

From: [Renee Loree](#)
To: [Chris J. Ruschmann](#); [Mark Luchini](#)
Cc: [Mary Johns](#); [Kim Campbell](#); [Purchasing](#); [Chris Murray](#)
Bcc: [Shelly Klawonn](#)
Subject: RE: RFP- 25-190 Documentation request
Date: Tuesday, December 31, 2024 4:05:00 PM
Attachments: [RFP 25-190 Evaluation Committee Responsibility Form.pdf](#)
[RFP 25-190 Overview and General Instructions for Evaluation Committee.pdf](#)

Mr. Ruschmann & Mr. Luchini,

Per your request for records. There is no charge for this request.

Due to file size of the files requested. The [Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Sheets](#), and [Bid Proposals](#) will be available via Zend To, the CBJ file share platform. You will receive a separate email with the Zend To link.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

To maintain confidentiality of evaluators.

- I have attached the standard *Evaluation Committee Responsibility Form* that must be read, understood, signed, and returned to Purchasing prior to receipt of any received proposals.
 - Evaluator #1 signed and returned the sheet on 11/20/24.
 - Evaluator #2 signed and returned the sheet on 12/13/24.
 - Evaluator #3 signed and returned the sheet on 12/09/24.
- In addition to the *Evaluation Committee Responsibility Form*, each evaluator is educated on the evaluation process. The attached *Overview and General Instructions for Evaluation Committee* form is given to each evaluator as a reminder of the guidelines for evaluating. Conflict of interest is address on this document as well.

Procurement Process Records

You have asked for meeting minutes, emails or communications related to the evaluation and award process.

- Much like the pre-proposal there were no minutes taken at the evaluation committee meeting.
- As stated in the *Evaluation Committee Responsibility Form*, under Confidentiality there is no communication until the evaluation committee meeting.
- This is also addressed in the *Overview and General Instructions for Evaluation Committee* form.

As indicated in my signature I will be out of the office starting the New Years Holiday through Monday 1/6, please use the purchasing@juneau.gov email address if additional information is required.

Regards,

Renée Loree

Purchasing Officer

City and Borough of Juneau

Renee.Loree@juneau.gov

Phone: 907-586-5215 ext. 4071

Upcoming Leave January 1-6, 2025, return to office 1/7/25.

From: Chris J. Ruschmann <chris@scsalaska.net>

Sent: Tuesday, December 31, 2024 2:31 PM

To: Purchasing <Purchasing@juneau.gov>

Cc: Mary Johns <Mary.Johns@juneau.gov>; Renee Loree <Renee.Loree@juneau.gov>; Kim Campbell <Kim.Campbell@juneau.gov>; Mark Luchini <mark@scsalaska.net>

Subject: RFP- 25-190 Documentation request

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Sheets: Detailed scoring breakdown for all bidders.

Bid Proposals: Copies of all submitted proposals

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Documentation of steps taken to address potential conflicts of interest.

Procurement Process Records: Meeting minutes, emails, or communications related to the evaluation and award process.

Please provide these documents in accordance with the **Alaska Public Records Act (AS 40.25.110-120)**. If any fees are associated with this request, kindly inform me in advance.

Regards,

Chris Ruschmann

Snowcloud Services LLC.

C: 907-209-1059

O: 907-789-7701

RESPONSIBILITIES OF RFP EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFP 25-190 Provision of Internet Services for CBJ Juneau MIZ

Thank you for participating on the evaluation committee for this RFP. To protect the integrity of this formal solicitation and the evaluation process, it is essential that each participant understand and abide by the following responsibilities. Adherence to these requirements will help assure the effectiveness of the evaluation team as a whole, and protect the overall interests of the CBJ and the vendors in the award of this RFP.

Fairness and Integrity. It is the responsibility of every member on the evaluation panel to collectively ensure that the evaluation is conducted in an impartial, objective and professional manner, and that the same level of effort is extended to the evaluation of all vendors' proposals.

Understanding of the Project. Your success as an effective member of the team depends on your comprehensive understanding of the project, and your familiarity with the requirements and specifications contained in the RFP. Please review the RFP thoroughly prior to beginning your evaluation of vendor proposals.

Attendance. Attendance of all committee members at all scheduled meetings is crucial to the quality of the evaluation process. Without all representatives present, meetings are not effective, as not all opinions can be shared in a group setting. Therefore, members must attend all meetings of the committee, including interviews with proposers, if conducted.

Additionally, committee members must not discuss the evaluation with one another unless all members are present.

Confidentiality. To preserve the integrity of the evaluation process, the following rules of confidentiality must be observed:

1. Do not communicate with others outside of the evaluation committee on the nature or content of the written proposals, interviews, the evaluation proceedings and deliberations, or individual opinions about the proposers or the project.
2. The names and number of proposers/firms must be held in confidence.
3. Some committee members may need to communicate the details of their involvement with their supervisor, department head, or other superior(s) from time to time; however, committee members must convey the importance of confidentiality to those individuals.
4. Do not communicate with proposers about this project outside of any scheduled and sanctioned evaluation activity.

Conflicts of Interest. You may not participate as a member of this committee if you, or a member of your immediate family has a financial interest pertaining to this procurement. If you currently have, or later discover, a conflict of interest, declare the circumstances immediately to Purchasing and remove yourself from the committee.

I understand and agree to adhere to the above guidelines for proposal evaluations. I do not currently have a Conflict of Interest, which would prevent my participation in this process.

Signature: _____ Printed Name: _____

Date: _____ Department/Organization _____

RFP EVALUATION GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

- Read the RFP and all addenda associated with RFP and all proposals submitted. *If any proposal includes confidential information, report it to the Buyer in Purchasing.*
 - *Different methods are allowed; i.e. reading each proposal then scoring or reading all proposals then scoring. Be mindful not to compare proposals to each other. Your scores should always represent how well a proposer responded to the project requirements presented by CBJ issued RFP and not a comparison to another submitted response.*
- Request clarification of the Request for Proposals from Purchasing, if needed. Always reference the section of the proposal that needs clarification.
- **Keep all information regarding proposals confidential.** This includes names of committee members, the number of proposals submitted, the names of the proposers, scores, etc. Information will be made available to the public once the Purchasing Division posts the Committee's results.
- Refer any questions you have to the buyer in Purchasing and make a list of any items that need clarification (and bring the list to the Committee meeting).
- Using the Preliminary Evaluation form provided, **score & rank each proposal independently.**
- Meet, as scheduled, to review references and confer with committee members in order to gain additional information and various perspectives.
- Revise individual scores/rankings, as appropriate, based on additional information. Under no circumstances should scores be adjusted at the insistence of other committee members.
- The Purchasing Buyer will ask for your scores to determine collective ranking of proposals, based on individual scores and ranks.
 - If determined to be needed, references will be checked right away by the Assigned Person, typically the Project Manager. Questions will be emailed to all references, and will be the same for each reference.
 - If determined to be needed, oral interviews may be held with top ranked proposers. To do so, a list of questions will need to be prepared, as they need to be the same for all proposers. A meeting time, place and date, agreeable to the committee members, Purchasing Buyer and the proposers, will be determined and all persons will be notified by Purchasing Buyer. *After the interviews are held, Evaluators will be allowed to revise their individual scoring/ranking, as appropriate.*
- Submit Evaluation Committee's recommendation to award pending successful negotiations with the #1 ranked firm, to Purchasing Buyer who will prepare the posting for intent to award. Digital Individual Evaluation forms will be used as back up to the posted final scores.
- Purchasing Division will notify all proposers as to the outcome of the evaluation process. After successful completion of the protest posting period, negotiations can begin with the #1 ranked firm. If an agreement cannot be reached, the second lowest ranked Proposer may be contacted for negotiations.

NOTE: In the event of a tie in the ranking totals, only the raw scores of the Proposers who are tied will be totaled to determine the successful Proposer.

Description of Numerical Scores

Do not award scores using the numbers: 5 or 2 –

Disallowing these numbers creates a bigger gap between results.

Unacceptable (0 or 1) Point: Zero (0) points are awarded to firms in any category in which they either fail to provide any of the required information. One (1) point is awarded for insufficient or inadequate information or information which cannot be understood.

Marginal: 3 or 4 Points: 3 or 4 points are awarded to responses considered marginally acceptable. For example:

- The proposal reiterated a requirement, but offered no explanation of how or what was to be accomplished.
- The proposal offered an explanation of how or what was to be accomplished but may have contained inaccurate statements or references which affected their approach but did not totally negate the approach.
- The proposal provided irrelevant material in response to the submittal requirements (“fluff”).

You cannot award 2 or 5 points: The purpose is to create differences among the scores awarded in order to separate the vendors and help create meaningful rankings.

Adequate to Good: 6, 7 or 8 Points: Varying amount of points are awarded in any category of the proposal if satisfies the requirement, is accurate, can be understood and accomplished, and is unambiguous. Varying amount of points are awarded if the proposal satisfies the requirement and describes specifically how and/or what is to be accomplished in clear detail.

Outstanding; 9 & 10 Points: 9 or 10 points are awarded in any category if the proposal satisfies the requirements in a superior manner, both quantitatively and qualitatively for their approach and the quantity and quality of their previous similar jobs and the experience and training of their personnel. Meets or goes beyond the proposal requirements and adds value to the City.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Once seeing the submittals, you may discover that one of the proposers is someone with whom you have a business or social connection.

If that happens, please notify purchasing (the buyer at 586-5215 ext 4 to determine if a **conflict of interest** exists.

A conflict of interest, real OR perceived, can compromise the entire project.