



MEMO

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

TODD SPITZER
District Attorney-Public Administrator

DATE: April 20, 2021
TO: Victor Cumberland, Purchasing Manager
FROM: RFP Evaluation Committee
SUBJECT: Recommendation for Award

The Evaluation Committee for RFP No. 026-C027585-VC for Victim/Witness Assistance Program rates the responding Respondents as follows:

File Folder No: C027585	RFP No: 026-C027585-VC
Proposal responses released to Evaluation Committee:	April 13, 2021
Deputy Purchasing Agent Signature:	

EVALUATION COMMITTEE RATING/RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD

The Evaluation Committee rates responses to the RFP as follows:		
RATING	RESPONDENT	JUSTIFICATION
98.8	Waymakers	Comprehensive services, vast experience, well written proposal, good video presentation
Committee Chairperson Signature:		Date: 4/20/2021
Evaluation Committee Member #2 Signature:		Date: 4/20/2021
Evaluation Committee Member #3 Signature:		Date: 4/20/2021
DA/PURCHASING USE ONLY		
Deputy Purchasing Agent Recommendation: <i>Met all RFP requirements.</i>		
Deputy Purchasing Agent Signature: _____		

RFP Scoring Sheet

RFP No.: 026-C027585-VC Victim/Witness Assistance Program

Phase I - Evaluation Criteria

Company	Evaluator 1					Evaluator 2					Evaluator 3					Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	TOTAL
Waymakers	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0		86.0
																		0.0
																		0.0
																		0.0

Evaluation Criteria - 100 points (Weight 75%):

1. Respondent's expertise and experience in providing the services within the Scope of Work.
2. Respondent's billing rates and fee structure.
3. Respondent's ability to demonstrate quality of services within the Scope of Work.
4. Respondent's resources available to provide services as specified in the Scope of Work.
5. Respondent's provided references. Respondent to provide a minimum of three references.
6. Respondent's proposal Organization/Completeness of response and degree of compliance with County Model Contract.

Weights

- 25
- 30
- 20
- 10
- 10
- 5

Weighted Scores

Company	Evaluator 1					Evaluator 2					Evaluator 3					Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	TOTAL
Waymakers	25.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	4.0	25.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	4.0	25.0	30.0	20.0	8.0	10.0	4.0	73.8

Phase II - Oral presentation

Company	Evaluator 1					Evaluator 2					Evaluator 3					Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	TOTAL
Waymakers	5.0					5.0					5.0							15.0
																		0.0
																		0.0
																		0.0

Oral Presentation - 100 Points (Weight 25%)

1. Respondent's oral presentation

Weights

- 100

Weighted Scores

Company	Evaluator 1					Evaluator 2					Evaluator 3					Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	TOTAL
Waymakers	100.0					100.0					100.0							25.0
																		0.0
																		0.0
																		0.0

Phase I and II Totals

Company	Total
Waymakers	98.8
	0
	0
	0

Committee Chairperson Signature

Evaluation Committee Signature #2

Evaluation Committee Signature #3

Date 4/20/2021

Date 4/20/2021

Date 4/20/2021

Proposer's Name: Waymakers
Evaluator Number: Evaluator # 1

Weight: 75%

Score: 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

[illegible]

6. RESPONDENT'S PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT.	5%/1 point	4	4
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; • Any exceptions noted and/or taken.			
<i>Notes:</i>			
Respondent Total	100	99	
Total Weighted Possible Score			75
Converted to 75 weighted point score total			74.3
Additional Comments:			

CRITERIA – PHASE II**Weight:** 25%.

Score: 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 - PHASE II	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
ORAL PRESENTATIONS.	100%	5	25
<i>Notes:</i>			
Respondent Total	100	0	0 25
Total Weighted Possible Score			25
Converted to 25 weighted point score total			25

Proposer's Name: Waymakers
Evaluator Number: Evaluator # 2

Score: 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

6. RESPONDENT'S PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT.	5%/1 point	4	4
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; • Any exceptions noted and/or taken. 			
<i>Notes:</i>			
Respondent Total	100	99	74.3
Total Weighted Possible Score			75
Converted to 75 weighted point score total			
Additional Comments:			

CRITERIA – PHASE II

Weight: 25%.			
Score: 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 - PHASE II	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
ORAL PRESENTATIONS.	100%	5	25
<i>Notes:</i>			
Respondent Total	100	0	0 25
Total Weighted Possible Score			25
Converted to 25 weighted point score total			25

2. RESPONDENT'S BILLING RATE AND FEE STRUCTURE	30%/6 points		
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed billing rates/costs are comparable to others in the industry; • Proposed billing rates/costs provided within County budget. 		5	30
Notes:			
3. RESPONDENT'S ABILITY TO DEMONSTRATE QUALITY OF SERVICES WITHIN THE SCOPE OF WORK.	20%/4 points	5	20
Proposal demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of project & objectives as it relates to the Statement of Work; • Methods for approaching project and established plan to accomplish the services noted in the Statement of Work; • List a minimum of five (5) years of experience with same or like services. 			
Notes:			

Page 15 of 17

6. RESPONDENT'S PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION/COMPLETENESS OF RESPONSE AND DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY MODEL CONTRACT.	5%/1 point	\$4 78	4
Completeness of response in accordance with RFP instructions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is complete, comprehensive, and well-organized; • RFP requirements are addressed and adhered to; • Any exceptions noted and/or taken. 			
<i>Notes:</i>			
Respondent Total	100	97	72.8
Total Weighted Possible Score			75
Converted to 75 weighted point score total			
Additional Comments:			

CRITERIA – PHASE II

Weight: 25%.			
Score: 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 - PHASE II	Weight (%)	Score (0-5)	Total (Weight X Score)
ORAL PRESENTATIONS.	100%	5	25
<i>Notes:</i>			
Respondent Total	100	0	0 25
Total Weighted Possible Score			25
Converted to 25 weighted point score total			25