

## General Engineering Services for Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority Projects – 2022 IDIQ

### EVALUATION CRITERIA AND POINT ALLOCATIONS

#### **Firm/Team Specialized Experience**

**0-40 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. Primary focus should be on prime consultants' experience to perform the major items of work however, sub-consultants experience will be considered based on the element of work identified in Standard Form CPRA 24-102.

Scoring of Firm/Team Specialized Experience

Very Strong	Strong	Acceptable	Weak	Very Weak
40	30	20	10	0

#### **Key Personnel Qualifications and Experience**

**0-30 points**

Evaluates the professional qualifications of Key Personnel identified in Form 24-102 and designated to manage and lead the performance of the work described in the scope of services, including academic attainment, professional achievements and relevant experience. Emphasis should be placed on the project managers and discipline leads most responsible for the deliverable products.

Scoring Key Personnel

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

#### **Capacity and Capability of Firm**

**0-18 points**

Evaluates the firm/team support personnel such as project engineers and technical staff. Evaluates the 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. Evaluates the firm/team 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 11).

Scoring Capacity and Capability of Firm/Team

Very Strong	Strong	Acceptable	Weak	Very Weak
18	13.5	9	4.5	0

**Veteran and Hudson Initiative Programs Participation**

**0-12 points**

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

Twelve (12) points shall be reserved for proposers who are themselves a certified Veteran Initiative small entrepreneurship or who will engage the participation of one or more certified Veteran Initiative small entrepreneurships as subcontractors.

Ten (10) points shall be reserved for proposers who are themselves a certified Hudson Initiative small entrepreneurship or who will engage the participation of one or more certified Hudson Initiative small entrepreneurships as subcontractors

If the Proposer is not a certified small entrepreneurship, but has engaged one (1) or more Veteran 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 Veteran Initiative and/or Hudson Initiative certification certificate;
- 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.