

**AIR QUALITY MONITORING SERVICES  
Evaluation Criteria/Selection Process Summary**

On October 29, 2010, the Harbor Department issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Air Quality Monitoring Services. The following is a summary services required to provide support and assistance:

Operations and Maintenance

- Monitoring O<sub>3</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, CO, PM10, PM2.5, EC and ultrafine particles
- Monitoring meteorological conditions
- Hosting/maintaining real-time and filter-based data on the CAAP website
- Archiving data
- Developing Quality Assurance/Quality Control protocols
- Performing routine repair and maintenance of equipment
- Supporting Port staff in public presentations/meetings, as requested

Data Review and Quality Assurance

- Conducting Daily / Monthly / Bi-Monthly Reviews
- Preparing Annual Reports

Optional Tasks

Optional tasks to conduct special studies and/or analyses have been included in this proposed Agreement and will not exceed \$300,000 over the life of the Agreement. Such studies would focus on source apportionment and using monitoring data to help improve control strategies.

The RFP was posted on the Port of Los Angeles (Port) website, and over 7,500 email notifications were sent out to recipients on the Diversity Xchange Database and the Los Angeles Business Virtual Network (LABVN). An RFP notification letter was also mailed to firms that have specifically expressed interest in this RFP to the Environmental Management Division (EMD), but were not yet registered on the Diversity Xchange Database or the LABVN.

The Harbor Department received proposals from five (5) firms. The criteria for evaluation of the proposals were presented in the RFP for each proposer to review, and each proposal was evaluated based on these criteria. The criteria are shown on the attached RFP Selection Evaluation Form.

<u>Name</u>	<u>City/State</u>	<u>Status</u>
Advanced GeoEnvironmental Inc. (AGE)	Brea, CA	SBE
Advance Monitoring Methods (AMM)	Castlerock, CO	SBE/OBE
CET Engineering (CET)	West Covina, CA	SBE/MBE
Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	San Diego, CA	OBE
Sonoma Technology Inc. (STI)	Petaluma, CA	OBE

**Proposal Review Results**

The proposals were evaluated and rated by one Marine Environmental Supervisor and one Environmental Specialist from the Port's EMD, and one Environmental Specialist from the Los Angeles World Airports EMD. Proposals were individually reviewed and each rater scored using a range of 0 to 5 for each criteria, with 5 being exceptionally well qualified and 0 being not included/non-responsive. A weighting factor and weighted score were used for the proposal

review process, as shown on the attached RFP Selection Evaluation Form. The results are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Proposal Review Scores**

<b>Firm</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Total Score (Max points 300)</b>
<b>SAIC</b>	93	92	98	<b>283</b>
<b>STI</b>	81	92	92	<b>265</b>
<b>CET</b>	89	80	91	<b>260</b>
<b>AGE</b>	77	70	78	<b>225</b>
<b>AMM</b>	77	74	64	<b>215</b>

All proposals were deemed responsive and due to the small number of proposals, all five firms were invited to interview.

**Interview Results**

All firms listed above were invited to interview. During the interview process, each firm responded to a set of questions formulated by the selection committee. The firms were ranked based on the results of their presentation and responses to the interview questions. The rankings were determined using the criteria and weighting factors shown on the attached Interview Selection Evaluation Form. The results are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Summary of Interview Scores**

<b>Firm</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Total Score (Max points 300)</b>
<b>SAIC</b>	97	98	98	<b>293</b>
<b>CET</b>	84	82	84	<b>250</b>
<b>STI</b>	81	72	86	<b>239</b>
<b>AGE</b>	80	70	76	<b>226</b>
<b>AMM</b>	69	62	64	<b>195</b>

**Firm Selection**

The interview panel consisted of the same three individuals that evaluated the proposals. Interview questions were based on the criteria presented in the RFP, with some modifications to downplay the need for Port of Los Angeles experience. During the interviews, a special effort was made to consider whether the firms that had not been providing these services to EMD in the existing contract had new ideas and approaches that would add value to these services going forward, such that a change was warranted or prudent. For instance, every firm was asked the same question regarding techniques and methods to identify source apportionment from raw sampling data. The answers revealed the depth of technical experience and capability

of each firm, demonstrating their understanding of emerging science and how to go beyond basic data gathering and inform the design and implementation of control strategies. Also, the interview panel considered how each firm planned to transition operational responsibility for the monitoring network without disrupting or jeopardizing the continuity of publicly available air monitoring data.

While, all of the firms generally demonstrated an ability to perform the required tasks described in the RFP, the following considerations were the primary reasons for retention of the incumbent firm.

- Lack of long term air monitoring project experience: Several of the firms major monitoring projects were short term projects, deploying equipment and monitoring air quality for one year or less.
- Staffing: Reliability and availability of on-site staff was a concern because some of the firms had a limited number of site technicians that were also committed to several other monitoring sites throughout Southern California.
- Inexperience in dealing with the public: Some of the firms had little to no experience responding to public queries and challenges regarding data and operations.
- Application of monitoring data to programs: Only one firm demonstrated thorough understanding of how to utilize monitoring data in ways that are useful to the port such as improving emission control programs, technology advancement projects and incentive programs.

The selection was based solely on the interview scores. As shown in the table above, SAIC scored the highest in interview and therefor was recommended to provide Air Quality Monitoring Services.