Geophysical Proposal Grading Sheet

Town of Apple Valley | RFP-2026-03

Use one copy per evaluator per firm. Score only the five published technical criteria. Price is calculated separately after technical scoring.

Firm: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

Stage: Initial / After authorized clarification or interview Version: _____

Conflict disclosure: I have disclosed actual, potential or apparent conflicts and can evaluate impartially. If recused, do not score. Initials: _____

Published criterion	Max	Score	What the RFP asks reviewers to consider
Technical approach and methodology	30	____	Scientific suitability; depth and resolution; QA/QC; integration; alternatives; limitations; reproducibility; target ranking.
Team qualifications and experience	20	____	Relevant geophysics and hydrogeology; key-person roles; licenses; comparable geology and well-siting work.
Project understanding and risk management	15	____	Town need; uncertainty; access; environmental constraints; cultural noise; safety; grant and stakeholder coordination.
Work plan schedule and capacity	10	____	Logical tasks; availability; field readiness; deliverable schedule; critical path and contingency planning.
Relevant performance and references	10	____	Comparable outcomes; quality; timeliness; budget control; defensibility; claims; client feedback.
Technical total	85	____	Add the five technical scores. Do not include price here.

Enter points directly, from zero to the stated maximum. Do not score out of five and then add those numbers. Explain the evidence behind each score on the next page.

Evaluator signature: _____ Date: _____

Basis: reviewed RFP Sections 8.1–8.5 and Form H. Confirm against the issued RFP and all addenda before use. This packet does not change the solicitation.

Evaluator Notes and Instructions

Town of Apple Valley | RFP-2026-03

Firm: _____ Evaluator: _____

Use the same standard for every firm. Strong, specific and well-supported responses earn more points; vague responses, gaps and unsupported claims earn fewer. Do not add hidden criteria, subweights or a new passing score.

Technical approach and methodology Score ____ / 30

Evidence, proposal page and reason for score:

_____

Team qualifications and experience Score ____ / 20

Evidence, proposal page and reason for score:

_____

Project understanding and risk management Score ____ / 15

Evidence, proposal page and reason for score:

_____

Work plan schedule and capacity Score ____ / 10

Evidence, proposal page and reason for score:

_____

Relevant performance and references Score ____ / 10

Evidence, proposal page and reason for score:

_____

Clarifications and follow up

Identify missing information or questions for the procurement lead. Reviewers must not contact firms individually.

_____

If a score changes after authorized discussions, preserve the original sheet and record the revised score, date and reason. Reference checks should use consistent questions and feed the published performance criterion.

Initial Review Checklist

Town of Apple Valley | RFP-2026-03

Procurement lead completes before scoring. This is an administrative screening record, not an additional points category. Apply the issued RFP, addenda and Town procedures; document any rejection or lawful clarification.

Firm: _____ Reviewer: _____

Review item	Check against issued requirements	Result
Receipt	Received by the published deadline and prescribed method.	Pass / Follow up / Fail
Proposal format	Technical and separate cost files, required content and addenda acknowledgment checked.	Pass / Follow up / Fail
Required forms	Required certifications, disclosures and reference information checked; apply any conditional requirements.	Pass / Follow up / Fail
Minimum qualifications	Experience, proposed personnel, licenses for regulated work and capacity checked against Section 6 and official Q&A.	Pass / Follow up / Fail
Conflicts and preparation roles	Form B reviewed; solicitation-drafting exclusion and other conflict determinations documented.	Pass / Follow up / Fail
Material exceptions	Scope exclusions, contract exceptions and missing mandatory services assessed.	Pass / Follow up / Fail
Responsibility	Integrity, performance and available resources checked; SAM exclusion and required license verification completed before award.	Pass / Follow up / Fail

Disposition

Proceed to technical scoring / Hold for authorized review / Reject with documented basis

Reason and authority for clarification or rejection:

_____

_____

Reviewer signature: _____ Date: _____

A minor omission is not automatically a material failure. Do not allow a clarification to become a private opportunity to substantially rewrite a proposal. Refer uncertain decisions to the procurement official and counsel.

Master Ranking and Price Record

Town of Apple Valley | RFP-2026-03

Complete after technical scoring. If not already specified, document a consistent aggregation method before evaluation. Recommended: average the eligible evaluators' technical totals for each firm, then add the price score once. A recusal is not a zero.

Issued RFP date/version: _____ Addenda: _____

Evaluation method confirmed by: _____ Date: _____

Price formula under Section 8.3 unless changed by a timely addendum:

Price points = (lowest responsive evaluated price ÷ firm's evaluated price) × 15

Use consistent rounding, retain unrounded calculations for ranking, and document the evaluated-price basis. A price comparison does not replace required price-reasonableness analysis.

Firm	Average technical /85	Evaluated price	Price points /15	Total /100	Rank
_____	____	$_____	____	____	____
_____	____	$_____	____	____	____
_____	____	$_____	____	____	____
_____	____	$_____	____	____	____
_____	____	$_____	____	____	____

Example only

Firm	Technical	Price	Price points	Total
A	70 / 85	$60,000	15.00	85.00
B	76 / 85	$75,000	12.00	88.00

B ranks higher in this example because its stronger technical score outweighs the three-point price difference. The lowest price does not automatically win.

Scope and price comparison

For each firm, record desktop review, field-survey extent, methods, mobilizations, QAPP support, deliverables, exclusions and optional work. Use the orange-outline map and officially published Q&A consistently. Do not invent added quantities, price penalties or new evaluation assumptions after proposals are received. Refer material scope differences to the procurement lead for a lawful, evenhanded resolution.

Evaluated-price basis / authorized adjustments: attach documentation.

Prepared by: _____ Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Selection Process in Plain Language

Town of Apple Valley | RFP-2026-03

1 Confirm the rules and reviewers

Use the actual issued RFP and all addenda. Confirm evaluator appointments, conflicts, approval authority, scoring procedure and any applicable meeting requirements. A practical panel is three impartial reviewers, including qualified geophysical or hydrogeological expertise. That panel size is a recommendation, not a requirement added by this sheet. Keep pricing from technical reviewers until technical scoring is complete.

2 Check whether each proposal qualifies

The procurement lead checks the deadline, required materials, qualifications, conflicts and material exceptions. Record why a proposal can proceed or why it cannot. Reviewers do not invent new eligibility requirements.

3 Read and score the technical proposals

Each reviewer independently scores each eligible firm using the same five criteria, up to 85 points. Write short reasons with proposal page references. Judge the proposed people, methods, coverage and usable results; a promise of finding water is not proof of quality.

4 Resolve questions consistently

The panel may discuss evidence and identify needed clarifications. The RFP permits interviews and discussions but does not require interviewing three firms. If used, follow a documented, fair process, evaluate under the existing criteria and preserve changes. Do not create separate interview bonus points or allow private proposal revisions.

5 Calculate price and rank the firms

Average eligible technical scores if that is the adopted method. The procurement lead opens the cost proposals, checks included scope and calculates up to 15 price points using the disclosed formula. Add the two scores for a total out of 100. Escalate ties under the applicable procedure; do not invent a tie-breaking preference.

6 Write the recommendation and obtain approval

Document which responsible firm offers the best value under the published factors, why its price is reasonable, and any scope or performance concerns. Obtain required Town authorization and follow applicable notice, protest and contract procedures. Explain any departure from the calculated ranking; a preference alone is not a sufficient reason.

7 Sign the agreement before work begins

Finalize the competed scope, price ceiling, schedule, insurance and federal clauses. EPA recommends draft contract and price-analysis review before signing and requires executed grant-funded contracts for review per its written comments. Issue the Town notice to proceed after applicable prerequisites; covered environmental information activities require the applicable EPA-approved QAPP.

Keep the proposals, receipt log, disclosures, original and revised grading sheets, reference checks, communications, price calculations, recommendation, approvals and contract in the procurement file.