

## AS-NEEDED AIR QUALITY SERVICES RFP Evaluation Criteria/Selection Process Summary

### RFP Tasks

The Request for Proposals (RFP) Scope of Work included the following Tasks:

1. Support and assistance in the implementation of the strategies in the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP), including special studies for the five main source categories identified in the CAAP.
2. Update the Bay Wide Health Risk Assessment (BWHRA) Tool.
3. Assistance in the identification, evaluation, and demonstration/piloting of new and emerging emission reduction technologies/strategies applicable to the Port industry.
4. Support for Port greenhouse gas (GHG) programs, including leadership in local, national and international GHG and Climate Change initiatives.
5. Technical expertise and review of air quality sections and health risk assessments of CEQA/NEPA documents.
6. Support and tracking of existing and proposed local, state and federal regulations/legislation, and an analysis of the potential impact on the Port.
7. Assistance in grant writing and tracking for air quality-focused grant opportunities and awards.
8. Permit compliance support for RECLAIM and other stationary and mobile sources.
9. Assistance in information sharing and outreach to national and international ports.
10. Assistance in preparing technical papers and presentations for conferences.
11. Any additional services requested by the Director of Environmental Management.

### Proposals Received

Under the RFP, firms were able to propose for all tasks contained in the scope of work or for specific task(s). The table below shows all firms that submitted a proposal and which tasks each proposals addressed.

	<b>COMPANY</b>	<b>Tasks</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>CITY, ST</b>
1	Integra Environmental Consulting, Inc	1,3,5,6	SBE	Burbank, CA
2	Environ International Corporation	ALL		Novato, CA
3	Sierra Research	ALL		Sacramento, CA
4	Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC	ALL	SBE	Albuquerque, NM
5	Science Applications International Corporation	ALL		San Diego, CA
6	Environmental Audit, INC.	4,5,6,8,9,10,11	SBE/WBE	Placentia, CA
7	E2 ManageTech, Inc	1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	SBE	Long Beach, CA
8	TETRA TECH	ALL		Pasadena, CA
9	Camp Dresser & McKee Inc	ALL		Los Angeles, CA
10	Davenport Engineering	8,11	SBE	Torrance, CA

### Proposal Review Results

Proposals were individually reviewed and 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 not used for the proposal review process, so the maximum rater score is 20. This is shown on the attached RFP Selection Evaluation Form. The ranked results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Proposal Review Scores**

Proposal Review Scores					
Firm	Reviewer				Average
	1	2	3	4	
Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC	94	88	92	78	88.0
TETRA TECH	94	92	80	81	86.8
E2 ManageTEch, Inc	82	90	88	77	84.3
Environ International Corporation	90	82	80	82	83.5
Science Applications International Corporation	90	80	84	67	80.3
Integra Environmental Consulting, Inc	80	82	74	68	76.0
Camp Dresser & McKee Inc	78	80	76	66	75.0
Sierra Research	72	68	80	67	71.8
Environmental Audit, INC.	78	72	72	60	70.5
Davenport Engineering	80	72	76	48	69.0

**Interview Selection**

Ten proposals were received. As all proposals were deemed responsive, EMD elected to invite all proposers to interview.

**Interview Results**

All firms listed above were interviewed. During the interview process, each firm responded to a set of questions formulated by the interview panel. The firms were ranked based on the results of their presentations and responses, using the criteria shown on the Interview Selection Evaluation Form.

Each criterion was scored using a range of 0 to 5, with 5 being exceptionally well qualified and 0 being not included/non-responsive. A weighting factor was established for each criteria and a final weighted score was calculated with a maximum score of 100. As can be seen on the Interview Selection Evaluation Form, Firm Qualifications & Experience (40%) and Project Organization & Personnel (20%) were assigned the highest weighting, followed by Technical Approach (20%), Fees & Budget Control (10%) and Quality & Responsiveness of Proposal (10%). The results are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Summary of Interview Scores**

Proposal Review Scores						
Firm	Reviewer					Average
	1	2	3	4	5	
Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC	96	95	92	96	78	91.4
Environ International Corporation	92	94	88	90	82	89.2
Integra Environmental Consulting, Inc	86	89	86	80	68	81.8
E2 ManageTEch, Inc	86	81	88	76	77	81.6
TETRA TECH	84	80	86	76	81	81.4
Science Applications International Corporation	72	77	81	84	67	76.2

Camp Dresser & McKee Inc	68	68	72	72	66	69.2
Sierra Research	64	64	70	68	67	66.6
Environmental Audit, INC.	48	49	55	64	60	55.2
Davenport Engineering	42	47	60	60	48	51.4

### Firm Selection

Based on the interviews conducted, five firms were selected as the most qualified to meet the Port's anticipated needs over the next three years. Five firms were determined to be the appropriate number of firms to handle current and future air quality needs. The recommended firms include:

Integra Environmental Consulting	Tasks: 1, 3, 5 and 6
Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC.	Tasks: All
Environ International Corp.	Tasks: All
E2 ManageTech, Inc.	Tasks: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10
Tetra Tech	Tasks: All