

**CONTRACTOR EVALUATION  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE + HARBOR MASTER PLAN**

**1. RESPONSIVENESS TO RFP.** Part one of the evaluation demonstrates whether the proposal meets the basic requirements outline in the Borough’s Request for Proposals. Please check yes or no for each requirement listed.

**2. QUALITATIVE EVALUATION:** Proposals will also be evaluated on “best value” based on the evaluation criteria as stated below. A 1000-point scale will be used to create the evaluation ranking. When assessing points, utilize a 1-10 scale, points awarded will then be multiplied by the weight assigned and totaled by borough staff.

| Factor                     | Weight |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Qualifications             | 15%    |
| Approach/Methodology       | 30%    |
| Past Experience/Success    | 20%    |
| Understanding of Community | 10%    |
| Cost                       | 25%    |

In determining the number of points to award, you may use the following guidance:

| Points | Guidance                               |
|--------|--|
| 10     | Couldn’t imagine a better response     |
| 9      | Excellent, insightful response         |
| 7-6    | More than adequate response            |
| 5-4    | Adequate response, no special insights |
| 3-2    | Inadequate response                    |
| 1-0    | Totally inadequate response            |
| 0      | No response given                      |

**Contractor:**

**Evaluator Letter:**

**1. Please check yes or no for each requirement.**

| <b>Responsiveness to RFP requirements</b>      | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| Deadline met?                                  |            |           |
| Transmittal letter signed?                     |            |           |
| Project Contact identified?                    |            |           |
| Detailed Proposal?                             |            |           |
| Methodology described?                         |            |           |
| Education & Experience detailed?               |            |           |
| Key project staff & subcontractors identified? |            |           |
| Key staff & subcontractor resumes provided?    |            |           |
| Cost Estimate Provided?                        |            |           |

**2. Qualitative Evaluation. Please award 1-10 points for each criteria (1 being lowest score, 10 being highest score)**

| <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Possible Points</b> | <b>Points Awarded</b> | <b>Multiplier</b> | <b>Total Points</b> |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| <b>1. QUALIFICATIONS</b>  |                        |                       |                   |                     |
| A. Does contractor (individual, firm, staff) have the education and experience to successfully update the Petersburg Comprehensive Plan?  | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| B. Does contractor (individual, firm, staff) have the education and experience to successfully develop a Harbor Master Plan & Rate Study? | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| C. Does the contractor appear to have sufficient staff and resource to successfully complete the project?                                 | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| <b>2. APPROACH/METHODOLOGY</b>  |                        |                       |                   |                     |
| A. Does the contractor propose a clear methodology and timeline to accomplish the project?  | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| B. Does contractor propose a clear and workable approach for public involvement, public review and feedback?                              | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| C. Does contractor's approach demonstrate creativity in achieving project goals?  | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| D. Is contractor's approach likely to result in an integrated and realistic plan with achievable action plans?                            | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| <b>3. PAST EXPERIENCE &amp; SUCCESS</b>   |                        |                       |                   |                     |
| A. Does the contractor have demonstrated experience and successes in harbor planning & rate studies?                                      | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| B. Does the contractor have demonstrated experience and successes in community plan development?  | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| C. Does the contractor have demonstrated experience and successes developing creative solutions for small rural communities?              | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| <b>4. UNDERSTANDING OF COMMUNITY</b>  |                        |                       |                   |                     |
| A. Does contractor demonstrate a clear understanding of Petersburg and surrounding region?  | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| B. Does contractor demonstrate a clear understanding of community needs and project objectives?   | 0-10                   |                       |                   |                     |
| <b>5. COST (Cost score will be added by staff)</b><br>(Lowest cost = 250) (Twice as expensive as lowest cost = 125 pts)                   | Up to 250              |                       |                   |                     |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b> (Score will be tabulated by staff)   |                        |                       |                   |                     |