

Evaluation Criteria

Engineering and Design Phase of Large Scale Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration Projects

Firm Workload Evaluation

Prior to the technical qualifications review of each proposer, CPRA will perform a workload analysis to determine the amount of work each prime proposer has received from the agency. A firm's workload with the agency will be the total amount, in dollars, that has been contracted to the firm with the last three (3) years from the advertisement date of the RSIQ. This will be inclusive of project specific awards as well as the total value of all active or closed task orders issued on retainer contracts. The Agency's Project Support section will provide contract and task value summaries for all proposers currently under contract with the agency. Point allocations for all proposers will be documented prior to the technical review. **The workload evaluation will be weighted to 10% of the firms overall score.** The following point distribution will be used:

\$0.00 - \$500,000	10 points
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	7 points
\$1,000,001 - \$1,500,000	4 points
\$1,500,001 - \$2,000,000	1 point
Greater than \$2,000,000	0 points

The workload evaluation is separate from the firm's capacity, and will not be factored into scoring of the firm's capacity during the technical qualifications review.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND POINT ALLOCATIONS

Firm/Team Specialized Experience

0-30 points

Firm/Team shall be evaluated based on project specific expertise, experience and resources related to applicable work performed for CPRA or similar projects performed for other agencies with emphasis on the Louisiana coastal and marine environment. Firm/Team should provide a general design approach and process (Standard Form CPRA 24-102, Section 10) which should reflect an understanding of the general project concepts contained within this RSIQ. Included in the approach should be roles and responsibilities of any potential subconsultants. Primary focus should be on prime consultants' experience however sub-consultants experience will be considered based on the element of work identified in Standard Form CPRA 24-102.

Scoring of Firm Experience

Very Strong	Strong	Acceptable	Weak	Very Weak
30	22.5	15	7.5	0

Key Personnel Qualifications and Experience

0-30 points

Evaluates the professional qualifications of key personnel related to the work described in the scope of services, including academic attainment, professional achievements and relevant experience. While firm principals are listed, they traditionally have little involvement in the project tasks; therefore emphasis should be placed on the project managers, project engineers and technical staff.

Scoring Key Personnel

Very Strong	Strong	Acceptable	Weak	Very Weak
30	22.5	15	7.5	0

Capacity of Firm

0-25 points

Evaluates the firm/teams ability and capacity to perform multiple projects simultaneously, complete work in a timely manner, and independently perform the general work outlined in the scope of services from a branch office independent of or with limited support from a home office. Consideration will also be given to the size of the firm/team based on the relative size of tasks anticipated to be issued under this scope.

Scoring Capacity of Firm

Very Strong	Strong	Acceptable	Weak	Very Weak
25	18.75	12.5	6.25	0

Capability of Firm

0-15 points

Evaluates the firm/teams ability to successfully provide services similar to those required by the agency. Criteria include past performance, knowledge of locality, coordination and cooperation with agency staff, ability to meet deadlines and budgets, and quality of work. The prime proposer should describe their management approach to general project work processes, resource allocation, accountability and quality control (Standard Form CPRA 24-102, Section 10).

Scoring Capability of Firm

Max	High	Medium	Low	Min
15	11.25	7.5	3.75	0

Scoring Formula

The overall final score for each proposer’s SIQ will be based on the following formula:

$$\text{Technical Review} \times (.9) + \text{Workload Evaluation} \times (.1) = \text{Total Score}$$

Suggested point allocations for each criterion are guided by the following five categories:

VERY STRONG – Firm/team’s qualifications exceeds requirements and demonstrates through accurate concise descriptions, exceptional experience the firm and the key staff have had with the disciplines of work being advertised. A thorough understanding of the relevance of the experience and high level of confidence that the goals and objectives of the contract are achievable with superb quality is demonstrated. Significant strengths exist with no weaknesses.

STRONG - Firm/team’s qualifications exceeds requirements and demonstrates, through accurate concise descriptions, good experience the firm and key staff have with the disciplines of work being advertised. There is a very good understanding of the relevance of the experience and level of confidence that the goals and objectives of the contract are achievable with high quality. The strengths outweigh any weaknesses that exist.

ACCEPTABLE - Firm/team’s qualifications meets the requirements and demonstrates, through basic general descriptions, adequate experience the firm and key staff have with the disciplines of work being advertised. There is an adequate understanding of the relevance of the experience and level of confidence that the goals and objectives of the contract can be achieved with acceptable quality. The strengths, if any, are offset with weaknesses.

WEAK - Firm/team’s qualifications do not meet the requirements and does not demonstrate adequate experience the firm and key staff have with the disciplines of work being advertised. There is doubt as to understanding the relevance of the experience and level of confidence for achieving the goals and objectives of the contract with acceptable quality. Weaknesses outweigh the strengths.

VERY WEAK - Firm/team’s qualifications do not meet the requirements and does not demonstrate adequate experience the firm and key staff have with the disciplines of work being advertised. There is no clear understanding of the relevance of the experience and no confidence that the goals and objectives of the contract can be achieved. The consultant lacks or has failed to demonstrate the required qualifications.