Evaluators will use this item to document receipt of Proposal Information with respect to Key Personnel.

Does the Proposal Include Identifications of the Key Personnel?       YES    NO

2. Key Personnel: Review and evaluate the proposed Offeror personnel to be included on this project team. Have these individuals worked Design/Build projects together previously? Do the key construction staff (superintendent, CQC, Project Manager) have experience with "fast-track" design/build projects? Are the designers of record registered professional engineers? Are the designers suitably experienced in their field to provide them a suitable level of design expertise? Based on that review, provide a rating for the Offeror proposed project team below. Include a listing of any apparent weaknesses or strengths of the offeror and the proposed project team.

Outstanding    Above Average    Satisfactory    Marginal    Unsatisfactory

Neutral

2a Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

2b Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses of the offeror with respect to Offeror Subcontractor Management.

2c Other: Include any other comments/rational to support the overall rating provided for this offeror.

**PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET**

**FACTOR 1-3**

**OFFEROR TECHNICAL APPROACH NARRATIVE**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

1. General: Evaluators will use this item to document receipt of a technical approach narrative with the Proposal Information.

Does the Proposal Include a Technical Approach Narrative?       YES    NO

2. Evaluate the Offerors described understanding the two phase Design/Build process being used in this solicitation. Does the Offeror demonstrate a suitable understanding of the process to enable him/her to adequately address and anticipate the risks associated with Design/Build processes?

Outstanding    Above Average    Satisfactory    Marginal    Unsatisfactory

Neutral

3. Evaluate the Offerors described understanding of "fast track" design construction procedures.

Outstanding    Above Average    Satisfactory    Marginal    Unsatisfactory

Neutral

4. Evaluate the Offerors described understanding of the integration of key subcontractors into the Design/Build process. Does the Offeror illustrate a clearly defined role and responsibility for each of his/her key subcontractors?

Outstanding    Above Average    Satisfactory    Marginal    Unsatisfactory

Neutral

5. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths the offeror demonstrated in the Technical Approach Narrative.

6. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses the offeror demonstrated in the Technical Approach Narrative.

7. Other: Include any other comments with respect to the Technical Approach Narrative.

**Factor 1-3 Summary and Overall Rating**

<b>FACTOR 1-3 SUMMARY RATING CHART</b>			
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rating*</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1.	Technical Approach Narrative Included in Proposal?	YES NO	
2.	Understanding of the Design/Build Process		
3.	Use of "Fast Track" Design/Build Process		
4.	Integration of Key Subcontractors		
5.	Strengths	N/A	No rating permitted
6.	Weaknesses	N/A	No rating permitted
7.	Other	N/A	No rating permitted
<b>OVERALL FACTOR 1-3 RATING**</b>			
<p>* Ratings may be either: Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory</p> <p>** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating.</p>			

**PROPOSAL RATING WORKSHEET**

**FACTOR 1-4**

**OFFEROR RELATIVE EXPERIENCE**

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

1. General: Evaluators will use this item to document receipt of example project listings with the Proposal Information.

Does the Proposal Include an Example Project Listing with Suitable Explanation?     YES     NO

2. Evaluate the Offerors provided example projects. Are these projects similar in size (cost) and complexity with this solicitation requirements? Was the Offeror in responsible charge of the example projects? Was he/she a key subcontractor?

Outstanding     Above Average     Satisfactory     Marginal     Unsatisfactory

Neutral

NOTE: IF THE OFFEROR HAS NO RELEVANT EXPERIENCE LISTED OR THE EVALUATION PANEL DETERMINES THE EXAMPLE PROJECTS PROVIDED TO NOT REPRESENT RELEVANT EXPERIENCE, THE OFFEROR MUST BE RATED AS "SATISFACTORY".

3. Strengths: Include a listing of any identified or obvious strengths the offeror demonstrated in the example projects included in the proposal.

4. Weaknesses: Include a listing of any identified or obvious weaknesses the offeror demonstrated in the example projects included in the proposal.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

**Phase 1 Summary and Overall Rating**

<b>PHASE 1 SUMMARY RATING CHART</b>			
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Rating*</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1.	Factor 1-1 Offeror Past Performance		The most important Factor.
2.	Factor 1-2 Offeror Project Key Personnel		This Factor is slightly less important than Factor 1-1
3.	Factor 1-3 Technical Approach Narrative		This Factor is slightly less important than Factor 1-1
4.	Factor 1-4 Offeror Relevant Experience		This Factor is less important than Factor 1-1
<b>OVERALL PROPOSAL RATING**</b>			
<p>* Ratings may be either: Neutral – Outstanding – Above Average – Satisfactory – Marginal – Unsatisfactory</p> <p>** Evaluators shall consider the ratings in the various items shown to determine a suitable overall rating. The overall rating cannot be an average, mode, or median of the ratings of the four factors. A final rating must be reached based on discussions and a consensus among the evaluators</p> <p>Attach additional sheets to this rating summary to provide supporting rational for assignment of ratings.</p>			

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Member 1

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Member 2

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Member 3

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Member 4

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chairperson