



Proposer's Name: Tetra Tech, Inc.			
Evaluator Number: 1 (Chairperson)			
<b>Weight:</b> Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.			
<b>Score:</b> Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable" to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable			
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>	<b>Score (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (Weight X Score)</b>
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES OF RESPONDENT</b>	20	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND PROJECT ORGANIZATION</b>	15	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	20	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of project &amp; objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work;</li> <li>Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiarity with the services requested;</li> <li>Resources clearly identified for each task;</li> <li>A marketing proposal that maximizes our royalties;</li> <li>Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times and the ability to provide services for the County during downtime caused by unanticipated interruptions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	25	4	100
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li> <li>RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>	20	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
Respondent Total	100		380
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			76



Proposer's Name: Tetra Tech, Inc.			
Evaluator Number: 2			
<b>Weight:</b> Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.			
<b>Score:</b> Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable			
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>	<b>Score (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (Weight X Score)</b>
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES OF RESPONDENT</b>	20	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND PROJECT ORGANIZATION</b>	15	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	20	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with the services requested;</li> <li>• Resources clearly identified for each task;</li> <li>• A marketing proposal that maximizes our royalties;</li> <li>• Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times and the ability to provide services for the County during downtime caused by unanticipated interruptions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	25	5	125
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li> <li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>			
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
Respondent Total	100		400
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			80



Proposer's Name: Tetra Tech, Inc.			
Evaluator Number: 3			
<b>Weight:</b> Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.			
<b>Score:</b> Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable			
CRITERIA	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES OF RESPONDENT</b>	20	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND PROJECT ORGANIZATION</b>	15	5	75
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	20	5	100
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with the services requested;</li> <li>• Resources clearly identified for each task;</li> <li>• A marketing proposal that maximizes our royalties;</li> <li>• Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times and the ability to provide services for the County during downtime caused by unanticipated interruptions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	25	5	125
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li> <li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>			
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
Respondent Total	100		400
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			80



Proposer's Name: DebrisTech, LLC			
Evaluator Number: 1 (Chairperson)			
<b>Weight:</b> Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.			
<b>Score:</b> Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable			
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>	<b>Score (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (Weight X Score)</b>
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES OF RESPONDENT</b>	20	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND PROJECT ORGANIZATION</b>	15	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	20	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with the services requested;</li> <li>• Resources clearly identified for each task;</li> <li>• A marketing proposal that maximizes our royalties;</li> <li>• Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times and the ability to provide services for the County during downtime caused by unanticipated interruptions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	25	3	75
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li> <li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>	20	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
Respondent Total	100		320
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			64



Proposer's Name: DebrisTech, LLC			
Evaluator Number: 2			
<b>Weight:</b> Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.			
<b>Score:</b> Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable			
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>	<b>Score (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (Weight X Score)</b>
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES OF RESPONDENT</b>	20	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND PROJECT ORGANIZATION</b>	15	3	45
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	20	3	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of project &amp; objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work;</li> <li>• Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Familiarity with the services requested;</li> <li>• Resources clearly identified for each task;</li> <li>• A marketing proposal that maximizes our royalties;</li> <li>• Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times and the ability to provide services for the County during downtime caused by unanticipated interruptions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	25	2	50
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li> <li>• RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>			
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
Respondent Total			
	100		215
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			43



Proposer's Name: DebrisTech, LLC			
Evaluator Number: 3			
<b>Weight:</b> Each evaluation criteria is given a percent weight based on the importance to the Scope of Work.			
<b>Score:</b> Scores ranging from 0 "Unacceptable to 5 "Excellent" are given for each criteria as follows: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Unacceptable			
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>	<b>Score (0-5)</b>	<b>Total (Weight X Score)</b>
<b>QUALIFICATIONS AND RELATED EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES OF RESPONDENT</b>	20	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific significant related experience and expertise in the services requested in the Scope of Work;</li> <li>Experience providing same/similar services for public agencies.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>PROPOSED STAFFING AND PROJECT ORGANIZATION</b>	15	4	60
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualifications of key personnel; ability to provide experienced staffing to fulfill the services outlined in the Scope of Work; project manager and key personnel possess experience working with public agencies to provide similar services.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>WORK PLAN/PROJECT APPROACH</b>	20	4	80
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of project &amp; objectives as it relates to the Scope of Work;</li> <li>Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Scope of Work, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiarity with the services requested;</li> <li>Resources clearly identified for each task;</li> <li>A marketing proposal that maximizes our royalties;</li> <li>Inclusion of a plan that addresses proposed response times and the ability to provide services for the County during downtime caused by unanticipated interruptions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT</b>	25	3	75
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized;</li> <li>RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; Minimal exceptions or acceptable exceptions, no exceptions noted.</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b>			
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed payment/cost schedule is fair and adequate;</li> </ul>			
Notes:			
Respondent Total	100		295
Total Weighted Possible Score			500
Converted to 100 point score total			59