

TO: Evaluation Committee Members

FROM: Jim Groves

DATE: June 25, 2018

SUBJECT: Proposal Evaluations for Complex Coordinated Terrorist Attack (CCTA)
Regional Coordination Plan/RFP NO. 18-034

Thank you for serving on the Evaluation Committee which is charged with evaluating proposals from three (3) firms interested in providing CCTA planning services to Durham County. The selection process for the services involves determining the best-qualified firm for the project. The review and evaluation of the attached proposals and completion of an evaluation form is the first step in identifying the best-qualified firm. Evaluations are due back to Durham County on or before July 12, 2018.

IMPORTANT: PLEASE COMPLETE THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM ON PAGE #3, INCLUDING THE DATE AND YOUR SIGNATURE!!! Return the form to Jim Groves or Leslie O'Connor.

Following the receipt of information from each of you, an Evaluation Committee meeting will be scheduled to discuss the written proposal evaluations and ratings. The Evaluation Committee will then identify the top firms to be interviewed, **if necessary**. Each firm will be allowed a 15-20 minute presentation followed by approximately 10-minutes for questions. Sample questions will be discussed by the Evaluation Committee for use during the interview. Please plan on meeting with me approximately 30-minutes prior to each interview to briefly discuss the firm's proposal and our approach to the interview process.

The following items are attached:

Copy of RFP No. 18-034
RFP Responses
Evaluation Forms – for each firm
Explanation of evaluation criteria
Confidentiality & Conflict of Interest Policy Form

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at 919 560-0674 or email jgroves@dconc.gov.

Attachments

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBER
DURHAM COUNTY CONFIDENTIALITY & CONFLICT OF INTEREST
DISCLOSURE POLICY**

Consistent with the laws of the State of North Carolina and applicable County policies, evaluators are expected to adhere to certain standards in carrying out their duties. The County's expectation is that evaluators will serve in an objective manner and join the County to ensure fairness and equal opportunity throughout the process. In order to avoid a potential conflict of interest, the following provisions must be adhered to:

- No evaluator shall in any way use or attempt to use his/her position to obtain financial gain or avoid financial detriment.
- No evaluator shall solicit or receive gifts from any proposer.
- Evaluators shall secure the proposals while they are in their possession.
- Evaluators shall only discuss proposals as provided for in the evaluation process established for the procurement. For most, this is restricted to a scheduled Evaluation Committee meeting.

Evaluation Committee members must sign the attached Confidentiality & Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement. Any Evaluation Committee member who believes a potential conflict of interest exists must inform the Evaluation Committee Chairperson. In the event a conflict of interest does exist, the individual will be removed from the Committee and may be replaced by an alternate member.

An evaluator has a **conflict of interest** whenever an evaluator or a member of an evaluator's immediate family 1) has been, or is currently, an employee of or on the board of directors of a proposer or 2) has a financial interest in a proposer or the award of the contract. An evaluator has a **potential conflict of interest** when an evaluator or a member of an evaluator's immediate family has, or has had, an association with a proposer or a key employee of a proposer the nature of which a disinterested observer would reasonably expect would result in bias either for or against the proposer. "Proposer" includes any person or entity who will participate in performance of the contract if it is awarded. A County employee does not have a conflict of interest simply by reason of having worked with a proposer as part of the employee's job duties.

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBER
DURHAM COUNTY CONFIDENTIALITY & CONFLICT OF INTEREST
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

All evaluators are required to read the Durham County Confidentiality & Conflict of Interest Policy and to sign this disclosure statement.

As a member of the Evaluation Committee to evaluate Complex Coordinated Terrorist Attack (CCTA) Regional Coordination Plan/RFP NO. 18-034

I, _____, hereby certify that I have read the Durham County Confidentiality & Conflict of Interest Disclosure Policy and agree to comply with the provisions stated therein.

I further attest that

(Please check one box)

_____ I do not have any conflict of interest with any of the proposers responding to this solicitation.

_____ I have a potential conflict of interest. See comments.

_____ I have a conflict of interest. See comments.

Comments:

This form shall be kept on file at Durham County's Purchasing Division as part of the public record for this solicitation.

Evaluation Committee Member Name printed:

Evaluation Committee Member Signature:

Signature Date: _____

CCTA Regional Coordination Plan/RFP NO. 18-034
EVALUATION CRITERIA

Please complete the information at the top of each evaluation page, including your name and the firm name (vendor) of the proposal being evaluated.

After reading the proposal, please use the evaluation criteria to help you determine if the proposal met the evaluation criteria MINIMALLY WELL, FAIRLY WELL, or VERY WELL. Please provide a score for each project narrative requirement (1-8) using the appropriate scale identified on the evaluation sheet. Each narrative requirement is weighted, meaning there are different ranges for each one. Do not worry about providing a score for #6 or #8, that will be tabulated by Durham County.

For consistency among the evaluators, please utilize this scoring rubric:

0-5 = 0-1 Minimal	2-3 Fair	4-5 Very Well
0-10 = 0-3 Minimal	4-6 Fair	7-10 Very Well
0-15 = 0-4 Minimal	5-9 Fair	10-15 Very Well
0-25 = 0-5 Minimal	6-15 Fair	16-25 Very Well

Reviewer Initials _____ Dept. _____ Date _____

Proposer's Name _____

Project Narrative Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Maximum of 100 Points			
1. Public Sector Experience	1. Proposer has CCTA, or related, experience with local government	0-10	
2. Demonstrated ability to meet commitments requested in the RFP	2. Proposer has successfully completed CCTA, or similar, projects	0-15	
3. Qualifications of staff and SMEs to be assigned to this project	3. Staff and SMEs assigned to this project have CCTA, or related, experience	0-15	
4. Specific plans and methodology for providing the proposed services	4. Proposer presents a unique proposal showing they understand the project scope and requirements	0-25	
5. References from at least three (3) regional projects of similar size and scope	5. Proposer presents at least (3) positive references for relatable regional projects of similar size and scope	0-10	
6. Financial stability	6. Company finances show the Proposer can operate on the proposed payment schedule without disruption of services	0-5	N/A
7. Overall Cost	7. Proposer presents the best value to Durham County	0-15	N/A
8. Compliance with Durham County M/WBE requirements	8. Proposer meets the Durham County M/WBE requirements	0-5	

TOTAL SCORE _____

Add here any other comments about this proposal. _____

Reviewer Initials _____ Dept. _____ Date _____

Proposer's Name _____

Project Narrative Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Maximum of 100 Points			
1. Public Sector Experience	1. Proposer has CCTA, or related, experience with local government	0-10	
2. Demonstrated ability to meet commitments requested in the RFP	2. Proposer has successfully completed CCTA, or similar, projects	0-15	
3. Qualifications of staff and SMEs to be assigned to this project	3. Staff and SMEs assigned to this project have CCTA, or related, experience	0-15	
4. Specific plans and methodology for providing the proposed services	4. Proposer presents a unique proposal showing they understand the project scope and requirements	0-25	
5. References from at least three (3) regional projects of similar size and scope	5. Proposer presents at least (3) positive references for relatable regional projects of similar size and scope	0-10	
6. Financial stability	6. Company finances show the Proposer can operate on the proposed payment schedule without disruption of services	0-5	N/A
7. Overall Cost	7. Proposer presents the best value to Durham County	0-15	N/A
8. Compliance with Durham County M/WBE requirements	8. Proposer meets the Durham County M/WBE requirements	0-5	

TOTAL SCORE _____

Add here any other comments about this proposal. _____

Reviewer Initials _____ Dept. _____ Date _____

Proposer's Name _____

Project Narrative Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Maximum of 100 Points			
1. Public Sector Experience	1. Proposer has CCTA, or related, experience with local government	0-10	
2. Demonstrated ability to meet commitments requested in the RFP	2. Proposer has successfully completed CCTA, or similar, projects	0-15	
3. Qualifications of staff and SMEs to be assigned to this project	3. Staff and SMEs assigned to this project have CCTA, or related, experience	0-15	
4. Specific plans and methodology for providing the proposed services	4. Proposer presents a unique proposal showing they understand the project scope and requirements	0-25	
5. References from at least three (3) regional projects of similar size and scope	5. Proposer presents at least (3) positive references for relatable regional projects of similar size and scope	0-10	
6. Financial stability	6. Company finances show the Proposer can operate on the proposed payment schedule without disruption of services	0-5	N/A
7. Overall Cost	7. Proposer presents the best value to Durham County	0-15	N/A
8. Compliance with Durham County M/WBE requirements	8. Proposer meets the Durham County M/WBE requirements	0-5	

TOTAL SCORE _____

Add here any other comments about this proposal. _____

Evaluation Committee Evaluation Score Sheet
Project Title: CCTA Regional Coordination Plan
Project No. RFP NO. 18-034

Evaluation Committee Member No.	Vendor 1: Hagerty		Vendor 2: IEM		Vendor 3: Nodi			
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank		
1	82	1	74	2	73	3		
2	67	1	62	2	35	3		
3	73	1	61	2	47	3		
4	81	1	63	2	21	3		
5	86	1	63	2	40	3		
6	87	1	83	2	53	3		
7	87	1	84	2	52	3		
Overall Total:	563	7	490	14	321	21		
Average:	80.4	1	70	2	45.8	3		

Justification: Hagerty was deemed the most qualified firm for the project based on their methodology on accomplishing the work, their subject matter experts that had relatable Complex Coordinated Terrorist Attacks (CCTA) experience, their significant experience supporting local government with projects of similar size and scope, and the overall cost to accomplish the work. In addition, Hagerty stated that a percentage of work would be assigned to M/WBE.