

Geotechnical Engineering Services for Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Projects – 2019 IDIQ

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND POINT ALLOCATIONS

Firm/Team Specialized Experience

0-30 points

Firm/Team shall be evaluated based on marsh creation and other coastal restoration 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. 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

0-25 points

Evaluates the professional qualifications of key personnel related to the work described in the scope of services, including academic attainment and professional achievements; and the relevant experience related to marsh creation and other coastal restoration projects performed for CPRA or similar projects performed for other agencies with emphasis on the Louisiana coastal and marine environment. While firm principals are listed, they traditionally have little involvement in the project tasks; therefore emphasis should be placed on the project managers, senior engineers, project engineers and technical staff.

Scoring Key Personnel

Very Strong	Strong	Acceptable	Weak	Very Weak
25	19	12.5	5	0

Capacity of Firm

0-15 points

Evaluates the firm/teams ability and capacity to perform multiple projects simultaneously and complete work in a timely manner. Firms with main or branch offices with geographic proximity to the Louisiana Coastal Zone that have the capacity to independently perform the work outlined in the scope of services within these offices with limited support from other offices will receive a greater allocation of points. 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
15	11	7.5	3.5	0

Capability of Firm

0-20 points

Evaluates the firm/teams ability to successfully provide geotechnical engineering services 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
20	15	10	5	0

Hudson Initiative Programs

0-10 points

Evaluates prime proposers who themselves are a Hudson Initiative small entrepreneurship certified through the Louisiana Economic Development for Small Entrepreneurship under Hudson Initiative Program or prime proposers who engage one or more subcontractors certified through the Louisiana Economic Development for Small Entrepreneurship under Hudson Initiative Program

If the Proposer is not a certified small entrepreneurship, but has engaged one (1) or more Veterans Initiative or Hudson Initiative certified small entrepreneurship(s) to participate as subcontractors, the Proposer shall provide the following information for each certified small entrepreneurship subcontractor:

- i. Subcontractor’s name;
- ii. Subcontractor’s Hudson Initiative certification;
- iii. A detailed description of the work anticipated to be performed; and
- iv. The projected percentage of the subcontract for the three-year contract term.

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.