

EVALUATION FORM

#	Evaluation Criteria	Rating Requirements	Rating	Rationale
1	Responsiveness to submission requirements	*Highly Advantageous: Proposal creatively and thoroughly addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals. *Advantageous: Proposal adequately addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals. *Not Advantageous: Proposal does Not address all of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals. *Unacceptable: Proposal does Not address any of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.		
2	Previous related work and references	*Highly Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with five or more such projects and excellent references. *Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with three to five such projects and 3 good references or a combination of good and excellent references. *Not Advantageous: Involvement in at least two such projects, and a combination of good and neutral references. *Unacceptable: Involvement of one or fewer similar projects and/or 1 or more poor references.		
3	Municipal experience	*Highly Advantageous: Contracted with five or more Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services. *Advantageous: Contracted with three or four Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services. *Not Advantageous: Contracted with two Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services. *Unacceptable: Contracted with one or no Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.		
4	Success of previous related projects	*Highly Advantageous: Five or more similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation. *Advantageous: Three or four similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation. *Not Advantageous: Two similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities and some evidence of successful implementation. *Unacceptable: One or fewer similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with little or no evidence of successful implementation.		

Price Proposal:

Ranking

EVALUATION FORM

#	Evaluation Criteria	Rating Requirements	Rating	Rationale
1	Responsiveness to submission requirements	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Proposal creatively and thoroughly addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Proposal adequately addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Proposal does Not address all of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Proposal does Not address any of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p>	HA	Of all the proposals, the respondent best demonstrated the ability to translate the RFP's requirements directly to Hingham. Respondent's knowledge not only of Hingham and its community, but also of MA and Northeast regional technical and legislative elements impressed the evaluation team and were deemed extremely beneficial.
2	Previous related work and references	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with five or more such projects and excellent references.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with three to five such projects and 3 good references or a combination of good and excellent references.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Involvement in at least two such projects, and a combination of good and neutral references.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Involvement of one or fewer similar projects and/or 1 or more poor references.</p>	HA	Firm members were substantially involved in the referenced projects, though not all members were involved in all projects. However, the references for the members of respondent's team were outstanding (including several employed by or engaged with Hingham) -- those who provided references were effusive in their recommendations. Therefore, the evaluation team judged this as HA.
3	Municipal experience	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Contracted with five or more Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Contracted with three or four Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Contracted with two Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Contracted with one or no Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p>	A	While the respondent itself did not indicate that it had contracted with MA municipalities, each of the member consultants had contracted with, worked for, or volunteered for MA municipalities in multiple capacities and demonstrated a depth of experience relevant to the RFP requirements. Therefore, the evaluation team judged this to be acceptable.
4	Success of previous related projects	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Five or more similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Three or four similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Two similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities and some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: One or fewer similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with little or no evidence of successful implementation.</p>	NA	While the respondent itself did not indicate that it had developed similar plans, the members of the respondent team have had experience with developing and implementing the various components of a climate action plan at the municipal level.

Price Proposal: \$80,000

Ranking	1	The respondent demonstrated the greatest understanding of Hingham's needs, the local environment, and MA policy trends. The communication plan was strong, and the respondent's references were persuasive. Therefore, the evaluation team ranked respondent first and believes its slightly higher pricing is justified by its capabilities in developing the plan, its knowledge of Hingham and MA, and its references.
----------------	---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EVALUATION FORM

#	Evaluation Criteria	Rating Requirements	Rating	Rationale
1	Responsiveness to submission requirements	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Proposal creatively and thoroughly addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Proposal adequately addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Proposal does Not address all of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Proposal does Not address any of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p>	HA	The proposal addressed in detail how the respondent would address each of the components of the RFP, highlighting in particular what the respondent could do to address Hingham's needs and how to address conducting the services on a remote basis. The proposal was creative and well received. However, the evaluation team did feel that the respondent's proposed schedule of interaction with the CAPC and Town officials was inadequate.
2	Previous related work and references	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with five or more such projects and excellent references.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with three to five such projects and 3 good references or a combination of good and excellent references.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Involvement in at least two such projects, and a combination of good and neutral references.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Involvement of one or fewer similar projects and/or 1 or more poor references.</p>	A	Because the respondent consists of two independent firms issuing a joint proposal, the referenced projects involve one firm or the other. Separately, they have substantial involvement on their distinct projects, but not jointly. References expressed positive experiences, though they were unable to speak to respondent's community outreach acumen, which the evaluation team deems critical to the project's success.
3	Municipal experience	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Contracted with five or more Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Contracted with three or four Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Contracted with two Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Contracted with one or no Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p>	U	Respondent has no MA municipal contracting experience. The evaluation team notes, however, that the respondent does have municipal experience, including large municipalities like San Francisco, that could translate to the work done for Hingham.
4	Success of previous related projects	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Five or more similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Three or four similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Two similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities and some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: One or fewer similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with little or no evidence of successful implementation.</p>	HA	Of all proposals, the respondent best demonstrated its involvement with climate action planning development and consulting, pointing to specifics on implementation and success measures.

Price Proposal: \$80,000

Ranking

2	Respondent has strong and directly relevant climate action planning experience, and the evaluation team appreciated the thoughtfulness of the respondent's approach. Concerns that prevented the evaluation team from ranking this respondent first consisted of its lack of MA contracting experience and a local presence, coupled with the inability of any of the references to speak to respondent's community engagement experience.
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EVALUATION FORM

#	Evaluation Criteria	Rating Requirements	Rating	Rationale
1	Responsiveness to submission requirements	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Proposal creatively and thoroughly addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Proposal adequately addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Proposal does Not address all of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Proposal does Not address any of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p>	A	While the proposal was thorough, the respondent emphasized its technical acumen and ability to execute on projects that might result from a climate action plan rather than climate action planning itself. Community engagement, which is deemed critical for the success of the plan, was not as thoroughly explained as the other components of the planning process.
2	Previous related work and references	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with five or more such projects and excellent references.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with three to five such projects and 3 good references or a combination of good and excellent references.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Involvement in at least two such projects, and a combination of good and neutral references.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Involvement of one or fewer similar projects and/or 1 or more poor references.</p>	A	While none of the referenced projects were climate action plans, the evaluation team noted the involvement of the proposed staff with successful projects. Furthermore, references were positive on the work the respondent had provided in other projects (though the evaluation team was curious as to why respondent did not list the Town of Hingham as a reference when it noted having done other projects for the Town).
3	Municipal experience	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Contracted with five or more Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Contracted with three or four Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Contracted with two Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Contracted with one or no Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p>	HA	Respondent has a great deal of contracting experience with MA municipalities and meets the criteria requirements.
4	Success of previous related projects	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Five or more similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Three or four similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Two similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities and some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: One or fewer similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with little or no evidence of successful implementation.</p>	NA	None of the referenced projects were climate action plans. However, the evaluation team was impressed with the portfolio of referenced projects, the professionalism of the respondent, and the technical capabilities on projects and components that would underly a climate action plan.

Price Proposal: \$79,724.51

Ranking

3	The evaluation team is impressed with the respondent's technical acumen and MA municipal experience, and thinks they could be a good candidate for implementing various components of a climate action plan. However, respondent was unable to demonstrate climate action planning experience, and did not address fully community engagement. Lastly, while respondent provided a lower price than the highest ranked proposal, the differential was less than 1/2 of 1%, and therefore the pricing was not seen as overcoming these deficiencies.
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EVALUATION FORM

#	Evaluation Criteria	Rating Requirements	Rating	Rationale
1	Responsiveness to submission requirements	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Proposal creatively and thoroughly addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Proposal adequately addresses the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Proposal does Not address all of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Proposal does Not address any of the Goals and Tasks in this Request for Proposals.</p>	A	The proposal addressed each of the goals in the RFP, but did not do much more than regurgitate the RFP components. Response lacked depth and application to Hingham.
2	Previous related work and references	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with five or more such projects and excellent references.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Substantial involvement of firm members assigned to this project with three to five such projects and 3 good references or a combination of good and excellent references.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Involvement in at least two such projects, and a combination of good and neutral references.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Involvement of one or fewer similar projects and/or 1 or more poor references.</p>	A	Personnel proposed to work on project were assigned and involved with referenced projects.
3	Municipal experience	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Contracted with five or more Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Contracted with three or four Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Contracted with two Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: Contracted with one or no Massachusetts municipalities for planning consultant services.</p>	HA	The proposal mentions greater than five MA municipal consulting projects, and thus meets the RFP criterion; however, none of the referenced projects are directly applicable to climate action planning.
4	Success of previous related projects	<p>*Highly Advantageous: Five or more similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Advantageous: Three or four similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Not Advantageous: Two similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities and some evidence of successful implementation.</p> <p>*Unacceptable: One or fewer similar Plans have been adopted by the respective municipalities with little or no evidence of successful implementation.</p>	U	While each of the referenced projects addressed one or more elements that might be included in a climate action plan (such as GGH emissions inventory or energy efficiency), none suggested a comprehensive climate action planning approach. Only one of the references alluded to implementation.

Price Proposal: \$78,000

Ranking

4	The proposal primarily reiterated the RFP requirements without depth or explanation as to the applicability to Hingham. None of the similarly referenced projects were located in MA, and none directly dealt with climate action planning. While the price proposal is the lowest of the four, it is only 2.5% lower, and thus the price differential was not viewed as sufficiently advantageous to make up for the deficiencies when compared to the other proposals.
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------