

Evaluation Criteria Breakdown of Scoring Ranges

Item 1 Experience of the Firm							
1 <u>Project Management</u>							
	Project Management	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Range of Points	0	1 - 5	6 - 20	21 - 40	41 - 60
Max Score 60							
2 <u>Technical Services</u>							
2.A	Water Resources and Management	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 30</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 10	11-22	23 - 30
2.B	Ecosystem Restoration	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 20</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 9	10 - 16	17 - 20
2.C	Flood Risk Management - Delta	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 20</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 9	10 - 16	17 - 20
2.D	Use of Best Available Science and Adaptive Management	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 20</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 9	10 - 16	17 - 20
2.E	Climate Change	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 20</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 9	10 - 16	17 - 20
2.F	Geographic Information System	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 20</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 9	10 - 16	17 - 20
Technical Services Max Score 130							
3 <u>Policy Development</u>							
3.A	California Governance	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 15</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 6	7 - 11	12 - 15
3.B	Performance Measures	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 15</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 6	7 - 11	12 - 15
3.C	Land Use Planning	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 15</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 6	7 - 11	12 - 15
3.D	Landscape Architecture	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 15</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 6	7 - 11	12 - 15
3.E	Agriculture	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 15</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 6	7 - 11	12 - 15
3.F	Economics	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 15</i>	Range of Points	0	1 - 2	3 - 6	7 - 11	12 - 15
Policy Development Score 90							
4 <u>CEQA</u>							
		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	CEQA Max Score 30	Range of Points	0	1 - 3	4 - 13	14 - 25	26 - 30
5 <u>APA/ OAL</u>							
		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	APA/OAL Max Score 30	Range of Points	0	1 - 3	4 - 13	14 - 25	26 - 30
6 <u>Administrative Record</u>							
		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	Administrative Max Score 20	Range of Points	0	1 - 3	4 - 10	11 - 17	18 - 20
7 <u>Public Relations</u>							
		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	Public Relations Max Score 20	Range of Points	0	1 - 3	4 - 10	11 - 17	18 - 20
Experience of the Firm Total Max Score 380							

Item 2 Experience of Personnel								
1 Project Director Management Experience								
1.A	Project Director Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 30	Range of Points	0	1 - 8	9 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 30
1.B	Project Director's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 30	Range of Points	0	1 - 8	9 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 30
Project Director Management Experience Max Score 60								
2 Project Manager Management Experience								
2.A	Project Manager Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 30	Range of Points	0	1 - 8	9 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 30
2.B	Project Manager's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 30	Range of Points	0	1 - 8	9 - 15	16 - 22	23 - 30
Project Manager Management Experience Max Score 60								
3 Firm(s) Staff Experience								
3.A1	Water Resources and Management Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.A2	Water Resources and Management Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.B1	Ecosystem Restoration Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.B2	Ecosystem Restoration Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.C1	Flood Risk Managemnet (Delta centric) Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.C2	Flood Risk Managemnet (Delta centric) Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.D1	Use of Best Available Science and Adaptive Management Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.D2	Use of Best Available Science and Adaptive Management Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.E1	Climate Change Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.E2	Climate Change Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.F1	Geographic Information System Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.F2	Geographic Information System Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.G1	California Governance Staff Experience		Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.G2	California Governance Staff's Similar Projects Experience		Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		Max Sub Score 15	Range of Points	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15

3.H1	Performance Measures Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.H2	Performance Measures Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.I1	Land Use Planning Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.I2	Land Use Planning Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.J1	Landscape Architecture Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.J2	Landscape Architecture Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.K1	Agriculture Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.K2	Agriculture Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.L1	Economic Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.L2	Economic Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.M1	CEQA Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.M2	CEQA Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.N1	APA/ OAL Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.N2	APA/ OAL Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.O1	Aministrative Record Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.O2	Aministrative Record Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.P1	Public Relations Staff Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Years of Experience	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
3.P2	Public Relations Staff's Similar Projects Experience <i>Max Sub Score</i> 15	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
		<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	10 - 15
Firm(s) Staff Experience Max Score		480					
Experience of the Personnel Total Max Score 600							

Item 3 References and Quality Assurance							
1 References							
1.A	References' Responses on Quality of Work and Work Process	Number of Satisfactory References	No satisfactory references provided	Did not provide contact information sufficient to evaluate the proposer's performance	One or more of the references are/ were dissatisfied with the proposed performance	All 3 references stated that the applicant(s) performed or is performing satisfactory	One or more of the 3 references stated that the proposer performed or is performing above satisfactory
	<i>Max Sub Score</i> 30	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	0	1 - 5	6 - 17	18 - 30
1.B	References' Responses on Related Projects	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score</i> 30	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 2	3 - 10	11 - 22	23 - 30
Project Director Management Experience Max Score		60					
2 Quality Assurance and Vetting							
2.A	Procedures for Quality Assurance	Quality Assurance Procedure	No procedures for quality assurance provided	Procedures for quality assurance provided were not applicable to proposed services	Quality Assurance procedure relies solely on Project Manager	Quality Assurance procedure relies on staff and Project Manager	Quality Assurance procedure relies on staff, Project Manager, and Project Director
	<i>Max Sub Score</i> 35	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	0	1-8	9-17	18-25
2.B	Staff Reviewers Involved in Quality Assurance and Vetting	Number of Reviewers	0	1	2	3	4+
	<i>Max Sub Score</i> 25	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 16	17 - 25
Project Manager Management Experience Max Score		60					
References and Quality Assurance Total Max Score 120							

Item 4 Availability of Resources							
1 Licensed Staff							
1.A	Licensed Staff Available to Perform Services	Number of Licensed Staff	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 30</i>	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 2	3 - 10	11-22	23 - 30
1.B	Licensed Staff Instrumentally Involved in Providing Services	Number of Related Projects	0	< 2	2 to 5	5 to 10	10 +
	<i>Max Sub Score 30</i>	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 2	3 - 10	11-22	23 - 30
Licensed Staff Max Score 60							
2 Firms Workload							
2.A	Firms Ability to Perform Services Under Existing and Projected Work Loads	Workload Description	No satisfactory description of existing or projected work load provided	Staff or Project Manager will be available soon to perform services	Staff and Project Manager will be available soon to perform services	Staff and Project Managers are available immediately to perform services	Staff, Project Director and Managers are available immediately to perform services
	<i>Max Sub Score 40</i>	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 10	11 - 20	21 - 30	31 - 40
2.B	Firms Flexibility to Access Additional Staff As Needed	Number of Reviewers	No Additional Staff Available	Firm has Additional Staff, but are not Accessible	Firm has Additional Staff that are Accessible, but not Local	Firm has Additional Staff that are Accessible and are Local	Firm has Additional Accessible Staff that are Local and can Access Sub-consultant Additional Staff
	<i>Max Sub Score 30</i>	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 5	6 - 13	14 - 21	22 - 30
Firms Workload Max Score 70							
3 Firm(s) Accessibility to the Delta Stewardship Council							
3.A	Local Firm Offices Providing Services	Firm(s)' Locally Located (Greater Sacramento Area)	No firm(s) located locally	1 Sub-consultant located locally	> 1 Sub-consultant located locally	Prime consultant located locally	Prime consultant and all subconsultant located locally
	<i>Max Sub Score 20</i>	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20
3.B	Project Manager Located Locally	Locally Located (Greater Sacramento Area) and Accessible	Project Manager is not located locally	Project Manager is not located locally, but can be made available with well in advanced notice	Project Manager is not located locally, but can be made available with advanced notice	Project Manager is located locally and can be made available with notice	Project Manager is located locally and can be made available with relatively short notice
	<i>Max Sub Score 25</i>	<i>Range of Points</i>	0	1 - 5	6 - 11	12 - 18	19 - 25

3.C	Project Director Located Locally	Locally Located (Greater Sacramento Area) and Accessible	Project Director is not located locally	Project Director is not located locally, but can be made available with well in advanced notice	Project Director is not located locally, but can be made available with advanced notice	Project Director is located locally and can be made available with notice	Project Director is located locally and can be made available with relatively short notice	<i>Max Sub Score</i> 25
								<i>Range of Points</i>
Firm(s) Accessibility to the Delta Stewardship Council Max Score		70						
Availability of Resources Total Max Score 200								