

- a)  $\frac{\text{Lowest Cost}}{\text{Another Cost}} = \text{Result 1}$
- b)  $\text{Result 1} \times (\text{multiplied by}) 170 (\text{cost points}) = \text{Result 2}$
- c)  $\text{Result 2} + (\text{added}) \text{ to } 30 (\text{cost evaluation score}) = \text{Cost Section Score}$
- d) **Scoring example for illustration purposes only:**

Lowest price earns 170 points (cost points) + 30 (cost evaluation score).

Other proposers earn cost scores as follows:

(low cost)  $\$100,000 \div (\text{another proposal cost}) \$127,000 = .7874$  (Result 1)  
 (Result 1)  $.7874 \times 170 \text{ points (cost points)} = 134$  (Result 2)  
 (Result 2)  $134 + 30 (\text{cost evaluation score}) = 164$

#### 4. Stage 4 – Combining Narrative Proposal Score and Cost Section Score

CDPH will combine the narrative proposal score to the final Cost Section score and will tentatively identify the firm with the highest combined proposal score from each of the earlier evaluation stage(s).

#### 5. Stage 5 – Adjustments to Score Calculations for Bidding Preferences

- a. CDPH will determine which firms, if any, are eligible to receive a bidding preference (i.e., small business or non-small business subcontractor preference, TACPA and/or EZA).
- b. To confirm the identity of the highest scored responsive Proposer, CDPH will adjust the total score for applicable claimed preference(s) for those Proposers eligible for bidding preferences. CDPH will apply preference adjustments to eligible Proposers according to State regulations following verification of eligibility with the appropriate office of the Department of General Services. More information about the allowable bidding preferences appears in the RFP section entitled, "Preference Programs".

#### 6. Stage 6 – Oral Interview

CDPH may choose to conduct oral interviews with up to the top four (4) highest scoring Proposers. CDPH may, at its discretion, choose not to conduct oral interviews. The purpose of the oral interview is to assess and/or confirm:

- a. Each Proposer's understanding of CDPH's needs and the overall importance of the project.
- b. The Proposer's commitment to provide quality services in a timely manner.
- c. The Proposer's willingness and ability to establish effective working relationships with State staff.
- d. The capabilities and strengths of the Proposer's management team.
- e. The soundness and strengths of the Proposer's approach to accomplish the objectives and manage the project to ensure successful completion of all Scope of Work requirements.

If oral interviews are held, CDPH will evaluate the results of each oral presentation on a competitive basis by comparing the oral presentation responses of one proposer to those of another proposer. Proposers may earn 50 points for the oral interview stage. The earned

oral interview points will be added to the Technical Proposal Score in the final score calculation.

If CDPH chooses to conduct oral interviews, the length of each interview should not exceed 4 hour(s). CDPH anticipates that interviews will be held in Sacramento during the week of August 31-September 1, 2010. In addition to the Proposer's official authorized representative(s), CDPH may request the presence of primary and/or key project personnel to attend the interview. If applicable, CDPH will mail, email, or fax specific interview requirement information to each of the affected Proposers.

**7. Stage 7 – Final Score Calculation**

CDPH will use the formula shown below to calculate final proposal scores and to determine the highest scored proposal.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 \text{a. Narrative Proposal Score} & \times 70\% = & \text{Technical Score} \\
 \text{b. Cost Section Score} & \times 30\% = & \text{Cost Score} \\
 & & \text{(includes Oral Interview points, if conducted)} \\
 \\ 
 \text{c. Technical Score} & & \\
 + \text{ Cost Score} & & \\
 \hline
 = \text{ Total Point Score} & & 
 \end{array}$$

**N. Narrative Proposal Rating Factors**

Raters will use the following criteria to score the narrative portion of each proposal.

**1. Executive Summary**

<b>Executive Summary Rating Factors</b> [Not to exceed 4 pages]	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>
To what extent did the Proposer express, in its own words, its understanding of CDPH's needs and the importance of this project? <b>Assign 1 point or 0 points if the Proposer restates or paraphrases information in the RFP.</b>	<b>3</b>	
To what extent did the Proposer demonstrate the tangible results that it expects to achieve? <b>Assign 1 point or 0 points if the Proposer restates or paraphrases information in the RFP.</b>	<b>3</b>	
To what extent did the Proposer express a sincere commitment to perform this work in an efficient and timely manner?	<b>3</b>	
To what extent did the Proposer demonstrate that it can effectively integrate this project into its current obligations and existing workload?	<b>3</b>	
To what extent did the proposer adequately explain why it should be chosen to undertake this project at this time?	<b>3</b>	
<b>Executive Summary Score</b>	<b>15 Points earned X 1.0 = _____</b>	