

Mission Springs Water District
Complete Deployment of ArcGIS Enterprise, Utility Network, Cityworks
RFP - Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

Tuesday, February 6, 2024

Scored Criteria	Average Combined Score			
	Axim Geospatial	Burns & McDonnell	Cyient, Inc.	Timmons Group
Understanding of the District, its goals for the project and services required: Evaluation based on the how well the consultant's response reflects a complete understanding of the needs of the District and desired outcome for all project components. How well will the plan outlined in the RFP response result in a successful and well executed result that achieves the District's goals.	235.4	225.8	185.4	237.1
Qualifications and experience (Projects of similar size and/or scope): The quality, quantity, and complexity of Consultant's successful past performances on similar engagements will be considered as a significant indicator of the Consultant's technical competency and capability to complete this engagement. Expertise is gained by working on many different engagements and can be a major advantage to the District. Organizations with highly successful and complex engagement experiences are preferred. The evaluation of references and past engagement success will play a key role in this category.	186.3	162.0	139.0	191.0
Key personnel: Consideration will be given to the qualifications of the Consultant's personnel proposed for assignment to the engagement. The Consultant's availability of additional staff for escalation and assistance to reduce the amount of outside contractor assistance required will be a factor. Organizations who are particular in their hiring practices, and those who recruit and retain personnel with more years of experience and who concentrate on training their personnel resulting in technology certifications will score well in this category.	142.3	134.0	110.4	142.8
Approach to work: The proposal will be evaluated for the completeness, and realism of the approach to deliver the services in accordance with the requirements of this RFP.	140.8	140.0	118.0	136.3
References: Consideration will be given to the references provided by the Consultant.	106.5	99.8	61.7	112.5
Cost: This evaluation is based on the Consultant's cost model inclusive of fixed and additional service fees relative to the quality of services offered and the needs of the District. Note that a low-cost bid, in and of itself, will not be sufficient to score high in this category if the quality of services or personnel available indicate the probable need for additional consulting services for advanced technology needs in the future.	67.8	66.5	38.7	77.0
Overall Total Score:	879.1	828.2	653.2	896.6

Errors and Mistakes in Response
Timmons: Wrong month listed in RFP due date on cover
Timmons: Page 4 references ISO 55000 (asset management) at top of page, however, 3rd paragraph down references ISO 5000 (Aluminum-silicon alloy-coated steel sheet)
Timmons: Page 3 (bottom paragraph) references "...the City's technical requirements."
Cyient: Proposal (PDF pg. 29) states there is a separate attachment (KCI_Quals.pdf) with KCI's qualifications, experience, and references, however, no attachment was included or on PlanetBids.
Cyient: Exhibit D - Consultant Questionnaire, #3: Did not provide requested information about partner company, #5: Did not answer question
Cyient: Missing names in all Maximo specialists
Cyient: Formatting and style inconsistencies (bold, hyphen spacing, capitalization)
Cyient: Wrong population size of Desert Hot Springs

Reviewed By: Brian Macy - General Manager, MSWD
 Arturo Ceja - Director of Finance, MSWD
 Eric Weck - Engineering Manager, MSWD
 William Whitten - Business Analyst, MSWD
 Kurt Kettenacker - IT Manager, MSWD

Date: 2/6/24

Christian Hernandez - Asset Management Supervisor, IWA