ATTACHMENT F: PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

All proposals will be reviewed for responsiveness and then evaluated using the criteria set out herein.

Offeror Name:	
Evaluator Name:	
Date of Review:	
RFP Number:	2523H018
Title	ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

RFP: 2523H018

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS PROPOSAL IS 1000

5.01: Understanding of the Project — 10 Percent
Maximum Point Value for this Section - 100 Points
1000 Points x 10 Percent = 100 Points
Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.
1) How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpo

How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?				
NOTES:				
How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project? NOTES:				
To what degree has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the state expects it to provide? NOTES:				
Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the state's time schedule and how they can meet it? NOTES:				

5.02: Methodology used for the Project — 20 Percent

RFP: 2522S071

Maximum Point Value for this Section - 200 Points

1000 Points x 20 Percent = 200 Points

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

1) How comprehensive is the methodology and does it depict a logical approach to fulfilling the requirements of the RFP?

NOTES:

2) How well does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

NOTES:

3) Does the methodology interface with the time schedule in the RFP?

NOTES:

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.02:

5.03: Management Plan for the Project — 20 Percent
Maximum Point Value for this Section - 200 Points
1000 Points x 20 Percent = 200 Points
Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

1)	How well does the management plan support all of the project requirements and logically lead to the deliverables required in the RFP?				
	NOTES:				
2)	How well is accountability completely and clearly defined? NOTES:				
3)	Is the organization of the project team clear?				
	NOTES:				

2

4) How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?

STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIE AMHS COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

NOTES:
To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessare to perform the contract?
NOTES:
Does it appear that the offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?
NOTES:
To what degree is the proposal practical and feasible?
NOTES:
To what extent has the offeror identified potential problems?
NOTES:

RFP: 2522S071

STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIE

AMHS COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

RFP: 2522S071

5.04: Experience and Qualifications — 20 Percent **Maximum Point Value for this Section - 200 Points** 1000 Points x 20 Percent = 200 Points Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below.

1)	Ouestions	reaardina the	nerconnel·
	Ouestions	reaarama me	bersonnei:

1)) Questions regarding the personnel:				
a) To what degree does the offered Project Manager's experience relate to the scope of services described in Section 3.01 and is that experience relevant and based on similar projects?					
NOTES:					
	b)	Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the project requires?			
	NO	TES:			
c) How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the person project?		How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?			
NOTES:					
2)	Qu	estions regarding the firm and subcontractor (if used):			
a) To what extent does the Offeror exceed the minimum required experience as defined in Sectio		To what extent does the Offeror exceed the minimum required experience as defined in Section 1.04?			
	NOTES:				
	b)	To what degree is the offeror relying on sub-contractor experience to meet the minimum required experience for the firm as described in Section 1.04?			
	TES:				
	c)	How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?			
NOTES:					

STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIE AMHS COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION

d) How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of project								
NOTES:								
e) Has th	ne firm provided letters of reference fro	m previous clients?						
NOTES:								
=	bcontractor will perform work on the co	ontract, how well do the	ey measure up to the evaluation used					
NOTES:	NOTES:							
EVALUATOR'S	S POINT TOTAL FOR 5.04:							
	SCORII	NG SUMMARY						
Section 5.01	Understanding of the Project	Max Score = 100						
Section 5.02	Methodology used for the Project	Max Score = 200						
Section 5.03	Management Plan for the Project	Max Score = 200						
Section 5.04	Experience and Qualifications	Max Score = 200						
Evaluator Tot	al Technical Score	Max Score = 700						

RFP: 2522S071