

**North Dakota State Water Commission
900 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58505-0850**

Request For Proposal (RFP)

RFP Title: ***Statewide PMP Analysis***

RFP Number: ***770-2115-19-01***

Date of Issue: ***February 12, 2019***

Purpose of RFP: The study's purpose is to develop more representative probable maximum precipitation (PMP) estimates for use when evaluating flood safety, assessing flood risk, and calibrating event-specific hydrological models. The current PMP dataset covering North Dakota was derived in the 1970s and 1980s as part of the Hydrometeorological Reports (HMRs) completed by the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration. However, since the completion of the HMRs, North Dakota has experienced a wet-cycle that was not prevalent during the climate record used in previous studies.

Offerors are not required to return this form.

Procurement Officer: *Mark D. Schneider*

Project Manager: *Damon Grabow*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

Introduction and Instructions

- 1.01 Purpose of the RFP
- 1.02 Contact Person, Telephone, Fax Numbers and E-mail
- 1.03 RFP Schedule
- 1.04 Return Mailing Address and Deadline for Receipt of Proposals
- 1.05 Assistance to Offerors with a Disability
- 1.06 Deadline for Receipt of Questions and Objections
- 1.07 Approved Vendor Registration Requirements
- 1.08 Pre-proposal Conference
- 1.09 Amendments to the RFP
- 1.10 News Releases

SECTION TWO

Background Information

- 2.01 Background Information
- 2.02 Budget

SECTION THREE

Scope and Schedule

- 3.01 Scope of Work
- 3.02 Deliverables
- 3.03 Location of Work
- 3.04 Prior Experience
- 3.05 Required Licenses
- 3.06 Federal Requirements

SECTION FOUR

General Contract Information

- 4.01 Contract Term, Extension and Renewal Options
- 4.02 Contract Type
- 4.03 Standard Contract Provisions
- 4.04 Proposal as a Part of the Contract
- 4.05 Additional Terms and Conditions
- 4.06 Supplemental Terms and Conditions
- 4.07 Contract Approval
- 4.08 Contract Changes – Unanticipated Amendments
- 4.09 Indemnification and Insurance Requirements
- 4.10 Taxes and Taxpayer Tax Identification
- 4.11 Contract Funding
- 4.12 Proposed Payment Procedures
- 4.13 Payment Terms
- 4.14 Contract Personnel
- 4.15 Inspection & Modification - Reimbursement for Unacceptable Deliverables
- 4.16 Termination for Default
- 4.17 Confidentiality
- 4.18 Work Product, Equipment, and Material
- 4.19 Independent Entity
- 4.20 Assignment
- 4.21 Disputes - Applicable Law and Venue

SECTION FIVE

Evaluation Criteria and Contractor Selection

- 5.01 Methodology and Understanding of the Project

- 5.02 Management Plan for the Project
- 5.03 Experience and Qualifications
- 5.04 Contract Cost

SECTION SIX

Proposal Format and Content

- 6.01 Proposal Format and Content
- 6.02 Introduction
- 6.03 Methodology and Understanding of the Project
- 6.04 Management Plan for the Project
- 6.05 Experience and Qualifications
- 6.06 Cost Proposal
- 6.07 Required Enclosures

SECTION SEVEN

Standard Proposal Information

- 7.01 Authorized Signature
- 7.02 State Not Responsible for Preparation Costs
- 7.03 Conflict of Interest
- 7.04 Offeror's Certification
- 7.05 Offer Held Firm
- 7.06 Amendments to Proposals and Withdrawal of Proposals
- 7.07 Alternate Proposals
- 7.08 Subcontractors
- 7.09 Joint Ventures
- 7.10 Disclosure of Proposal Contents and Compliance with North Dakota Open Records Laws
- 7.11 Evaluation of Proposal
- 7.12 Right of Rejection
- 7.13 Clarification of Offers
- 7.14 Preference Laws
- 7.15 Contract Negotiation
- 7.16 Failure to Negotiate
- 7.17 Notice of Intent to Award – Offeror Notification of Selection
- 7.18 Protest and Appeal

SECTION EIGHT

Attachments

- 8.01 Attachments

1. Proposal Evaluation Form
2. Offeror Checklist

SECTION ONE INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS

1.01 Purpose of the RFP

The North Dakota State Water Commission (NDSWC) is soliciting proposals for completion of a statewide probable maximum precipitation analysis.

1.02 Contact Person, Telephone, Fax, E-mail

The procurement officer is the RFP's point of contact. All vendor communications regarding this RFP must be directed to the procurement officer. Unauthorized contact regarding the RFP with other NDSWC employees may result in the vendor being disqualified, and the vendor may also be suspended or disbarred from the state bidders list.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER: Mark D. Schneider
PHONE: (701) 328-2788
FAX: (701) 328-3696
E-MAIL: mdschneider@nd.gov

PROJECT MANAGER: Damon Grabow
PHONE: (701) 328-4969
FAX: (701) 328-3696
E-MAIL: dmgrabow@nd.gov

1.03 RFP Schedule

This schedule of events represents the NDSWC's best estimate of the schedule that will be followed for this RFP. If a component of this schedule, such as the deadline for receipt of proposals, is delayed, the rest of the schedule will be shifted by the same number of days.

The approximate RFP schedule is as follows:

- RFP Issued: February 12, 2019
- Deadline for receipt of questions and objections related to the RFP: February 27, 2019 at 5:00 PM CST
- Responses to questions / RFP amendments (if required) March 6, 2019
- Proposals due by: March 15, 2019, 5:00 PM CST
- Proposal Evaluation Committee evaluation completed by approximately: March 22, 2019
- NDSWC issues Notice of Intent to Award a Contract approximately: March 29, 2019
- Contract start approximately: April 15, 2019

1.04 Return Mailing Address and Deadline for Receipt of Proposals

Offerors must submit 4 hard copies of the proposal and an electronic copy of the proposal via thumb drive in a sealed envelope or package clearly labeled "cost proposal."

Envelopes or packages containing proposals must be clearly addressed as follows to ensure proper delivery and to avoid being opened by the NDSWC before the deadline for receipt.

North Dakota State Water Commission
Request for Proposal (RFP): Statewide PMP Analysis
RFP Number: 770-2115-19-01
900 E. Boulevard Ave., Dept 770
Bismarck, ND, 58505-0850

Proposals must be received by the NDSWC no later than 5:00 P.M., CST on March 15, 2019. Proposals will not be publicly read at the opening.

Proposals may not be delivered orally, by facsimile transmission, by other telecommunication, or by electronic means. Offerors may fax or electronically transmit signed proposals to a third party, who must deliver the proposal to the location indicated above by the date and time designated as the deadline for receipt of proposals.

Offerors assume the risk of chosen dispatch method. The NDSWC and State of North Dakota assume no responsibility for delays caused by any delivery service. Postmarking by the due date will not substitute for actual proposal receipt by the NDSWC. An offeror's failure to submit its proposal prior to the deadline will cause the proposal to be rejected. Late proposals or amendments will not be opened or accepted for evaluation.

**1.05
Assistance to Offerors with a Disability**

Offerors with a disability that need an accommodation should contact the procurement officer prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals so that reasonable accommodation can be made.

**1.06
Deadline for Receipt of Questions and Objections**

Offerors must carefully review this solicitation, the contract, risk management provisions, and all attachments for defects or questionable or objectionable material. All questions must be in writing and directed to the NDSWC, addressed to the procurement officer, and cite the subject RFP number. The procurement officer must receive these written requests by the deadline specified in the RFP Schedule of Events to allow issuance of any necessary amendments.

This will also help prevent the opening of a defective solicitation and exposure of offeror's proposals upon which an award could not be made. Protests based on the content of the solicitation will be disallowed if these faults have not been brought to the procurement officer's attention, in writing, before the time indicated in the Schedule of Events.

If the question may be answered by directing the questioner to a specific RFP section, then the procurement officer may answer the question over the telephone. Other questions may be more complex and may require a written RFP amendment. The procurement officer will make this determination. Oral communications are considered unofficial and non-binding on the NDSWC. The offeror must confirm telephone conversations in writing.

**1.07
Approved Vendor Registration Requirements**

VENDORS MUST BE APPROVED BEFORE CONTRACT AWARD

Proposals will be accepted from vendors that are not currently approved vendors on the State's bidders list; however, the successful offeror will be required to become approved prior to award.

To become an approved vendor, offerors must: 1) be registered with the North Dakota Secretary of State (fees apply), and 2) submit a completed Bidders List Application to the North Dakota Vendor Registry Office. Prospective offerors may access the Procurement Vendor Database on-line to verify whether their firm is currently on the bidders list. The bidders list that will be used for this solicitation is commodity code

918-82 Scientific/ Technical Consulting
961-43 Hydrological and Oceanography Services
961-74 Scientist Services
961-88 Weather Forecast Services
961-95 Modeling Service

The Procurement Vendor Database, registration instructions, and forms are available on-line at: <http://www.nd.gov/spo/vendor/registry/>. Contact the Vendor Registry Office at 701-328-2683 or infospo@nd.gov for assistance.

The successful offeror should register and become approved within **60 CALENDAR DAYS** from the Notice of Intent to Award date. If an offeror fails to become approved by the time specified by the procurement officer, its proposal will be determined to be non-responsive and will be rejected.

1.08 Pre-proposal Conference

No pre-proposal conference will be held for this RFP. Offerors are advised to carefully review the RFP and all attachments and submit all questions to the procurement officer by the deadline indicated for submission of questions in the schedule of events.

1.09 Amendments to the RFP

If an amendment to this RFP is issued, it will be provided to all offerors who were notified of the RFP and to those that have requested a copy of the RFP from the procurement officer. Amendments will also be posted to the State Procurement Website at www.nd.gov/spo/.

1.10 Notice Provided

Notice of this solicitation has been provided in accordance with N.D.C.C. § 54-44.4-09.

The Request for Proposal and any amendments to the RFP will be posted on the following websites: <http://www.nd.gov/spo/> <http://www.swc.nd.gov/>

SECTION TWO BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.01

Background Information

The current PMP dataset covering North Dakota was derived in the 1970s and 1980s as part of Hydrometeorological Reports (HMRs) completed by the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). HMR-51 consisted of the continental US east of the 105th meridian, while HMR-48 was done specifically for the Red River of the North and the Souris River. HMR-48 PMP values include influences attributable to snowmelt, which has proven to influence runoff and flooding. HMR-52 covered methodology for using PMP values found in HMR-51.

Since the completion of the HMRs, North Dakota has experienced a wet-cycle that was not prevalent during the climate record used in previous studies. This period consisted of a number of large spring floods and precipitation events. Many of the historic flooding events in North Dakota occurred due to melting snow or rain on snow events, most recently in 1997, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

This study's purpose is to develop more representative PMP estimates for evaluating flood safety, assessing flood risk, and calibrating event-specific hydrological models.

Currently, the manner in which PMP values are calculated is inconsistent and cumbersome, from the use of hand calculations to coarse chart estimations. This study aims to provide the public a user-friendly tool to estimate PMP values.

The final report will contain PMP information for use by engineers, hydrologists, and risk managers in routing floods and probable maximum flood development. The PMP estimates are used in the design of dams and other miscellaneous structures.

This project is managed by a Review Board. The Review Board consists of both state and federal agencies with direct knowledge of the sciences and methods involved in a PMP analysis. Headed by the NDSWC, the remaining members of the Review Board are the National Weather Service (NWS) offices of Bismarck, ND and Grand Forks, ND, the Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS) office in Bismarck, ND, the North Dakota State Climatologist at the North Dakota State University (NDSU), and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Omaha District. This board was developed with the intent to guide the NDSWC in selecting a firm by participating in the program development and selection criteria, maintain the analysis integrity through participation in meetings and discussions, and review the deliverables and final products.

2.02

Budget

The estimated budget for project completion is not to exceed **\$600,000**. Proposals priced at more than **\$600,000** will be considered non-responsive.

SECTION THREE SCOPE OF WORK

3.01 Scope of Work

Project Description

NDSWC is soliciting proposals to update statewide PMP values to take advantage of improved technology and to include recent large events. Most recent PMP values for the state of North Dakota date back to HMRs 48, 51, and 52 completed in 1973, 1978, and 1982, respectively. The selected firm will complete a statewide PMP analysis that includes updating the current storm database, updating the current dew point dataset, updating PMP values to include snowmelt, temporal rainfall distribution, and a GIS product.

1. Project Management

1.1. Meetings: There will be a minimum of four onsite / in-person meetings conducted in Bismarck, ND to include participation with the project Review Board members. Additional stakeholders may also participate. The contractor will be required to participate in person. Review Board members may participate in person, by video teleconference (VTC), or teleconference. It is expected that each of these meetings may require up to a full work day of on-site participation, not to include transportation and preparation requirements. Additional VTC meetings may be scheduled throughout the project timeframe, as needed and agreed upon by the NDSWC and the contractor. At minimum, monthly progress teleconference calls will be expected between the contractor and NDSWC.

1.1.1. Kick off / Scoping Meeting: To be held within the first two months upon selection of the contractor to review the contractor's plans to accomplish the project, address the Review Board, and answer questions. Additionally, the kickoff meeting will be used to address the Review Board's requirements, discuss a proposed schedule for project submittal/review, and garnering Review Board consensus.

1.1.2. In-Progress Review (IPR) Meetings: Two IPR meetings will be conducted to discuss and review project status at key timeframes to be proposed by the selected contractor. These meetings will also be used to provide project data to the Review Board for review and address any questions or concerns.

1.1.3. Final Meeting: To be conducted to review, discuss, and conduct a formal presentation of the final report. This will also include a discussion / review of any other deliverables and address any remaining Review Board issues or concerns. It is possible the final meeting could be a two-day event if beneficial to the NDSWC and Review Board.

1.1.4. All Meetings: As identified in section 1.1 will be facilitated by the contractor, to include scheduling, establishing agendas, meeting coordination requirements, production of minutes, and capturing any noted issues and concerns. After each meeting, the contractor will generate minutes and an action item task list with deadlines for follow-up actions. Minutes will be delivered to the Review Board. Additionally, the contractor will maintain all meeting minutes, notes, required actions, and action results. All previously noted items will be provided to the NDSWC in an organized format, along with the final report and other deliverables upon project completion.

1.2. Monthly Progress Reports: The contractor shall submit a written monthly progress report outlining the study status, progress, and results to date, regardless of whether a billing statement is submitted, by the last working day of the month. This report shall be discussed in conjunction with a monthly teleconference call.

1.3. Billing Statements: Billing statements will be submitted as agreed upon between the contractor

and the NDSWC, but no more frequently than monthly. Each billing statement must include a task-by-task report justifying the cost of items contained in the billing statement. The monthly progress report may be used as the justification for the billing statements as long as all the cost items covered in the billing statement are addressed in the progress report.

- 1.4. Documentation:** This analysis requires a detailed report that includes documentation on storms assessed and disqualified, techniques for capturing snowmelt, PMP estimates, seasonality differences, spatial and temporal distributions, and techniques for transposing and maximizing storms. It is imperative that all of the data, assumptions, conclusions, recommendations, and supporting documentation used to develop this analysis are captured, cataloged, referenced, and provided to the NDSWC in an organized format, along with the final report and other deliverables, upon project completion.
- 1.5. Peer Review:** As identified in section 2.01 (Background Information), the NDSWC's intent is to have all critical data, including the final report, peer reviewed by the Review Board to ensure the analysis integrity. It is the NDSWC's expectation that the contractor will address the Review Board's comments and concerns as necessary to ensure consensus is attained amongst the Review Board prior to final report completion / publishing. All Review Board comments, concerns, and noted resolutions must be documented and provided to NDSWC with the final report and other deliverables upon project completion.

2. Probable Maximum Precipitation Analysis

- 2.1.** Complete a statewide PMP analysis using current state-of-the-science methods for the State of North Dakota, including updating the PMP values and methods for North Dakota that are currently contained in HMR-48, -51, and -52 published in 1973, 1978, and 1982, respectively, by the NWS.

2.1.1. Review of Existing Information

Gather and review all existing precipitation and climatological data and information relevant to completing a statewide PMP analysis for North Dakota. This is to include a critical review of previous work within local HMRs and pertinent information from NDSWC, NWS, USACE, USGS, NRCS, and ND State Climatologist.

2.1.2. PMP event selection

It is anticipated that this analysis will have a focus on local and regional storms and emphasize local meteorological phenomenon and flooding impacts, such as snowmelt.

This analysis should include a critical review of PMP events in past HMRs and expand storm review to include events that could have occurred in North Dakota that have occurred since HMR publications, including snowmelt events.

2.1.3. PMP event list and characteristics

Develop a comprehensive list of PMP events and their characteristics, including an evaluation of any maximization and transposition factors.

The updated storm database will include each storm with appropriate descriptive attributes, such as date, duration, location, and storm type (convective, remnant tropical, atmospheric river, winter, etc.) as a separate attributes.

2.1.4. Storm Maximization, Transpositioning, Areal Reduction Factors, and Spatial Patterns

Selected storms will be maximized using updated maximum dew point data. A storm

transposition analysis will be performed on the selected storms to each grid location throughout the state. Selected storms will be adjusted for spatial pattern and size variations, such that the data fits all elevations and basin sizes across the state. This portion of the PMP task is to include detailed discussion of the procedures and limits used, along with PMP value maps for each of the standard durations and areas described in HMR 51 and 48, along with a discussion of differences and variances from historic data.

2.1.5. Develop PMP Values

2.1.5.1. Snowmelt

Develop PMP values for snowmelt across the state, with updated methods per the state-of-the-science.

2.1.5.2. Precipitation

Develop PMP values for precipitation across the state with updated methods per the state-of-science.

2.1.6. Temporal Distribution

This PMP analysis must include the temporal distribution of PMP events across the state. The temporal distribution derived through the proposed analysis should be based on PMP events, seasonality, location, etc.

2.1.7. Dew Point

Dew point temperatures are a major factor in producing PMPs. As such, an updated dataset of maximum dew point temperatures across the state is needed. Similar to the precipitation data, the dew point data set is out of date and requires refurbishing after the most recent regional wet cycle and global climate changes. Provide raster data of dew point values.

2.1.8. Statistical Evaluation of PMP Results

Develop probabilistic estimates for PMP values.

3. GIS

Develop a user manual and a GIS script and dataset for use across multiple platforms. The resulting data derived from the proposed PMP analysis is to be disseminated through online GIS techniques, as well as possibly distributed for desktop activities on a variety of platforms.

HMR-48 and -51 depicted results using coarse isohyets and, ultimately, tabular data. This project requires a computerized, raster-based product. The expectation is to receive a program and data that can deliver the needed temporal PMP results as a GIS plugin or an online interactive tool. This GIS tool must work across multiple platforms and not be proprietary in nature.

4. Quality Control

Through the course of this study, every attempt must be made to ensure the study results as compared to the results of previous studies conducted in ND and adjacent regions are consistent and defensible. A quality control procedure must be developed that is consistent with the federal guidelines and PMP development strategies or supported by technical documentation provided by the Review Board.

- 4.1. Provide a comparison to HMR-48 and -51 derived PMP values and describe and map the differences.
- 4.2. Provide a comparison of the PMP frequency estimates to NOAA Atlas 14 or other frequency estimates and describe and map differences.
- 4.3. Show historic extreme storms as percent of PMP.

3.02 Deliverables

The contractor will be required to provide the following deliverables electronically to NDSWC:

1. A project notebook that includes all documentation, meeting minutes, and reports found under Task 1, Project Management.
2. Final report with an executive summary that includes results from Task 2, Probable Maximum Precipitation Analysis, and all related supporting tasks.
 - a. Compile report on Task 2.1.1, Review of Existing Information.
 - b. Compile PMP event list and characteristics from Task 2.1.3, PMP event list and characteristics.
 - c. Provide dew point dataset per Task 2.1.7, Dew Point.
 - d. Provide a report covering quality control that discusses the results and analysis identified in Task 4, Quality Control.
3. Provide a GIS script and PMP-value raster data for PMP estimation across all elevations, basin sizes, and temporal distributions for North Dakota, as described in Task 3, GIS.

3.03 Location of Work

There is no required location for this work. The NDSWC **will not** provide workspace for the contractor.

The contractor should include in its price proposal: transportation, lodging, and per diem costs sufficient to pay for any person(s) to make necessary trip(s) to Bismarck, ND. Travel to other locations will not be required.

3.04 Prior Experience

In order for offers to be considered responsive, offerors must meet the minimum prior experience requirements. An offeror's failure to meet these minimum prior experience requirements will cause its proposal to be considered non-responsive and its proposal will be rejected. The minimum experience requirements are:

1. Offeror must demonstrate meteorological expertise and experience as related to the science and application of PMP, to include: storm analysis, storm selection, transposition, maximization, snowmelt analysis, and temporal distribution of extreme rainfall events.
2. Successful completion of an independently peer reviewed statewide PMP analysis within the past 10 years.
3. Demonstrated ability to deliver a GIS-based PMP estimation tool within the past 10 years.
4. A minimum of 5 years of experience updating and revising regional or statewide PMP values.

3.05 Required Licenses

At the time specified by the deadline for proposal submission, the offeror must have and keep current any

professional licenses and permits required by federal, state, and local laws for contract performance. Offerors that do not possess required licenses at the time proposals are due will be determined non-responsive.

**3.06
Federal Requirements**

The offeror must identify all known federal requirements that apply to the proposal, the evaluation, or the contract.

SECTION FOUR GENERAL CONTRACT INFORMATION

4.01

Contract Term, Extension, and Renewal Options

The State intends to enter into a contract with an effective date beginning **April 15, 2019**, and ending **April 15, 2021**.

Extension Option

The NDSWC reserves the right to extend the contract period for an additional 12 months beyond the normal contract expiration date.

4.02

Contract Type

This contract is a **Firm Fixed Price** contract.

4.03

Standard Contract Provisions

The successful offeror will be required to sign the NDSWC Contract of Services during negotiation. No alteration of these provisions will be permitted without prior written approval from the NDSWC.

4.04

Proposal as a Part of the Contract

Part or all of this RFP and the successful proposal may be incorporated into the contract.

4.05

Additional Terms and Conditions

The NDSWC reserves the right to add, delete, or modify terms and conditions during contract negotiations. These terms and conditions will be within the scope of the RFP and will not affect the proposal evaluations.

4.06

Supplemental Terms and Conditions

Proposals including supplemental terms and conditions will be accepted, but supplemental conditions that conflict with those contained in this RFP or that diminish the NDSWC's rights under any contract resulting from the RFP will be void. The NDSWC is not responsible for identifying conflicting supplemental terms and conditions before issuing a contract award. After award of contract:

- (a) if conflict arises between a supplemental term or condition included in the proposal and a term or condition of the RFP, the term or condition of the RFP will prevail; and
- (b) if the NDSWC's rights would be diminished as a result of application of a supplemental term or condition included in the proposal, the supplemental term or condition will be void.

4.07

Contract Approval

This RFP does not obligate the NDSWC. NDSWC's obligation will commence upon contract approval. Upon written notice to the contractor, the NDSWC may set a different starting date for the contract. The NDSWC will not be responsible for any work done by the contractor that occurs prior to the contract start

date.

4.08 Contract Changes - Unanticipated Amendments

During the course of this contract, the contractor may be required to perform additional work. That work will be within the general scope of the initial contract. When additional work is required, the project manager designated by the NDSWC will provide the contractor a written description of the additional work and request the contractor to submit a firm price and time schedule for accomplishing the additional work. Cost and pricing data must be provided to justify the cost of amendments.

The contractor will not commence additional work until the project director has secured NDSWC's written approval

4.09 Indemnification and Insurance Requirements

The indemnification and insurance provisions will be incorporated into the final contract.

Objections to any of the provisions of the Indemnification and Insurance Requirements must be made in writing to the attention of the procurement officer. No alteration of these provisions will be permitted without prior written approval from the NDSWC, in consultation with the North Dakota Risk Management Division.

Upon receipt of the Notice of Intent to Award, the successful offeror must obtain the required insurance coverage and provide the procurement officer with proof of coverage prior to contract approval. The coverage must be satisfactory to the NDSWC, in consultation with the North Dakota Risk Management Division. An offeror's failure to provide evidence of insurance coverage is a material breach and grounds for award withdrawal or contract termination.

4.10 Taxes and Taxpayer Identification.

The contractor must provide a valid Vendor Tax Identification Number as a provision of the contract.

The NDSWC and State are not responsible for and will not pay local, state, or federal taxes. The State sales tax exemption number is E-2001, and certificates will be furnished upon request by the NDSWC.

A contractor performing any contract, including service contracts, for the United States Government, State of North Dakota, counties, cities, school districts, park board, or any other political subdivisions within North Dakota is not exempt from payment of sales or use tax on material and supplies used or consumed in carrying out contracts. In these cases, the contractor is required to file returns and pay sales and use tax, just as required for contracts with private parties. Contact the North Dakota Tax Department at 701-328-1246 or visit its website at www.nd.gov/tax/ for more information.

A contractor performing any contract, including a service contract, within North Dakota is also subject to the corporation income tax, individual income tax, and withholding tax reporting requirements, whether the contract is performed by a corporation, partnership, or other business entity, or as an employee of the contractor. In the case of employees performing the services in the state, the contractor is required to withhold state income tax from the employees' compensation and remit to the state as required by law. Contact the North Dakota Tax Department at 701-328-1248 or visit its web site for more information.

4.11 Proposed Payment Procedures

The NDSWC will make payments based on a negotiated payment schedule. Each billing must consist of an invoice and progress report. No payment will be made until the progress report and the project

manager has approved invoice.

The NDSWC will not make any advanced payments before performance by the contractor under this contract.

4.12 Contract Funding

Payment for the contract is subject to funds already appropriated and identified.

4.13 Payment Terms

No payment will be made until the NDSWC approves the contract.

Payment for services received under contracts will normally be made within 30 calendar days after receipt and acceptance by the NDSWC or after receipt of a correct invoice, whichever is later. Payment inquiries must be directed to the NDSWC.

4.14 Contract Personnel

The project manager designated by the NDSWC must approve any change of the contractor's project team members named in the proposal, in advance and in writing. Personnel changes that are not approved by the NDSWC may be grounds for contract termination.

4.15 Inspection & Modification - Reimbursement for Unacceptable Deliverables

The contractor is responsible for the completion of all work set out in the contract. All work is subject to inspection, evaluation, and approval by the project manager designated by the NDSWC. The NDSWC may employ all reasonable means to ensure that the work is progressing and being performed in compliance with the contract. Should the project manager determine that corrections or modifications are necessary in order to accomplish its intent, the project manager may direct the contractor to make changes. The contractor will not unreasonably withhold changes.

Substantial failure of the contractor to perform the contract may cause the NDSWC to terminate the contract. In this event, the NDSWC may require the contractor to reimburse amounts paid (based on the identified portion of unacceptable work received) and may seek associated damages.

4.16 Termination for Default

If the project manager designated by the NDSWC determines that the contractor has refused to perform the work or has failed to perform the work with diligence as to ensure its timely and accurate completion, the NDSWC may, by providing written notice to the contractor, terminate the contractor's right to proceed with any of the remaining work.

4.17 Open Records Laws - Confidentiality

Any records that are obtained or generated by the contractor under this contract are subject to North Dakota open records law regarding public records and handling of confidential information.

4.18 Work Product, Equipment, and Material

All work product, equipment, or materials created or purchased under this contract belong to the NDSWC and must be delivered to NDSWC upon request or contract termination by the NDSWC.

**4.19
Independent Entity**

The contractor is an independent entity under this contract and is not a State employee for any purpose. The contractor retains sole and absolute discretion in the manner and means of carrying out the contractor's activities and responsibilities under the contract, except to the extent specified in the contract.

**4.20
Assignment**

Contractor may not assign or otherwise transfer or delegate any right or duty without the NDSWC's express written consent. However, the contractor may enter into subcontracts, provided that the subcontract acknowledges the binding nature of this contract and incorporates this contract, including any attachments.

**4.21
Disputes - Applicable Law and Venue**

Any dispute arising out of this agreement will be resolved under the laws of the State of North Dakota.

**SECTION FIVE
EVALUATION CRITERIA AND CONTRACTOR SELECTION**

**THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED
TO SCORE THIS CONTRACT IS 100**

5.01

Methodology and Understanding of the Project

Thirty-five Percent (35%) of the total possible evaluation points will be assigned to this criterion.

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

Did the offeror demonstrate meteorological expertise and experience as related to the science and application of PMP to include: storm analysis, storm selection, transposition, maximization, snowmelt analysis, and temporal distribution of extreme rainfall events?

Does the methodology include a sound approach for estimating snowmelt and precipitation values?

Does the methodology include a sound approach for maximization and transpositioning?

Does the methodology and understanding of the GIS product make sense?

How reasonable is the quality control methodology?

How reasonable is the methodology for storm selection?

Does the methodology include a sound approach for developing temporal distribution?

Does the methodology include a sound approach for updating dew point data?

How reasonable is the methodology for statistical analysis of PMP values?

Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables expected?

Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the NDSWC's time schedule and ability to meet it?

Is the proposal submitted responsive to all material requirements in the RFP?

5.02

Management Plan for the Project

Twenty Percent (20%) of the total possible evaluation points will be assigned to this criterion.

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

To what extent does the management plan allow for timely meetings and updates throughout the project?

How well does the management plan account for in-person meetings?

How well does the management plan incorporate the peer review process?

How well does the management plan support all of the project requirements and logically lead to the deliverables required in the RFP?

How well is accountability completely and clearly defined?

Is the organization of the project team clear?

How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?

To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessary to perform the contract?

Does it appear that offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

Has the contractor gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

Is the proposal practical, feasible, and within budget?

5.03 Experience and Qualifications

Thirty Percent (30%) of the total possible points will be assigned to this criterion.

If the RFP required a minimum amount of experience or qualifications, no points will be awarded for meeting the minimum. Points will be awarded for experience and qualifications that exceed the stated minimums. Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below:

Questions regarding the personnel.

Does the offeror have a full member of the American Meteorological Society (AMS) or an AMS Certified Consulting Meteorologist as part of the project team?

How many years of experience on similar projects do individuals assigned have?

How many statewide PMP analyses have been completed?

Has the contractor completed snowmelt estimates prior to this project?

Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

Questions regarding the firm.

Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing statewide PMP projects on time and within budget?

Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing regional PMP projects on time and within budget?

How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

Has the firm provided 3 references along with letters of reference from previous clients?

If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does it measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

5.04 Contract Cost

Fifteen Percent (15%) of the total possible evaluation points will be assigned to this criterion.

Any prompt payment discount terms proposed by the offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be evaluated according to the method set forth in the Proposal Evaluation form attached to this RFP.

SECTION SIX PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT

6.01

Proposal Format and Content

The NDSWC discourages overly lengthy and costly proposals; however, in order for the NDSWC to evaluate proposals fairly and completely, offerors must follow the format set out in this RFP and provide all information requested.

6.02

Introduction

Proposals must include the complete name and address of offeror's firm and the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person the NDSWC should contact regarding the proposal.

Proposals must confirm that the offeror will comply with all provisions in this RFP. The proposal must disclose any instances where the firm or any individuals working on the contract have a possible conflict of interest and the nature of that conflict (e.g., employed by the State of North Dakota).

Proposals must be signed by a company officer empowered to bind the company. An offeror's failure to include these items in the proposal may cause the proposal to be determined to be non-responsive, and the proposal may be rejected.

6.03

Methodology and Understanding of the Project

Offerors must provide comprehensive narrative statements that illustrate their understanding of the requirements of the project, deliverables, project schedule, and contract terms and conditions. Offerors must also identify any pertinent issues and potential problems related to the project.

Offerors must provide comprehensive narrative statements that illustrate their understanding and set out the methodology they intend to employ. Offerors must illustrate how the methodology will serve to accomplish the work and provide the deliverables described in the scope of work within the NDSWC project schedule.

6.04

Management Plan for the Project

Offerors must provide comprehensive narrative statements that set out the management plan they intend to follow and illustrate how the plan will serve to accomplish the work and furnish the deliverables described in the scope of work within the NDSWC project schedule. Offerors must provide a narrative or organizational chart that describes the project team organization. The organizational chart must illustrate the lines of authority, designate the individual responsible and accountable for the completion of each RFP component and deliverable, and indicate where the work will be performed.

6.05

Experience and Qualifications

Offerors must describe the experience of their firm in completing similar projects. Additionally, offerors must provide information specific to the personnel assigned to accomplish the work called for in this RFP. Offerors must provide a narrative description of the project team organization, a personnel roster that identifies each person who will actually work on the contract, and provide the following information about each person listed:

- (a) title;

- (b) resume;
- (c) description of the type of work the individual will perform; and
- (d) the number of estimated hours for each individual.

If an offeror intends to use subcontractors, the offeror must identify in the proposal the names of the subcontractors and the portions of the work the subcontractors will perform.

Offerors must provide at least 3 reference names and phone numbers for similar projects the offeror's firm has completed. The NDSWC reserves the right to contact any references provided by an offeror. Offerors are also invited to provide letters of reference from previous clients.

6.06 Cost Proposal

Cost proposals must include an itemized list of all direct and indirect costs associated with the contract performance, including total number of hours at various hourly rates, direct expenses, payroll, supplies, overhead assigned to each person working on the project, percentage of each person's time devoted to the project, and profit.

All costs associated with the contract must be stated in U.S. currency. Any commodities being imported must be identified, and the price must include any applicable customs, brokerage agency fees, and duties.

Offerors must complete cost proposal attached to this RFP or prepare a cost proposal following the same format.

6.07 Required Enclosures

Offerors must provide all DOCUMENTS, SAMPLES, RESUMES, COPIES OF CERTIFICATES, OR OTHER INFORMATION specifically required in this RFP.

SECTION SEVEN STANDARD PROPOSAL INFORMATION

7.01 Authorized Signature

An individual authorized to bind the offeror to the RFP provisions must sign all proposals.

7.02 State Not Responsible for Preparation Costs

The NDSWC will not pay any cost associated with the preparation, submittal, presentation, or evaluation of any proposal.

7.03 Conflict of Interest

Offerors must disclose any instances where the firm or any individuals working on the contract have a possible conflict of interest and the nature of that conflict (e.g., employed by the State of North Dakota). The NDSWC reserves the right to cancel the award if any interest disclosed from any source could either give the appearance of a conflict or cause speculation as to the objectivity of the offeror's proposal. The NDSWC's determination regarding any questions of conflict of interest is final.

7.04 Offeror's Certification

By signature on the proposal, an offeror certifies that it complies with:

- a) the laws of the State of North Dakota;
- b) North Dakota Administrative Code;
- c) all applicable local, state, and federal laws, code, and regulations;
- d) the applicable portion of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964;
- e) the Equal Employment Opportunity Act and the regulations issued by the federal government;
- f) the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the regulations issued by the federal government;
- g) all terms, conditions, and requirements set forth in this RFP;
- h) a condition that the proposal submitted was independently arrived at, without collusion;
- i) a condition that the offer will remain open and valid for the period indicated in this solicitation; and
- j) a condition that the firm and any individuals working on the contract do not have a possible conflict of interest (e.g., employed by the State of North Dakota).

If any offeror fails to comply with the provisions stated in this paragraph, the NDSWC reserves the right to reject the proposal, terminate the contract, or consider the contractor in default.

7.05 Offer Held firm

Proposals must remain open and valid for at least **90 DAYS** from the deadline specified for submission of proposals. In the event award is not made within **90 DAYS**, the NDSWC will send a written request to all offerors deemed susceptible for award asking offerors to hold their price firm for a longer specified time period.

7.06 Amendments to Proposals and Withdrawals of Proposals

Offerors may amend or withdraw proposals prior to the deadline set for proposal receipt. No amendments will be accepted after the deadline unless they are in response to a NDSWC request. After the deadline, offerors may make a written request to withdraw proposals and provide evidence that a

substantial mistake has been made. The procurement officer may permit proposal withdrawal upon verification that a substantial mistake has been made, and the NDSWC may retain the offeror's bid bond or other bid type of bid security, if one was required.

7.07

Alternate Proposals

Offerors may submit **ONLY ONE** proposal for evaluation.

Alternate proposals (proposals that offer something different than what is requested) will be **REJECTED**.

7.08

Subcontractors

Subcontractors may be used to perform work under this contract. If an offeror intends to use subcontractors, the offeror must identify in the proposal the subcontractors' names and the portions of the work the subcontractors will perform.

If a proposal with subcontractors is selected, the offeror must provide the following information concerning each prospective subcontractor within **FIVE WORKING DAYS** from the date of the NDSWC's request:

- (a) complete name of the subcontractor;
- (b) complete address of the subcontractor;
- (c) type of work the subcontractor will be performing;
- (d) percentage of work the subcontractor will be providing;
- (e) evidence, as set out in the relevant section of this RFP, that the subcontractor is registered and, if applicable, holds a valid North Dakota business license; and
- (f) a written statement, signed by each proposed subcontractor, that clearly verifies that the subcontractor is committed to render the services required by the contract.

An offeror's failure to provide this information may cause the NDSWC to consider the proposal non-responsive and reject it. The substitution of one subcontractor for another may be made only with prior written approval of the procurement officer or project manager.

7.09

Joint Ventures

Joint ventures will not be allowed.

7.10

Disclosure of Proposal Contents and Compliance with North Dakota Open Records Laws

All proposals and other material submitted become the property of the NDSWC and may be returned only at the NDSWC's option. All proposals and related information, including detailed cost information, are exempt records and will be held in confidence until an award is made, in accordance with N.D.C.C. § 54-44.4-10(2).

Offerors may make a written request that trade secrets and other proprietary data contained in proposals be held confidential. Material considered confidential by the offeror must be clearly identified, and the offeror must include a brief statement that sets out the reasons for confidentiality. See the North Dakota Office of the Attorney General website for additional information.

<http://www.ag.nd.gov/OpenRecords/ORM.htm>

After award, proposals will be subject to the North Dakota open records law. Records are closed or confidential only if specifically stated in law. If a request for public information is received, the procurement officer, in consultation with the Office of the Attorney General, will determine whether the

information is an exception to the North Dakota open records law, and the information will be processed appropriately.

7.11 Evaluation of Proposals

All proposals will be reviewed to determine if they are responsive to the solicitation requirements. The procurement officer or an evaluation committee will evaluate responsive proposals. The evaluation will be based solely on the evaluation factors set forth in this RFP. The evaluation will consider information obtained subsequent to any discussions with offerors determined to be reasonable for award and any demonstrations, oral presentations, or site inspections, if required in this RFP.

7.12 Right of Rejection

The NDSWC reserves the right to reject any proposals, in whole or in part. Proposals received from debarred or suspended vendors will be rejected. The procurement officer may reject any proposal that is not responsive to all of the material and substantial terms, conditions, and performance requirements of the RFP.

Offerors may not qualify the proposal nor restrict the NDSWC's rights. If an offeror does so, the procurement officer may determine the proposal to be a non-responsive counter-offer and the proposal may be rejected.

The procurement officer may waive minor informalities that:

- do not affect responsiveness;
- are merely a matter of form or format;
- do not change the relative standing or otherwise prejudice other offers;
- do not change the RFP's meaning or scope;
- are insignificant, negligible, or immaterial in nature;
- do not reflect a material change in the work; or
- do not constitute a substantial reservation against a requirement or provision.

The NDSWC reserves the right to reject any proposal determined to be not responsive, and to reject the proposal of an offeror determined to be not responsible. If in the NDSWC's best interest, the NDSWC also reserves the right to refrain from making an award.

7.13 Clarification of Offers

In order to determine if a proposal is reasonably susceptible for award, communications by the procurement officer or the proposal evaluation committee are permitted with an offeror to clarify uncertainties or eliminate confusion concerning the contents of a proposal and determining responsiveness to the RFP requirements. Clarifications may not result in a material or substantive change to the proposal. The initial evaluation may be adjusted because of a clarification under this section.

After receipt of proposals, if there is a need for any substantial clarification or material change in the RFP, an amendment will be issued. The amendment will incorporate the clarification or change, and a new date and time established for new or amended proposals. Evaluations may be adjusted as a result of receiving new or amended proposals.

7.14 Preference Laws

The preference given to a non-resident offeror will be equal to the preference that would be given or

required to a North Dakota offeror by the state of the non-resident offeror (i.e., reciprocal preference). A “resident” North Dakota bidder, offeror, seller, or contractor is one who has maintained a bona fide place of business within North Dakota for at least one year prior to the date on which a contract was awarded. For a listing of state preference laws, visit the following website: <http://www.nd.gov/spo/legal/resources/> or contact the North Dakota State Procurement Office at 701-328-2740.

7.15 Contract Negotiation

After final evaluation, the procurement officer may negotiate with the offeror of the highest-ranked proposal. Negotiations, if held, will be within the scope of the request for proposals and limited to those items that would not have an effect on the ranking of proposals. If the highest-ranked offeror fails to provide necessary information for negotiations in a timely manner, or fails to negotiate in good faith, the NDSWC may terminate negotiations and negotiate with the offeror of the next highest-ranked proposal.

If contract negotiations are commenced, they will be held:

PRIMARILY BY TELECONFERENCE OR EMAIL.

If contract negotiations are held, the offeror will be responsible for all costs, including its travel and per diem expenses.

7.16 Failure to Negotiate

If the selected offeror:

- fails to provide the information required to begin negotiations in a timely manner;
- fails to negotiate in good faith;
- indicates it cannot perform the contract within the budgeted funds available for the project; or
- if the offeror and the NDSWC, after a good faith effort, cannot come to terms,

the NDSWC may terminate negotiations with the offeror initially selected and commence negotiations with the next highest ranked offeror.

7.17 Notice of Intent to Award - Offeror Notification of Selection

After the contract negotiation completion, the procurement officer will issue a written Notice of Intent to Award and send copies to all offerors. The Notice of Intent Award will set out the names and addresses of all offerors and identify the proposal selected for award. The scores and placement of other offerors will not be part of the Notice of Intent to Award.

The successful offeror named in the Notice of Intent to Award is advised not to begin work, purchase materials, or enter into subcontracts relating to the project until both the successful offeror and the NDSWC sign the contract.

7.18 Protest and Appeal

North Dakota law provides that an interested party may protest a solicitation.

If an interested party wishes to protest the RFP’s content, the written protest must be received by the procurement officer at least seven calendar days before the deadline for proposal receipt.

An interested party may protest the award or proposed contract award.

If an offeror wishes to protest the award or proposed contract award, the written protest must be received by the procurement officer within seven calendar days after the date the Notice of Intent to Award was issued.

SECTION EIGHT ATTACHMENTS

8.01 Attachments

Attachments

1. Proposal Evaluation Form
2. Offeror Checklist

ATTACHMENT 1

PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

All proposals will be reviewed for responsiveness and evaluated using the criteria set out in this RFP.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATORS

Each evaluation criterion has been assigned a specific number of points. The questions under each evaluated area help you measure the offeror's response quality. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

RATING SCALE FOR ASSESSING OFFEROR RESPONSES

This rating scale is intended to establish guidelines within that range to ensure members of the RFP evaluation committee perform their evaluation with consistency. You may assign any value for a given criteria from 0 to the maximum number of points. A zero value typically constitutes no response or an inability of the offeror to meet the criterion. In contrast, the maximum value should constitute a high standard of meeting the criterion. If a specific criterion would only yield a yes or no response (e.g., offeror can submit an electronic report in required format by noon Friday), the evaluator should award either the maximum points or a zero.

For Example: "Experience and Qualifications" is an evaluation criteria receiving a weighting of 20% of the total possible points. Using a 100 Point Scale, a maximum of 20 points can be awarded. The rating scale would be:

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value.
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability.
6-10	Good. Some applicability.
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability.
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability.

COST PROPOSAL

If offerors were required to place cost proposals in a separate sealed envelope, do not open the cost proposal until the technical proposals have been evaluated.

The cost proposals will be evaluated by the evaluation committee and recorded on the evaluation summary sheets.

Any prompt payment discount terms offered by the offeror will not be not taken into consideration in evaluating cost. However, the cost proposals of nonresident offerors may be adjusted by the application of preference laws, if applicable. Contact the State Procurement Office at 701-328-2740 for assistance in applying preference laws.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

Person or Firm Name _____

Name of Proposal Evaluation (PEC) Member _____

Date of Review _____

RFP Title/Number _____

I hereby certify that I do not have a conflict of interest with this offeror. I further certify that I have reviewed the Request for Proposal Evaluators Guide and that neither I nor my immediate family members have a conflict of interest with regard to this offeror who submitted a proposal in response to this Request for Proposal, in accordance with [N.D.A.C. § 4-12-04-04](#).

Signature _____ **Date** _____

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS USED TO SCORE THIS CONTRACT IS 100

6.03 Methodology and Understanding for the Project

Weight **35 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **35 Percent** = **35 Points**

Rating Scale (35 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value.
1-8	Fair. Limited applicability.
9-17	Good. Some applicability.
18-26	Very Good. Substantial applicability.
27-35	Excellent. Total applicability.

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Did the offeror demonstrate meteorological expertise and experience as related to the science and application of PMP to include: storm analysis, storm selection, transposition, maximization, snowmelt analysis, and temporal distribution of extreme rainfall events?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Does the methodology include a sound approach for estimating snowmelt and precipitation values?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Does the methodology include a sound approach for maximization and transpositioning?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Does the methodology and understanding of the GIS product make sense?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How reasonable is the quality control methodology?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How reasonable is the methodology for storm selection?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Does the methodology include a sound approach for developing temporal distribution?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Does the methodology include a sound approach for updating dew point data?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How reasonable is the methodology for statistical analysis of PMP values?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the deliverables expected?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Has the offeror demonstrated an understanding of the NDSWC's time schedule and can meet it?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Is the proposal submitted responsive to all material requirements in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.03: _____

6.04 Management Plan for the Project

Weight **20 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **20 Percent** = **20 Points**

Rating Scale (20 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value.
1-5	Fair. Limited applicability.
6-10	Good. Some applicability.
11-15	Very Good. Substantial applicability.
16-20	Excellent. Total applicability.

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

To what extent does the management plan allow for timely meetings and updates throughout the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How well does the management plan account for in-person meetings?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How well does the management plan incorporate the peer review process?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How well does the management plan support all of the project requirements and logically lead to the deliverables required in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How well is accountability completely and clearly defined?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Is the organization of the project team clear?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How well does the management plan illustrate the lines of authority and communication?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

To what extent does the offeror already have the hardware, software, equipment, and licenses necessary to perform the contract?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Does it appear that offeror can meet the schedule set out in the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Has the contractor gone beyond the minimum tasks necessary to meet the objectives of the RFP?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Is the proposal practical, feasible, and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.04: _____

6.05 Experience and Qualifications

Weight **30 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section

100 Points x **30 Percent** = **30 Points**

Rating Scale (30 POINT Maximum)	
Point Value	Explanation
0	None. Not addressed or response of no value.
1-7	Fair. Limited applicability.
8-16	Good. Some applicability.
17-23	Very Good. Substantial applicability.
24-30	Excellent. Total applicability.

Proposals will be evaluated against the questions set out below. Do not assign points to individual questions, instead, award a total score for each evaluation criterion.

Questions regarding the personnel.

Does the offeror have a full member of the American Meteorological Society (AMS) or an AMS Certified Consulting Meteorologist as part of the project team?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How many years of experience on similar projects do individuals assigned have?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How many statewide PMP analyses have been completed?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Has the offeror completed snowmelt estimates prior to this project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Are resumes complete and do they demonstrate backgrounds that would be desirable for individuals engaged in the work the RFP requires?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How extensive is the applicable education and experience of the personnel designated to work on the project?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Questions regarding the firm.

Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing statewide PMP projects on time and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Has the firm demonstrated experience in completing regional PMP projects on time and within budget?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

Has the firm provided 3 references along with letters of reference from previous clients?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

If a subcontractor will perform work on the project, how well does the subcontractor measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

EVALUATOR'S NOTES

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.05: _____

6.06 Contract Cost

Weight **15 Percent**. Maximum Point Value for this Section
100 Points x **15 Percent** = **15 Points**

Applying Preference Laws

Any prompt payment discount terms proposed by the offeror will not be considered in evaluating cost. The cost amount used for evaluation may be affected by the application of North Dakota preference laws (N.D.C.C. § 44-08-01). The preference given to a non-resident offeror will be equal to the preference that would be given or required to a North Dakota offeror by the state of the non-resident offeror (i.e., reciprocal preference).

When evaluating cost proposals from nonresident offerors, determine whether the offeror's state of residence has a preference law for vendors resident in that state. The nonresident offeror's cost proposal will be increased by the same percentage of preference given to vendors resident in that state.

For example, if the state law of the nonresident offeror requires a 5% preference for vendors resident in that state, the procurement officer will increase that offeror's cost proposal by 5% before evaluation.

See <http://cms.oregon.gov/DAS/EGS/PS/Pages/reciprocal.aspx> for a list of States Preference Laws, or contact the North Dakota State Procurement Office at 701-328-2683.

Converting Cost to Points

After applying any reciprocal preference, the lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined as follows:

$$\left(\frac{\text{Price of Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Price of Proposal Being Rated}} \right) \times \text{Total Points for Cost Available} = \text{Awarded points}$$

EVALUATOR'S POINT TOTAL FOR 6.06: _____

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Summary**

Name of RFP:		
RFP Number		
Vendor Being Evaluated:		
Evaluator Name:		
Date:		
Technical Evaluation <i>(Maximum 85 Points)</i>	Maximum Points by Category	Score
1. Methodology and Understanding of the Project	35	
2. Management Plan for the Project:	20	
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30	
Cost Evaluation (Maximum 15 Points) 1. Make adjustments for reciprocal preference, if necessary. See list of States Preference Laws: http://cms.oregon.gov/DAS/EGS/PS/Pages/reciprocal.aspx Calculated points awarded for price. $\left(\frac{\text{Price of Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Price of Proposal Being Rated}} \right) \times 15 \text{ Points} = \text{Awarded points}$		
4. Cost	15	
Total		

**Request for Proposal
Evaluation Totals**

Name of RFP:						
Name of Offeror:						
Date:						
Technical Evaluation Criteria	85 POINTS Maximum	Evaluator	Evaluator	Evaluator	Evaluator	Evaluator
1. Methodology and Understanding of the Project	35					
2. Management Plan for the Project:	20					
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30					
Evaluator Totals						
Grand Total		Note: Sum of all individual scores.				
Technical Proposal Score		Note: Total of individual points divided by the number of evaluators (85 POINT MAXIMUM).				
Cost Propose Score		Note: (15 POINT MAXIMUM)				
TOTAL						

**Request for Proposal
Summary of Evaluation Committee Totals**

Name of RFP:						
Date:						
Technical Evaluation Criteria	85 POINTS Maximum	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 3	Offeror 4	Offeror 5
1. Methodology and Understanding of the Project	35					
2. Management Plan for the Project:	20					
3. Experience and Qualifications:	30					
Technical Proposal Score						
Cost Proposals Score						
Grand Total						

ATTACHMENT 2

CHECKLIST FOR OFFERORS

- Submit any questions, comments, or requests for clarification to the procurement officer by the deadline for submission of questions.
- Be sure an individual authorized to bind the offeror to the provisions of the RFP signs the proposal.
- Comply with the North Dakota Secretary of State and the North Dakota State Procurement Office Registration requirements prior to the deadline stated in the RFP.
- Comply with minimum requirements for experience.
- Comply with professional licensing requirements, and provide copies of certifications, if required.
- Provide the information about the qualifications of the firm and individuals that will be working on the project.
- Identify all known federal requirements that apply to the proposal, the evaluation, or the contract.
- Provide the required number of references.
- Provide all documents or materials that must be submitted with the RFP.
- Identify and label any sections of the proposal you feel contain confidential information.