

## CEQA/NEPA DOCUMENTATION & SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

### Evaluation Criteria/Selection Process Summary

The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was divided into two work categories:

Category 1) professional services in the preparation of CEQA/NEPA documents and environmental studies and

Category 2) professional services in one or more of the following areas: cultural resources; air quality, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gases; sustainability planning and reporting; mitigation monitoring and reporting; and in-house CEQA/NEPA project management support.

Firms were able to bid on Categories 1 and 2 or Category 2 only. Proposals were rated based on the Selection Evaluation Form included below. A total of 22 proposals were received, of which 17 proposals were submitted for Categories 1 and 2 and five proposals were submitted for Category 2 only.

### Proposal Review Results

Proposals were individually reviewed by each rater 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 weighing factor was established for each criteria and a final weighted score. The highest weighted score possible is 100. An additional eight points was added to each maximum total score if a firm qualified as a Local Business Enterprise (LBE). The firms were then ranked based on the final scores. The results are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Proposal Review Scores**

Firm	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Ranking
<b>Categories 1 and 2</b>					
Firm A	72	65	63	75	15
Firm B	95	89	79	97	8
Firm C	67	70	50	67	16
Firm D	100	107	83	100	2
Firm E	98	96	84	98	5
Firm F	80	79	77	80	12
Firm G	60	43	51	60	17
Firm H	88	104	102	88	3
Firm I	86	81	70	83	10
Firm J	101	105	89	98	1
Firm K	82	78	79	80	11
Firm L	100	82	84	100	6
Firm M	90	83	Recused	93	7
Firm N	101	98	80	101	4
Firm O	88	81	78	85	9
Firm P	82	75	62	82	14

Firm Q	82	70	68	82	13
<b>Firm</b>	<b>Reviewer 1</b>	<b>Reviewer 2</b>	<b>Reviewer 3</b>	<b>Reviewer 4</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
<b>Category 2 Only</b>					
Firm R	104	107	92	102	1
Firm S	91	94	88	91	2
Firm T	88	79	58	85	3
Firm U	70	76	96	67	4
Firm V	80	61	54	80	5

## Interview Selection

Based on the proposal review scores above, the selection committee short-listed the following 11 firms under Categories 1 and 2 and four firms under Category 2 for interviews:

### Categories 1 and 2

Parsons Transportation Group  
 ENVIRON  
 SAIC  
 CDM Smith  
 Dudek  
 ICF Jones & Stokes, Inc.  
 LSA Associates, Inc.  
 Aspen Environmental Group  
 AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc.  
 AECOM  
 Environmental Science Associates

### Category 2

Castle Environmental Consulting  
 Starcrest  
 Environmental Compliance Solutions  
 PCR Services Corporation

## Interview Results

All firms listed above were interviewed. 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 proposals under the following five criteria:

- CEQA/NEPA/Special Studies Experience and Expertise
- Project Team, Resource Availability, and Locally Based
- Project Management Approach and Work Plan
- Fees and Budget Control
- Quality and Responsiveness of Proposal

Each criteria was scored using a range of 0 to 5, with 5 being exceptionally well qualified and 0 being not included/non responsive. A weighing factor was established for each criteria and a final weighted score. The highest weighted score possible is 100. An additional eight points was added to each maximum total score if a firm qualified as LBE. The firms were then ranked based on the final scores. The results are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Summary of Interview and Proposal Scores Combined**

Firm	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Ranking
<b>Categories 1 and 2</b>					
Firm B	90	90	72	90	5
Firm D	102	107	90	103	1
Firm E	90	89	56	89	7
Firm H	94	104	76	98	3
Firm I	85	91	64	94	6
Firm J	101	105	76	101	2
Firm K	82	70	60	81	9
Firm L	93	85	60	92	8
Firm M	87	75	Recused	81	7
Firm N	100	101	66	100	4
Firm O	78	77	58	74	10
Firm	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Ranking
<b>Category 2 Only</b>					
Firm R	104	107	100	104	1
Firm S	91	94	70	91	3
Firm T	88	85	56	88	4
Firm U	98	102	90	101	2

## Firm Selection

Based on the interviews conducted and review of proposals, the following six firms under Categories 1 and 2 and two firms under Category 2 were selected as the most qualified to meet the Port's anticipated needs over the next three years:

Categories 1 and 2

ENVIRON  
ICF Jones & Stokes, Inc.  
CDM Smith  
AECOM  
Parsons Transportation Group  
Dudek

Category 2

Castle Environmental Consulting  
Environmental Compliance Solutions

**Summary of RFQ Selection Process**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
RFQ Notification	3/26/13	Harbor Department electronic notification via POLA website
Pre-Proposal Meeting	4/10/13	Risk Management, Contracts & Purchasing, and Environmental staff gave presentations to attendees.
Proposal Due Date	5/3/13	22 proposals submitted to POLA
Interviews	7/8/13, 7/10/13, 7/16/13	Parsons Transportation Group Castle Environmental Consulting ENVIRON Starcrest SAIC Environmental Compliance Solutions CDM Smith PCR Services Corporation Dudek ICF Jones & Stokes, Inc. LSA Associates, Inc. Aspen Environmental Group AMEC Environment & Infrastructure, Inc. AECOM Environmental Science Associates
Selected Firms	9/12/13	ENVIRON ICF Jones & Stokes, Inc. CDM Smith AECOM Parsons Transportation Group Dudek Castle Environmental Consulting Environmental Compliance Solutions

## RFQ SELECTION EVALUATION FORM

July 2013

### PROJECT: CEQA/NEPA DOCUMENTATION AND SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

**SCORING GUIDELINES:**

**Rater's Score:** (Range 0-5) 0 – not included/non responsive; 1 – Marginal Abilities, Serious Deficiencies; 2 – Adequate with Minor Deficiencies; 3 – Adequate, Standard-Acceptable; 4 – Well Qualified; 5 – Exceptionally Well Qualified.

**Weighing Factor:** Input using a range of 1 through 6, with 1 being of relative lower importance and 6 being relative highest importance. You may use each number (1 through 6) more than once; however, in establishing weights, the total of all weighing factors (A-E) must equal 20. Example: 3+2+6+4+5=20 or 3+3+3+6+5=20.

**Weighted Score** = Rater's Score multiplied by (x) Weighing Factor. Totals should be calculated for each criterion.

**Total score** = Sum of all weighted scores.

Firm Name	Evaluated by	Date

CRITERIA TO BE RATED		RATER'S SCORE	WEIGHING FACTOR	WEIGHTED SCORE
A. Firm Qualifications, Experience and References	How long has the company been in business? Has the company done similar work? Level of expertise in subject matters areas?		<b>6</b>	
B. Project Organization, Personnel and Staffing	Qualification and experience of proposed personnel for requested services? On-site availability of team and project manager? Locally based firm or team?		<b>6</b>	
C. Project Approach, Work Plan, and Management	Quality of proposed work plan to meet project requirements? Quality of project management?		<b>4</b>	
D. Rates, Fees and Budget Control	Competitive rates and fees proposed? Are proposed budget management, fees and staff hours proposed and clearly defined?		<b>2</b>	
E. Quality and Responsiveness of the Proposal	Is the SOQ clear and understandable? Does the SOQ meet of all the RFQ requirements?		<b>2</b>	
	<b>Maximum points possible = 100</b>		<b>A+B+C+D+E=20</b>	<b>Total Points</b>