

# Evaluation Matrix

Solicitation 1412151846 (RFP) Construction Service for 69kV Circuit 691-693 Structure Replacement		Contractor:	Evaluator:	Score:	
Does Proposer meet Minimum Qualifications?			YES (Accept)	NO (Reject)	
Minimum Qualifications (Accept/Reject)					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>MAX Points</b>	<b>Low Bidder = 65 pts</b> The low bid will receive the maximum 65 points and the amount of that bid will be the basis for awarding points to all other bids based on the following formula: <b>Other bidders points = 65 * (Low Bidder/Bidder). For Example: Bid #1 = \$100, Bid #2 = \$125</b> <b>Bid #1 is low bid and will receive 55 points, Bid #2 will receive 52 points (65 x (100/125))</b>		TO BE FILLED IN BY PURCHASING	
<b>Quotation of Rates</b>	<b>65</b>				
<b>Similar Experience</b>  The Respondent shall provide two references from previously completed projects that closely align with the scope, complexity, and technical expertise needed for this project. Includes: 1. Reference Project Name 2. Reference Company Name 3. Reference Email Address & Name 4. Year work completed in within last 5 years 5. Contract Value \$ 6. Description of work and similar experiences to this project.  Similar experience includes: 1. CMP foundation installation. 2. Replacing transmission poles in residential neighborhood. 3. Replacing transmission pole with energized Distribution underbuilt.	<b>14</b>	Reference #1 Submittal	Highly relevant experience including items 1 to 3. Fully reflects the scope and complexity of this project (6-7 points)	Some relevant experience, but does not fully reflect the scope or complexity of this project. (3-5 points)	Minimal to no comparable experience to the scope and complexity of this project. (0-2 points)
		Reference #2 Submittal	Highly relevant experience including items 1 to 3. Fully reflects the scope and complexity of this project (6-7 points)	Some relevant experience, but does not fully reflect the scope or complexity of this project. (3-5 points)	Minimal to no comparable experience to the scope and complexity of this project. (0-2 points)
<b>Plan &amp; Schedule</b>  The Respondent shall provide a detailed project schedule that includes a comprehensive and realistic task breakdown, including clear durations, dependencies, and resource allocation. Clearly identifies key project milestones, aligns with critical path, and ensures adherence to JEA milestone and outage dates. See JEA Technical Specifications - Specific Instructions for JEA Milestones.  The Respondent shall provide a comprehensive Schedule outlining its plan to successfully complete the project and meet JEA's milestones. The Schedule should demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of work, JEA outage durations, and the pole delivery schedule, and include a detailed, logical sequence of activities. The Respondent shall also submit foundation bid documentation and identify three realistic potential risks, along with proposed mitigation strategies for each.	<b>18</b>	Schedule Submittal	Comprehensive and realistic task breakdown, including clear durations, dependencies, and resource allocation. Clearly identifies key project milestones, aligns with critical path, and meets JEA milestone and outage dates. (9 points)	Adequate breakdown of tasks, durations, and dependencies with some level of detail. Milestones are identified but may lack clarity or lack full alignment with the critical path. The schedule meets JEA milestone and outage dates. (4-8 points)	Incomplete or unrealistic task breakdown with unclear durations and dependencies. Key milestones are missing or poorly defined, and the schedule does not align with critical project phases. The timeline fails to meet JEA milestone and outage dates or shows significant discrepancies. (0-3 points)
		Plan	Full understanding of scope of work. Provides a detailed and logical sequence of work. Describes 3 realistic, potential risks and how to address them. (9 points)	General understanding of scope of work. Provides a generic sequence of work or lacks in details. Provides less than 3 realistic, potential risks or addressing the risk is adequately explained (4-8 points)	Limited to no understanding of scope of work. Provides a poor sequence of work, poorly organized, unclear, or unrealistic. Fails to provide realistic potential risks or severely lacks detail or addressing the risk is poorly explained (0-3 points)
<b>Safety</b>  Respondent shall provide the company's and sub-contractor's Experience Modification Rating (EMR) of the past 3 years. The average of each company will be taken as the average EMR rating for scoring. The lowest EMR average will be evaluated.	<b>3</b>	Average EMR Rating of past 3 years	EMR Rating less than 1.0 (3 points)	n/a	EMR Rating 1.0 or higher (0 points)
			<b>Total points</b>	<b>100</b>	