

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
EVALUATION FORM  
January 2014  
RFP No. 414055**

Firm: \_\_\_\_\_ Total Combined Score: \_\_\_\_\_

DEQ Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposal Evaluation Score \_\_\_\_\_ (total available points: 255)

Reference Check Score \_\_\_\_\_ (total available points: 90)

I. Pass / Fail (Circle one)

The two criteria below must be scored as "pass" to be eligible for further consideration.

\_\_\_\_\_ Package submitted by the deadline

\_\_\_\_\_ Package is complete (Offeror submitted information required in Section II A of RFP).

II. Personnel and Company Expertise- (Max 185 points)

a. Qualifications of company primaries (based on evaluation of resumes provided)

Pts

- 15 Superior qualifications and experience
- 10 Above average qualifications and experience
- 5 Adequate qualifications and experience
- 0 Inadequate qualifications and experience

Pts \_\_\_\_\_

b. Average years of weed control experience for key personnel (years of weed control experience divided by the number of key personnel whose primary duties are field oriented, based on the spreadsheet provided).

Pts

- 15 >5 years weed control experience
- 10 3-5 years weed control experience
- 5 <3 years of weed control experience

Pts \_\_\_\_\_

c. Percentage of field personnel that are licensed or certified applicators (based on the list of key employees, their duties, and the licensed status).

Pts

- 20 100% of field personnel certified applicators
- 15 100% of field personnel licensed applicators
- 10 >66% of field personnel licensed applicators
- 5 >33% of field personnel licensed applicators
- 0 <33% of field personnel licensed applicators

Pts \_\_\_\_\_

- d. Overall understanding of large-scale weed control programs considering variance in vegetation types, terrain, equipment/staff necessary to complete the project, etc.

Pts

- 30 Offeror's proposal shows superior knowledge of the complexities involved in large scale weed control programs.
- 20 Offeror's proposal shows excellent knowledge of the complexities involved in large scale weed control programs.
- 10 Offeror's proposal shows above average knowledge of the complexities involved in large scale weed control programs.
- 5 Offeror's proposal shows average/adequate knowledge of the complexities involved in large scale weed control programs.
- 0 Offeror's proposal shows less-than-adequate knowledge of the complexities involved in large scale weed control programs.

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- e. Understanding of weeds, treatments (chemicals and methods), and the effects of weed control on in-situ vegetation

Pts

- 30 Offeror's proposal shows superior knowledge of weeds, treatments, vegetation, etc.
- 20 Offeror's proposal shows excellent knowledge of weeds, treatments, vegetation, etc.
- 10 Offeror's proposal shows above average knowledge of weeds, treatments, vegetation, etc.
- 5 Offeror's proposal shows average/adequate knowledge of weeds, treatments, vegetation, etc.
- 0 Offeror's proposal shows less-than-adequate knowledge of weeds, treatments, vegetation, etc.

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- f. Understanding of the management of large-scale weed control programs

Pts

- 30 Offeror's proposal shows superior knowledge of resource allocation, problem solving, communication, reporting and invoicing, etc.
- 20 Offeror's proposal shows excellent knowledge of resource allocation, problem solving, communication, reporting and invoicing, etc.
- 10 Offeror's proposal shows above average knowledge of resource allocation, problem solving, communication, reporting and invoicing, etc.
- 5 Offeror's proposal shows average/adequate knowledge of resource allocation, problem solving, communication, reporting and invoicing, etc.
- 0 Offeror's proposal shows inadequate knowledge of resource allocation, problem solving, communication, reporting and invoicing, etc.

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- g. Expertise in chemical handling, storage, and disposal.

Pts

- 15 Offeror's proposal shows superior knowledge of chemical handling, storage, and disposal.
- 10 Offeror's proposal shows above average knowledge of chemical handling, storage, and disposal.
- 5 Offeror's proposal shows average/adequate knowledge of chemical handling, storage, and disposal.

0 Offeror's proposal shows inadequate knowledge of chemical handling, storage, and disposal.

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

h. Reliability in meeting timeframes.

Pts

15 Offeror's proposal shows superior reliability.

10 Offeror's proposal shows above average reliability.

5 Offeror's proposal shows average/adequate reliability.

0 Offeror's proposal shows inadequate knowledge of reliability.

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

i. Expertise in instrument calibration, instrument maintenance, quality control, quality assurance, and reporting.

Pts

15 Offeror's proposal shows superior knowledge of equipment calibration, and maintenance, quality control, quality assurance, and reporting.

10 Offeror's proposal shows above average knowledge of equipment calibration and maintenance, quality control, quality assurance, and reporting.

5 Offeror's proposal shows average/adequate knowledge of equipment calibration and maintenance, quality control, quality assurance, and reporting.

0 Offeror's proposal shows inadequate knowledge of equipment calibration and maintenance, quality control, quality assurance, and reporting.

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

III. Costs

Award 50 points if Offeror's prices are reasonable and competitive as compared to prices of other offerors responding to this RFP, and as compared to prices under previous DEQ contracts for weed control services.

Pts \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposal Evaluation Score\_\_\_\_\_**

**EVALUATION OF REFERENCES** (Maximum 90 points awarded for each reference check. Three (3) reference checks will be done. Reference Check Score equals total reference check points divided by 3.)

Each reference contacted will be asked the same questions and scored accordingly. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to submit three (3) references that are available and willing to respond to DEQ reference checks. The inability of DEQ to talk to all three references will not change scoring, the total score will be divided by three (3) no matter how many references could be contacted. DEQ will make every effort to contact three references.

Reference Contacted (name, company and phone number) \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Questions:**

- a. How would you rank the overall quality of work (including weed control and reporting) by Offeror?

Pts  
10      excellent  
7        good  
3        fair  
0        poor

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- b. How would you rank Offeror's ability to meet timelines necessary for effective weed control?

Pts  
10      timelines are consistently met  
7        timelines are usually met  
3        timelines are often not met  
0        timelines are not met

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- c. How would you rank Offeror's knowledge of chemicals, methods, vegetation reactions, etc. associated with weed control services?

Pts  
10      excellent  
7        good  
3        fair  
0        poor

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- d. Did Offeror complete requested weed control services for agreed upon prices and/or within budgets?

Pts  
10      yes  
0        no

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

- e. Did Offeror communicate effectively with you regarding work progress, problems, reporting, invoicing, etc.?

Pts  
10      yes  
0        no

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

f. How would you describe Offeror's reliability in weed control?

Pts

10 excellent  
7 good  
3 fair  
0 poor

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

g. Was the Offeror flexible enough to accommodate changing weather patterns or changing priorities and still remain effective? (i.e if the Offeror was rained out, did they move off site and not return quickly, or did they shut down temporarily, but return as conditions allowed).

Pts

10 yes  
0 no

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

h. Was the Offeror responsive to your priorities, concerns, requests, etc.? i.e. did the Offeror add additional resources if you thought the work was not getting done fast enough or if you identified additional work, would the Offeror change their schedule to accommodate your needs?

Pts

10 yes  
0 no

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

i. Would you use Offeror again?

Pts

10 yes  
0 no

Pts\_\_\_\_\_

Reference Check Score\_\_\_\_\_

Contacted By \_\_\_\_\_