PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

UNDERSTANDING THE PROJECT

25% - AVAILABLE POINTS - 250

30 pts		Did the offeror follow the instructions in the RFP concerning the introduction cover letter? Does the cover letter contain the offeror's contact information; include the required business and professional license number(s); state whether or not subcontractors or a joint venture will be used, and if so, fully identify them; identify whether or not the firm qualifies for the Alaska Bidder/Alaska Offeror Preference; confirm that the offeror will comply with all provisions in the RFP; clearly acknowledge that the project completion date is a fixed date; and include a clear commitment that the offeror will be available for negotiations? (Note: If the cover letter does not contain a statement as to whether or not the offeror has a possible conflict of interest or the cover letter is not signed by an authorized company official, the proposal may be determined non-responsive and be rejected.) * This value has been assigned by the Contracting Officer prior to proposal evaluation and will be revealed after evaluations are completed.	**_Score
35 pts	2.	Is the proposal well organized and clearly understandable?	Score
25 pts	3.	Does the proposal clearly identify: the contact person, the project manager, the field supervisor, party chiefs, and the platting supervisor?	Score
65 pts	4.	Has the offeror demonstrated a clear understanding of the project goals, final product, deliverables, and does the proposal specifically address this project?	Score
25 pts	5.	Does the proposal adequately address (if applicable): platting requirements (DNR & Borough), required attendance at borough meetings, number of plat sheets, proposed plat scale, and the submittal items required for DNR review?	Score
25 pts	6.	Has the proposal addressed logistics (where relevant items to consider may include: mobilization, demobilization, lodging, transportation, communications, and field office setup)?	Score
45 pts	7.	Did the offeror identify pertinent issues, potential problems and proposed solutions?	Score
250 Total Points Sub Total			

Scoring Summary of the Understanding: (Briefly describe the strong/weak points of the proposal):

PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR THE PROJECT

40% - AVAILABLE POINTS - 400

65 pts	1.	Is the proposed methodology and work plan discussion complete, practical and feasible?	Score
65 pts	2.	Did the offeror specifically address the methodology for this project, including field and office procedures, and the configuration of administrative parcels?	Score
50 pts	3.	Did the offeror address all Tasks and Sub-Tasks as listed in Section 3.03 Deliverables?	Score
15 pts	4.	Is the proposal schedule complete and realistic?	Score
25 pts	5.	Does the proposal's work plan clearly identify an <i>estimated hours</i> of staff time expected for the fieldwork, and is the proposed time commensurate with the scope of work and complexity of the project?	Score
25 pts	6.	Does the proposal's work plan clearly identify <i>estimated hours</i> of staff time expected for computations and platting, and are the proposed times commensurate with the scope of work and complexity of the project?	Score
25 pts	7.	Does the proposal's work plan clearly identify <i>estimated hours</i> of staff expected for project management, and is the proposed time commensurate with the scope of work and complexity of the project?	Score
25 pts	8.	Does the proposal provide for adequate support in terms of personnel and time?	Score
25 pts	9.	Does the proposal clearly identify whether or not the firm proposes to complete all portions of the work without subcontractors? If the offeror proposes to subcontract, has the offeror complied with the requirements of Section 3.10 Subcontractors? Are the subcontractor and the amount and type of work being subcontracted adequately identified? (Air charter is not a subcontractor.)	Score
40 pts	10	. Does the proposal address how quality control and quality assurance will be maintained for the fieldwork?	Score

40 pts	11. Does the proposal address how quality control and quality assurance will be			
		maintained for the platting?	Score	
400 Total Points Sub Total				
Scoring proposa		mmary of the Methodology and Work Plan: (Briefly describe the strong/weak points of the		
		EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS		
		25% - AVAILABLE POINTS - 250		
40 pts	1.	Does the proposal demonstrate that the proposer has the experience necessary to successfully manage this project (the proposer's qualifications and experience items to consider <u>may</u> include: relevance to this project, previous experience with DNR, previous experience with the platting authority, how specific is the experience to this type of project, etc.)?	Score	
20 pts	2.	Do the provided examples document the expertise and experience needed to complete this project?	Score	
40 pts	3.	Are individuals with appropriate experience performing the identified tasks?	Score	
10 pts	4.	Was a work history submitted for each of the <u>key personnel</u> on the project team, including subcontractors? (For the definition of <u>key personnel</u> , see question No. 3 on page 1 of this score sheet.)	Score	
100 pts	5.	How well has the offeror performed on past survey contract projects for DNR Land Sales? (70 is average, used for proposers with no past DNR experience on DNR Land Sales)	* Score	
40 pts	6.	Proximity of the firm's office to the project site?	* Score	
		* These values have been assigned by the Contracting Officer prior to proposal evaluation and will be revealed after evaluations are completed.		
250 Total Points Sub Total				
Scoring	Sun	nmary of Experience and Qualifications: (Briefly describe the strong/weak points of the pro	posal)	

ALASKA OFFEROR PREFERENCE

10% - AVAILABLE POINTS - 100

100 pts	Does the offeror meet the requirements for an Alaska Offeror?	*
		Score
	* This value has been assigned by the Contracting Officer prior to proposal evaluation and will be revealed after evaluations are completed.	
1000 Tota	al Points Proposal Total	
Scoring S	ummary of the Proposal: (Briefly describe the strong/weak points of the proposal)	
(Please no	ote that spacing for evaluator notes has been removed.)	