

Appendix H

Criteria for Evaluation Request for Proposals Template

PHASE 1

RFP - Evaluation/Scoring Guidelines

The evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines in awarding points to the evaluation criteria and the evaluations of the referenced questions.

Superior: 675 – 750 Points exceptional – completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFP; may provide additional information or cover areas not originally addressed within the RFP and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to Augusta, Georgia.

Good Response: 600 – 674 Points clearly meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the category or categories with no deficiencies noted.

Fair Response: 525 – 599 Points minimally meets most requirements of the RFP. Respondent/Offeror(s) demonstrated some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the category or categories, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

Failed Response: 0 – 524 Points does not meet the requirements of the RFP. Respondent/Offeror(s) has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

Note: Respondent/Offeror(s) receiving 600 or more points will be invited to do presentations to provide additional information if deemed necessary.

PHASE 2

Selection. After the deadline for the receipt of competing proposals, the Local Government shall reconvene the evaluation committee to review, evaluate and score the responses.

The criteria to be used in the evaluation of competing proposals for a qualifying project shall be determined by the evaluation committee of Augusta, Georgia prior to submitting a request for proposal for such qualifying project. The evaluation committee of the Augusta, Georgia shall establish a scoring matrix for review of responses to a request for proposal. The scoring matrix can be weighted in any fair manner to adequately assess the critical elements of a proposal, with the most likely highest weighted categories being (a) project financing and (b) qualifications and experience.

There are several factors that Augusta, Georgia may use when evaluating and selecting an unsolicited proposal, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (1) Project Financing
- (2) Qualifications and Experience
- (3) Project Characteristics
- (4) Project Benefit and Compatibility
- (5) Other Factors
- (6) References

Selection.

The evaluation committee and advisor, in consultation and upon the recommendation of the head of the using agency, shall select from among the offerors no less than three (3) offerors (the "short-listed offerors") deemed to be the most responsible and responsive; provided, however, that if three (3) or less offerors respond to the solicitation, this requirement will not apply. The selection of the short-listed offerors shall be made in order of preference. From the date proposals are received by Procurement Director through the date the contract is awarded, no offeror may make substitutions, deletions, additions or other changes in the configuration or structure of the offeror's teams or members of offeror's teams prior to award. The selection criteria shall include, but not be limited to, those contained in Senate Bill 59 - Partnership for Public Facilities and Infrastructure Act

Price information shall be separated from the proposal in a sealed envelope and opened only after the proposals have been reviewed and ranked. The names of the respondents will be identified at the proposal opening; however, no proposal will be handled to permit disclosure of the detailed contents of the responses until after award of contract. A record of all responses shall be prepared and maintained for the files and audit purposes.

Cumulative Scores will include the total from Phase 1 and Phase 2. It is the intent of the Owner to conduct a fair and comprehensive evaluation of all proposals received. **The contract for this project will be awarded to the proposer who submitted a proposal that is most advantageous to the Owner.**

Appendix H Sample Evaluation Form

Unsolicited Proposal Number: UP#

Date Received:

Project Name:

Date of acknowledgement of receipt of the unsolicited proposal:

Date accept the unsolicited proposal:

Date reject the unsolicited proposal:

Date of Vendor's notification of decision:

	Yes	No
Fee Enclosed: One Hundred Dollar Cashier Check payable to: Augusta, Georgia		
Package submitted by the deadline		

Advisory Committee Review

Phase I Review

Submittal and Quality of RFP MUST PASS A thru I FOR CONTINUED CONSIDERATION

	Pass	Fail
a) Project description,		
b) Project feasibility statement		
c) Proposed project schedule,		
d) Project financing plan		
e) Business case statement that shall include a basic description of any direct and indirect benefits that the private entity can provide in delivering the project, including relevant cost, quality, methodology, and process for identifying the project and time frame data,		
f) Description of any anticipated public support or opposition		
g)Qualifications and experience		
h) Names and addresses of persons who may be contact(See Appendix B)		
i) Any additional information pertinent information as determined by the proposer or as requested by Augusta, Georgia (local government) may reasonably request to comply with the requirements of the Public-Private Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2015 (the "PPFIA").		

Committee Members:

Independent Advisor(s)

Provide the proposer with the proposed Local Government fee to cover the costs of processing, reviewing and evaluating the unsolicited proposal. **The Process ends until the fee is received.**

FEE AMOUNT \$

(see Appendix A)

Appendix H - Page 2 of 3

Sample Evaluation Form

Unsolicited Proposal Number: UP#

Project Name:

Date of Evaluation:

Recommendation Date to Committee:

The Evaluation Committee and Independent Advisors shall perform the following financial review and analysis of the unsolicited proposal:

(a) A cost-benefit analysis;		
(b) Evaluation of the public need for or benefit derived from the qualifying project;		
(c) Evaluation of the estimated cost of the qualifying project for reasonableness in relation to similar facilities;		
(d) Evaluation of the source of funding for the project;		
(e) Consideration of plans to ensure timely development or operation;		
(f) Evaluation of risk sharing, including cost or completion guarantees, added value, or debt or equity investments by the private entity; and		
(g) Consideration of any increase in funding, dedicated revenue source, or other economic benefit that would not otherwise be available.		

Committee Members:

Independent Advisor(s)

Comments:

The Advisor(s) representing the Evaluation Committee (EC) shall make a recommendation to the governing body of Augusta, Georgia to reject or accept the unsolicited proposal. Any Advisor(s) and those members of the EC should be present to address any questions.

Appendix H - Page 3 of 3
Sample Evaluation Form

Unsolicited Proposal Number: UP#

Project Name:

Date of Evaluation:

Recommendation Date to Commission: Approved or Rejected (Circle One)

Posting and Publishing Notice of the Opportunity to Offer Competing Proposals (if approved)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO:

(add RFP in front of the UP# - RFPUP17-001)

Advistisement

Advertised a minimum of two times, with the first advertisement occurring at least ninety days prior to the deadline for receipt of competing proposals. The second advertisement shall follow no earlier than six weeks from the first advertisement.

Date: First Advertisement:

Second Advertisement:

Procedures for Processing, Review and Consideration of Competing Proposals (see Appendix I)

(a) Project financing	300	
(b) Qualifications and experience	160	
(c) Project Characteristics	100	
(d) Project Benefit and Compatibility	90	
(e) Other Factors	60	
(f) References	40	
Total Score	750	

Comments

Name of Evaluator:

Date: