

CONFIDENTIAL

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Best-Value Technical Proposal Evaluation Manual

DESIGN–BUILD PROJECT

P.I. No.

{ Proposal Due Date }

CONFIDENTIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE PROCEDURE.....	3
2.0	NON-DISCLOSURE INFORMATION & SECURITY OF WORK AREA	3
3.0	RESPONSIBILITIES	3
3.1	Evaluation Process Organization	3
3.2	Chief Engineer	4
3.3	Contracting Officer	4
3.4	Review Committee Chair Responsibilities	4
3.5	Selection Review Committee Responsibilities	5
3.6	Technical Review Committee.....	5
3.7	Technical Advisors	5
4.0	EVALUATION PROCEDURE.....	8
4.1	Technical Evaluation Procedure	7
4.2	Step 1 – Responsiveness Review: Pass/Fail Evaluation	8
4.3	Step 2 – Responsiveness Review: ATCs	8
4.4	Step 3 – Technical Proposal Review	8
4.5	Step 4 – Responsiveness Review: Technical Proposals	9
4.6	Step 5 – Technical Scoring	9
4.7	Step 6 – Oversight Review	10
4.8	Step 7 – Price Proposal Opening	10
5.0	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING.....	11

CONFIDENTIAL

FIGURES

Figure 1	Proposal Evaluation Organization
Figure 2	Evaluation Process Flow Chart

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Adjectival to Numerical Translation Table
Appendix B	Proposal Pass/Fail Checklist
Appendix C	ATC Checklist
Appendix D	Technical Review Committee Adjectival Evaluation Forms
Appendix E	Responsiveness Determination
Appendix F	Technical Review Committee Adjectival Scoring Recommendation
Appendix G	Selection Recommendation Committee Adjectival Translation and Technical Proposal Score
Appendix H	Combined Technical and Price Proposal Score Calculation

ACRONYMS

ATC	Alternative Technical Concept
CO	Contracting Officer
GDOT	Georgia Department of Transportation
ITP	Instructions to Proposers
RCC	Review Committee Chair
RFP	Request for Proposal
SRC	Selection Review Committee
TA	Technical Advisors
TPC	Technical Proposal Coordinator
TRC	Technical Review Committee
TSP	Office of Transportation Services Procurement

CONFIDENTIAL

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE PROCEDURE

This document provides the methodology and criteria for evaluation of the Proposals received in response to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Design-Build Project (Project) issued by the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) on .

The purpose of this Proposal Evaluation Plan is to provide a fair and uniform basis for the evaluation of the Proposals in accordance with GDOT’s enabling legislation, GDOT policies and the RFP.

2.0 NON-DISCLOSURE INFORMATION & SECURITY OF WORK AREA

This Proposal Evaluation Plan, and the evaluation materials, are sensitive information and shall not be publicly disclosed unless otherwise provided by statute, regulation or required by court order. It is particularly important that any information designated as “proprietary” by any respondent be carefully guarded to avoid release of information contained in such documents. Each person with access to the Proposals, including the Selection Review Committee (SRC), Technical Review Committee (TRC), and the Technical Advisors (TA) will be required to complete and sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

No information regarding the contents of the Proposals, the deliberations by the SRC, TRC, or TA, recommendations to the Chief Engineer, or other information relating to the evaluation process will be released or be publicly disclosed without the authorization of the Review Committee Chair (RCC). Additionally, no internal GDOT discussions related to these materials will be held outside the evaluation meetings described within this manual.

All requests made for information pertaining to this process shall be forwarded to the CO. The CO will be responsible for all communication outside the Proposal Evaluation and Technical Review Organization.

The Technical Proposal Coordinator (TPC) or the CO will obtain private meeting rooms for all discussions pertaining to evaluation of the Proposals. The SRC and TRC committees may meet in separate rooms to discuss the Proposals. Only CO, SRC, TRC, and TA members will be authorized admittance to these rooms. TAs will only be allowed in the TRC meeting room when specifically directed by the RCC or the CO. If a situation arises that requires an individual who is not a member of the SRC, TRC, or TA to be admitted to the meeting rooms (unless allowed under Section 4.6), all discussions will be discontinued and all paperwork either properly stored or otherwise safeguarded until such personnel have departed the room.

When working with the Technical Proposals and evaluation materials, each member shall keep all of the materials under their direct control and secure from others not associated with the evaluation process. At all other times, the materials shall be locked in a secured area. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, all materials (including work papers) shall be returned to the CO unless otherwise authorized by the CO.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Evaluation Process Organization

The chart shown in Figure 1 represents the Proposal evaluation organization for the Project. The RCC must approve justifications for additions or changes to this Organization.

CONFIDENTIAL

3.2 Chief Engineer

The Chief Engineer and/or designee will have responsibilities and duties that will include, but are not limited to:

- Concurring with SRC and TRC members.
- Observing the public price proposal opening process.
- Calculating the Combined Score calculation for each Proposal by adding the Proposal Price Score to the Technical Proposal Score.

3.3 Contracting Officer

A Contracting Officer will oversee the Best Value Proposal Evaluation.

The CO or designee shall:

- Be charged with being the point of contact during the procurement process.
- Be charged with observing the process used by the TRC and providing support, as necessary, during the Proposal review process.
- Be responsible for securing written Non-Disclosure Agreements from the SRC, TRC and TA prior to beginning the Proposal evaluation process.
- Submit written requests for clarification to Proposers if the evaluation team determines that a Proposal contains unclear information or otherwise needs clarification.
- Verify that each Proposer's Technical Proposal does not contain any pricing information.
- Be responsible for ensuring the timely progress of the evaluation, coordinating any consensus meeting(s) or re-evaluation(s), and ensuring that appropriate records of the evaluation are maintained.

3.4 Review Committee Chair Responsibilities

The RCC or designee shall:

- Serve as a point of contact in the event a TRC member or TA has questions or encounters issues relative to the evaluation process.
- Predetermine numerical scores correlating to each adjectival score for each category of the Technical Proposal review. Numerical scores may be uniform across all categories or varied as determined by the RCC. These scores shall be determined prior to receipt of the Technical Proposals and will be in general conformance with the score ranges provided in the Instructions to Proposers (ITP).
- Confirm that each Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) that is incorporated in the Proposal is incorporated properly.
- Sit on the SRC and TRC.
- Designate members of the SRC and TRC, along with other personnel.

CONFIDENTIAL

- Coordinate and facilitate the participation of TA, as necessary, during the course of the evaluation and selection process.
- If necessary, issue a report to the Chief Engineer or designee stating any deviations by GDOT relative to the evaluation methodology as stated in this document.
- Recommend for approval by the Chief Engineer a substitution and/or supplementation of evaluation personnel if a TRC member is unable to complete his/her responsibilities, or if additional TRC members are necessary to evaluate the Proposals more thoroughly.
- Have the authority, with the concurrence of the CO, to deviate from any procedure as prescribed herein as long as said deviations do not otherwise violate the applicable law. The change or modification should be documented in a report to the Chief Engineer.
- Make certain that each TRC member individually reviews and assesses each Proposer's Technical Proposal using the overall criteria set forth in this Proposal Evaluation Plan.
- Be responsible for securing the evaluation materials at the conclusion of the project evaluation.

3.5 Selection Review Committee Responsibilities

The SRC shall:

- Review the adjectival score recommendations and comments from the TRC.
- Finalize the adjectival scores based on the adjectival score recommendations from the TRC.
- Assign the predetermined numerical scores to the finalized adjectival scores.

3.6 Technical Review Committee

The TRC, a three to five member voting committee, will perform the Technical Proposal evaluation and scoring.

- Each TRC member will perform an independent review of each Technical Proposal submitted. All TRC members will have a recommended adjectival score for each proposer.
- The TRC will meet and discuss the scores and have the opportunity to modify their individual scores and comments.
- The TRC will develop a consensus adjectival score and the TRC Chair shall present this as a formal recommendation to the SRC.

3.7 Technical Advisors

- The TA(s) will serve as advisors to the TRC. Only the TRC will provide adjectival scores recommendations and comments for the Proposals. The TA may consist of GDOT employees or consultant support acting on behalf of GDOT.

CONFIDENTIAL


- The TA will participate in meetings with the TRC, as needed, to provide input into the evaluation process.

3.8 Technical Proposal Coordinator

- The TPC will be assigned by the RCC and will assist the CO and RCC in coordinating the reviews of the Technical Proposals.
- The TPC may perform other duties as requested by the RCC or CO.

CONFIDENTIAL

FIGURE 1 – PROPOSAL EVALUATION ORGANIZATION



CONFIDENTIAL

4.0 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The Proposals will arrive in three separate Volumes: the first Volume will be marked Administrative Information, the second Volume will be marked Technical Proposal, and the third Volume will be marked Price Proposal. The Price Proposals will remain unopened until the Technical Evaluation process has been completed and all Technical Proposals have been scored by the SRC. The Technical and Price Proposals will remain separated until the Technical Proposal scores are submitted to the CO or designee prior to the Price Proposals opening. Volume 1 with the Administrative Information will be evaluated by the CO and other required GDOT personnel.

The following presents a general framework for the organization of the SRC and TRC and the methodology for scoring the Proposals in relation to the information that was requested in the RFP.

4.1 Technical Evaluation Procedure

The following steps summarize the general procedures for the Technical Proposal evaluation:

- *Step 1 – Responsiveness Review: Pass/Fail Evaluation.* The CO will review the Technical Proposals for responsiveness and make a recommendation to the RCC and TRC Chair who will distribute to the TRC for consideration (copies will also be provide the SRC at this time).
- *Step 2 – Responsiveness Review: ATCs:* The RCC or designee will review whether the Proposer properly incorporated any ATCs into its Technical Proposal and make a recommendation to the TRC for consideration.
- *Step 3 – Technical Proposal Review:*
 - The TRC and TA will review the Technical Proposals.
- *Step 4 – Responsiveness Review: Technical Proposals:*
 - The TRC will determine if each Technical Proposal is responsive to the RFP.
- *Step 5 – Technical Scoring*
 - The TRC will separately determine the adjectival Technical Proposal scores and then develop one consensus adjectival score for recommendation to the SRC
 - The SRC will review the TRC’s adjectival score recommendations and Proposal comments, and facilitate discussion with TRC members as necessary.
 - The SRC will then finalize the adjectival scores and translate them into the pre-assigned, correlated numerical scores from the previously completed Appendix A.

CONFIDENTIAL

- *Step 6 – Oversight Review*
 - The RCC will compile the final scores. Scores are final and not subject to modification by an outside party.
 - The RCC will present a summary of the Technical Proposal scores to the CO and the Chief Engineer.
- *Step 8 – Price Proposal Opening:*
 - The CO or designee will publicly open the Price Proposals and determine the combined score of each Proposal and announce the Highest Combined Scoring Proposal.

4.2 Step 1 – Responsiveness Review: Pass/Fail Evaluation

The CO, in coordination with the RCC or other designee, will review the Technical Proposals for responsiveness to the RFP requirements by completing and forwarding Appendix B for each Technical Proposal to the RCC. The CO will also report his/her findings to the TRC.

If a Proposal obtains an initial non-responsive determination, the CO may issue requests for clarification or supplemental information from the Proposer to support a subsequent responsive or passing rating.

If a Proposal fails to achieve a passing score on any of the pass/fail portions of the evaluation, refer to Step 4 – Responsiveness Review: Technical Proposal.

4.3 Step 2 – Responsiveness Review: ATCs

The RCC and/or designee will complete Appendix C for each Technical Proposal to verify that any ATCs included in the Technical Proposal were properly incorporated. The RCC reserves the right to request clarifications from Proposer if incorporation of an ATC is unclear.

4.4 Step 3 – Technical Proposal Review

The TRC and TA will conduct the Technical Proposal review and evaluation. The following procedures outline the process to be followed during Step 3 of the evaluation process.

- The CO and RCC will hold a Proposal evaluation kick-off meeting to review the Instruction to Proposers (ITP) and the Technical Proposal Evaluation Manual with the TRC and TA.
- Following the kick-off meeting the TRC members and TA will independently review the Proposal materials. TRC members may begin drafting comments on the forms in Appendix D, make notes in Proposals, or formulate clarification questions. No discussions regarding the Proposal contents shall occur during this initial review, unless authorized by the RCC. TRC members may take notes on separate pieces of paper or request additional forms from the RCC. However, all notes must be included with the Evaluation Manual at the conclusion of the Proposal review process.

CONFIDENTIAL

- The TRC members may provide written clarification questions to the RCC to request a clarification notice be sent to a Proposer.
- The CO will assign each TRC member with a unique identification number. The TRC members shall use only their unique identification number, not their names, on all forms. The CO will maintain a log detailing TRC members and their corresponding identification numbers.

4.5 Step 4 – Responsiveness Review: Technical Proposals

The TRC will meet and discuss the overall responsiveness of each Proposer to the RFP. A Proposal will be determined as Responsive **unless**:

- The Proposal does not receive a “pass” in Step 1 (Responsiveness Review: Pass/Fail Evaluation) or Step 2 (Responsiveness Review: ATCs).
- The Proposal contains a major defect or defects that, in GDOT’s sole discretion, would significantly violate an RFP requirement.
- The Proposer places any condition on the Proposal.

The TRC shall vote orally on the responsiveness of each Technical Proposal. The RCC shall record the results on the form provided in Appendix E. A responsive Proposal will receive 50 points. A Technical Proposal shall be deemed non-responsive if at least 2/3 (66%) of the TRC members vote in favor of declaring a proposal non-responsive.

If a Proposal is deemed non-responsive, TRC may request, through the RCC and subsequently the CO, clarification or supplemental information from the Proposer to support a subsequent responsiveness determination. The CO will obtain the requested information from the Proposer. The CO will review the clarification received and provide the TRC with information relevant to the question of responsiveness.

If a Proposal is deemed non-responsive by the TRC, the TRC shall document the reasons to the RCC. The RCC will recommend the non-responsive determination to the Chief Engineer or designee. The Chief Engineer or designee shall review and concur with the TRC non-responsive recommendation. The CO shall notify the Proposer that their Proposal has been determined to be non-responsive. The Proposer will not receive a stipend unless the Proposal is deemed responsive.

4.6 Step 5 – Technical Scoring

- The TRC will develop adjectival scores and Proposal comments, the TRC members and CO will meet to discuss the score recommendations and the contents of the Proposals. After all discussions have ended, each TRC member will independently record his/her final comments on the evaluation forms included in Appendix D. Evaluation comments shall be specific and not generalized.
- The TRC will then complete the Evaluator Scoring Sheet in Appendix F by providing a consensus adjectival score for each review category for each Proposer.

CONFIDENTIAL

- The RCC will convene with the SRC and review the adjectival score recommendations and comments from the TRC. The TRC members may be asked to participate in the SRC scoring meeting to provide explanation for their scores or comments. The SRC will then finalize the adjectival scores, translate the scores from adjectival to numerical scores and average the numerical scoring percentages, and then convert the percentages into numerical points based on the points assigned to each category and total the number of points for each Proposer using Appendix G.
- The RCC shall keep a log of the identification of each TRC member.

4.7 Step 6 – Oversight Review


- The RCC and the CO will submit the results shown in Appendix G to the Chief Engineer.
- The Chief Engineer will review the results. The members of the TRC and SRC shall be available to address questions or comments regarding the scoring. The scores shall be considered final if the Chief Engineer concurs with the results.

4.8 Step 7 – Price Proposal Opening

- On the Price Proposal opening date, the CO or designee will publically announce the Technical Proposal score for each Proposal, and will publicly open the Price Proposals, determine the Price Proposal score, and add the Price Proposal score to the Technical Proposal score to obtain the combined score of each Proposal. The CO or designee may use a spreadsheet similar to Appendix H.
- After the combined scores are determined and the Highest Combined Score announced, the Price Proposal and supporting documentation from Volume 1 of the Highest Combined Scoring Proposal will be submitted to the bid review committee for review and the determination for award.

CONFIDENTIAL

FIGURE 2 –EVALUATION PROCESS FLOW CHART



CONFIDENTIAL

5.0 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORING

The TRC will review the Technical Proposals, along with the adjectival score recommendations and comments prepared by the TA, according to the criteria set forth in the RFP. Each TRC member will then adjectivally evaluate each of the review categories. Proposal elements will initially be given a qualitative adjectival rating using the Qualitative Rating Guide.

QUALITATIVE RATING GUIDE

ADJECTIVE	DESCRIPTION	PERCENT OF MAXIMUM SCORE
Excellent (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal demonstrates an approach with <u>unique or innovative</u> methods of approaching the proposed work with an <u>exceptional level of quality</u>. Proposal contains <i>many significant strengths and few minor weaknesses, if any</i>. There is <u>very little risk</u> that the Proposer would fail to satisfy the requirements of the design-build contract. 	90 - 100 %
Very Good (VG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal demonstrates an approach offering <u>unique or innovative</u> methods of approaching the proposed work. Proposal contains <i>many strengths that outweigh the weaknesses</i>. There is <u>little risk</u> that the Proposer would fail to satisfy the requirements of the design-build contract. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor and can be readily corrected. 	80 - 90 %
Good (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal demonstrates an approach that offers an <u>adequate level of quality</u>. Proposal contains <i>strengths that are balanced by the weaknesses</i>. There is <u>some probability of risk</u> that the Proposer may fail to satisfy some of the requirements of the design-build contract. Weaknesses are minor and can be corrected. 	70 - 80 %
Fair (F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal demonstrates an approach that <u>marginally meets</u> RFP requirements and/or objectives. Proposal contains <i>weaknesses that are not offset by the strengths</i>. There are questions about the likelihood of success and <u>there is a risk</u> that the Proposer may fail to satisfy the requirements of the design-build contract. There are significant weaknesses and very few strengths. 	50 – 70 %
Poor (P)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal demonstrates an approach that <u>does not meet the stated RFP requirements and/or objectives, lacked essential information, is conflicting, is unproductive, and/or increases</u> GDOT’s risk. Proposal contains <i>many significant weaknesses and very minor strengths, if any</i>. There is not a reasonable likelihood of success and a <u>high risk</u> that the Proposer would fail to satisfy the requirements of the design-build contract. 	0 – 50 %

CONFIDENTIAL

Strengths and weaknesses are defined as follows:

- *Strengths* – That part of the Proposal that ultimately represents a benefit to the Project and is expected to increase the Proposer’s ability to meet or exceed the RFP requirements.
- *Weaknesses* – That part of a Proposal which detracts from the Proposer’s ability to meet the RFP requirements or may result in inefficient or ineffective performance.

Once the TRC members assign consensus adjectival ratings to each Proposal scoring category, the SRC will convene, finalize the adjectival scores and convert the ratings to a predetermined numerical value for the purpose of arriving at the official technical score for the Proposal.

The progression of scoring from Poor to Fair to Good to Very Good to Excellent will reflect the aggressiveness of the Proposer’s unique and innovative ideas to bring GDOT increased benefit, advantage, quality and overall best value.

The Technical Proposal will account for one-hundred (100) percent of the total technical score.

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX A

ADJECTIVAL TO NUMERICAL TRANSLATION TABLE

CONFIDENTIAL

Adjective Rating	Points Range	Description	Assigned Numerical Value
Excellent (+)	90% - 100%	The Proposal exceeds in a significant manner stated requirements in a beneficial way, providing advantages, benefits or added value to the Project, and provides a consistently outstanding level of quality.	
Excellent			
Very Good (+)	80% - 90%	The Proposal exceeds the stated requirements in a beneficial way, providing advantages, benefits or added value to the Project, and offers a significantly better than acceptable quality.	
Very Good			
Good (+)	70% - 80%	The Proposal comfortably meets the stated requirements, provides some advantages, benefits or added value to the Project and offers a generally better than acceptable quality.	
Good			
Fair (+)	50% - 70%	Proposer has demonstrated an approach which is considered to marginally meet stated requirements and meets a minimum level of quality.	
Fair			
Poor (+)	0% - Failing	Proposer has demonstrated an approach which contains significant weaknesses/deficiencies and/or unacceptable quality.	
Poor			

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX B

PROPOSAL PASS/FAIL CHECKLIST

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Evaluator: _____

Proposal Pass/Fail Task	Pass	Fail
Business form of Proposer and team members shall meet the Project requirements and documentation is properly submitted. (ITP 5.1.2)		
An individual or a design-build firm identified in the Proposal shall not have changed since submission of the Proposer's SOQ, or Proposer shall have previously advised GDOT of a change and received GDOT's prior written approval thereto. (ITP 2.1)		
Proposer has delivered commitment letters from a Surety or an insurance company meeting the requirements of the ITP, indicating that the Surety will issue a Payment and Performance Bond and Warranty Bond, as required by the ITP, if Proposer is awarded the Contract. (ITP 5.6)		
Information Submittal Requirements		
Technical Proposal is in the format as required in Exhibit C of the ITP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 30 pages (single-sided) maximum (excluding Executive Summary, covers, dividers, and appendices) 		
Proposer information, certifications, and documents as listed in Exhibit B are included in the Proposal and are complete, accurate, and responsive, and they do not identify any material adverse changes from the information provided in the SOQ. Required forms: (separately sealed from Technical Proposal) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Form A</u>: Proposal Letter, including authorization to execute proposal. If joint venture, <u>Form A</u> must be signed by all JV members ✓ <u>Form B</u>: Non-Collusion Affidavit ✓ <u>Form C</u>: Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement ✓ <u>Form G</u>: Form of Participating Members, Major Non-Participating Members and Key Personnel Commitment ✓ <u>Form H</u>: Equal Employment Opportunity Certification ✓ <u>Form J</u>: Buy America Certification ✓ <u>Form K</u>: Use of Contract Funds for Lobbying Certification ✓ <u>Form L</u>: Debarment and Suspension Certification ✓ <u>Form N</u>: Work Product Assignment and Assumption ✓ <u>Form R</u>: Georgia Security and Immigration and Compliance Act Affidavit ✓ <u>Form S</u>: Opinion of Counsel (for Single Purpose Entities or Joint Ventures only) ✓ <u>Form T</u>: Drug Free Workplace 		
Proposer information, certifications, and documents as listed in Exhibit C are included in the Proposal and are complete, accurate, and responsive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Preliminary Schedule/Construction Phasing Plan</u> ✓ <u>Traffic Control Approach</u> ✓ <u>Project Management and Approach with Organizational Chart/Table</u> ✓ <u>DBE Participation Approach</u> 		
Proposer Price Proposal submitted separately and labeled appropriately.		

Note: P= Pass; F = Fail, NA = Not Applicable

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX C

ATC CHECKLIST

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____ Evaluator: _____

ATC No.	ATC Description	Approval Status	GDOT Approval Letter Included	ATC Submittal Included	All Conditions Capable of Being Met in Technical Proposal Have Been Met	Pass/Fail
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX D

**TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE AND
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
ADJECTIVAL EVALUATION FORMS**

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Subcommittee/Evaluator No: _____

{Reference scoring criteria heading}

Excellent **Very Good** **Good** **Fair** **Poor**

<i>{Reference scoring criteria subheading here, if applicable}</i>	Comment / Finding
<i>{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}</i>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Subcommittee/Evaluator No: _____

{Reference scoring criteria heading}	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	
<i>{Reference scoring criteria subheading here, if applicable}</i>	Comment / Finding
<i>{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}</i>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Subcommittee/Evaluator No: _____

{Reference scoring criteria heading}

Excellent **Very Good** **Good** **Fair** **Poor**

<i>{Reference scoring criteria subheading here, if applicable}</i>	Comment / Finding
{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}	
{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}	
{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}	

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Subcommittee/Evaluator No: _____

{Reference scoring criteria heading}	
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	
<i>{Reference scoring criteria subheading here, if applicable}</i>	Comment / Finding
<i>{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}</i>	

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Subcommittee/Evaluator No: _____

{Reference scoring criteria heading}

Excellent **Very Good** **Good** **Fair** **Poor**

<i>{Reference scoring criteria subheading here, if applicable}</i>	Comment / Finding
<i>{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}</i>	
<i>{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}</i>	

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX E

RESPONSIVENESS DETERMINATION

CONFIDENTIAL

Technical Review Committee	Proposers		
	{Insert Proposer Name}	{Insert Proposer Name}	{Insert Proposer Name}
Evaluator 1			
Evaluator 2			
Evaluator 3			
Evaluator 4			
Evaluator 5			
Evaluator 6			
Pass/Fail			{Revise proposer columns and member rows as applicable}

R = Responsive

NR = Non-Responsive

NOTE: 2/3 Majority of Evaluators voting NR needed for non-responsive determination

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX F

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE ADJECTIVAL
SCORING RECOMMENDATION**

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Selection Review Committee Adjectival Scoring

For each scoring criteria mark the adjectival score and if appropriate circle the + or -

{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria fourth bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Selection Review Committee Adjectival Scoring

For each scoring criteria mark the adjectival score and if appropriate circle the + or -

{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria fourth bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer: _____

Selection Review Committee Adjectival Scoring

For each scoring criteria mark the adjectival score and if appropriate circle the + or -

{Insert scoring criteria first bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria second bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria third bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
{Insert scoring criteria fourth bullet or paragraph here}	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Poor (+) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX G

**SELECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE ADJECTIVAL
TRANSLATION AND TECHNICAL PROPSAL SCORE**

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer:

Evaluation Category	SRC Adjectival Score	Adjectival to Numerical Translation	Max Score	Proposal Scores
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}	N/A	N/A	110	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}			50	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}			70	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}	N/A	N/A	20	

Proposer:

Evaluation Category	SRC Adjectival Score	Adjectival to Numerical Translation	Max Score	Proposal Scores
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}	N/A	N/A	110	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}			50	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}			70	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}	N/A	N/A	20	

Proposer:

Evaluation Category	SRC Adjectival Score	Adjectival to Numerical Translation	Max Score	Proposal Scores
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}	N/A	N/A	110	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}			50	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}			70	
{SCORING CRITERIA HEADING}	N/A	N/A	20	

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX H

**COMBINED TECHNICAL AND PRICE SCORE
CALCULATION**

CONFIDENTIAL

Proposer	Technical Proposal Score	Price Proposal Score	Combined Score (Price Score + Technical Proposal Score)
{Insert Proposer Name}		\$	
{Insert Proposer Name}		\$	
{Insert Proposer Name}		\$	
{Insert Proposer Name}		\$	
{Insert Proposer Name}		\$	{Revise proposer rows as applicable}