

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM
RFP 2016-0500-2933
Alaska School Bus Inspection Program

ALL PROPOSALS WILL BE REVIEWED FOR RESPONSIVENESS
THEN EVALUATED USING THE CRITERIA SET OUT HEREIN.

Person or Firm Name _____
Name of PEC Member _____
Date of Review _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND CONTRACTOR SELECTION

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

7.01 UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROJECT (3 PERCENT)

A: MAX SCORE OF 70 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: .

$(B/A) \times 3 =$ SCORE FOR THIS SECTION ____

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

1. How well has the offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding of the purpose and scope of the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

2. How well has the offeror identified pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

3. To what degree has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables the state expects it to provide?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

4. Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the state's time schedule and can meet it?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

5. Has the offeror provided a draft schedule that meets the timeline?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

6. Has the offeror described a fictitious sample report? If so, how well does this sample report demonstrate an understanding of the program and its deliverables?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7. Has the offeror described a fictitious entrance conference that you would hold upon arriving at a location? If so, how well does this fictitious entrance conference demonstrate an understanding of the program and its deliverables?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7.02 METHODOLOGY USED FOR THE PROJECT (6 PERCENT)

A: MAX SCORE OF 70 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION:

$(B/A) \times 6 =$ SCORE FOR THIS SECTION _____

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?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

2. Overall, how well does the methodology match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

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

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

4. How well does the explanation of how and when the offeror would notify bus owners of their scheduled inspection match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

5. How well does the explanation how the offeror would select the buses that will receive Combined Mechanical/Basic Safety Inspection, as referred to in §4.01 match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

6. How well does the offerors description of how they would conduct a preventative maintenance records review match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7. How well does the offerors description of the sequence of items to be inspected if they were conducting a combined basic safety/mechanical inspection and who would do what if two or more inspectors were conducting a combined basic safety/mechanical inspection match and achieve the objectives set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7.03 MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE PROJECT (2 PERCENT)

A: MAX SCORE OF 80 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: _____

(B/A) x 2 = SCORE FOR THIS SECTION _____

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?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

2. How well is accountability completely and clearly defined?[Is the organization of the project team clear?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

3. How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

4. To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessary to perform the contract?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

5. Does it appear that the offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

6. Has the offeror gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7. To what degree is the proposal practical and feasible?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

8. To what extent has the offeror identified potential problems?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7.04 EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS (14 PERCENT)

A: MAX SCORE OF 220 POINTS

B: TOTAL POINTS THIS SECTION: .

(B/A) X 14= SCORE FOR THIS SECTION _____

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

Questions regarding the personnel:

1. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience on similar projects?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

2. Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the project requires?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

3. How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

4. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience working independently in a position that includes duties listed in (b), (c), and (d) of §2.08 as listed above?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

5. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience inspecting school buses or public transportation buses?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

6. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience as an Automotive or heavy duty vehicle Shop Foreman responsible for the management and operation of an equipment shop including planning, directing, coordinating and evaluating employee and shop performance as it applies to service, preventive maintenance, maintenance and repair of equipment?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

7. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience developing and conducting training programs for shop mechanics who work on large vehicles which transport passengers?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

8. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience developing and conducting training programs for shop mechanics who work on large vehicles which transport passengers?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

9. Do the individuals assigned to the project have Certification as an Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) Certified Automobile Technician, ASE Certified Master Automobile Technician, ASE Certified Medium/Heavy Truck Technician, and ASE Certified Master Medium/Heavy Truck Technician?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

10. Do the individuals assigned to the project have knowledge of Alaska and the most current National Minimum Standards for School Buses?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

11. Do the individuals assigned to the project have a thorough understanding of the Alaska Manual for School Bus Inspections and the ability to explain manual contents to bus owners, mechanics and school district personnel when asked?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

12. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience performing physically demanding work, such as standing on hard surfaces for long periods of time, crawling under vehicles, and working outside in inclement weather?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

13. Do the individuals assigned to the project have a thorough understanding of mechanical terminology common to motor carrier personnel?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

14. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience explaining thoroughly and effectively to owners and operators, procedures, requirements, and reasons for placing buses out-of service based on both national and state school bus inspection standards?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

15. Do the individuals assigned to the project have experience assisting operators in addressing problems associated with bus and records inspections?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

16. Do the individuals assigned to the project have demonstrated ability in writing and verbalizing clear, accurate, and concise communications?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

Questions regarding the firm:

17. How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

18. How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

19. Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

20. Has the firm provided a description of the equipment required to perform the services highlighting the experience the offeror has with the equipment the offeror already possesses?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

21. Has the firm provided a description of their electronic information technology capabilities including versions of hardware and software to be used in the inspection process highlighting the experience the offeror has with hardware and software that the offeror already possesses?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

22. If a subcontractor will perform work on the contract, how well do they measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

Score ☐ 1 (Did not address adequately)
☐ 5 (Addressed adequately)
☐ 10 (Exceeds adequate)

Evaluator's Notes:

THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS WILL BE SCORED BY THE PROCUREMENT OFFICER

7.05 Contract Cost (65 Percent/65 Points)

Overall, a maximum of 65% of the total evaluation points will be assigned to cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by one or more of the preferences referenced under Section 2.13.

Converting Cost to Points: The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined through the method set out in Section 2.15.

TOTAL SCORE THIS SECTION: _____

7.06 Alaska Offeror Preference (10 Percent/10 Points)

If an offeror qualifies for the Alaska Bidder Preference, the offeror will receive an Alaska Offeror Preference. The preference will be 10 percent of the total available points. This amount will be added to the overall evaluation score of each Alaskan offeror.

TOTAL SCORE THIS SECTION: _____

TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE: