

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP22-2021 SUPPLY & INSTALLATION OF PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT AT OAKES PARK

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

1. General

Proposals will be evaluated by City staff based upon the predetermined categories with the points weighting as set out below.

2. Pricing Not the Most Important Factor

The City will not necessarily accept the lowest priced of any Proposal. Any implication that the lowest priced Proposal will be accepted is hereby expressly negated.

3. Selection

The selected Proposal submission (if any) will be chosen based upon the evaluation criteria pre-determined by the City which, in the City's sole decision, will determine the manner in which each Proposal submission meets the evaluation criteria stated below. The City, at its sole and unfettered decision, may seek to clarify any aspect of any Proposal submitted in response to this RFP at any time. Such clarification shall not provide any Bidder with an opportunity to improve upon or correct a previously submitted Proposal. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the City may elect to also negotiate with one or more Bidders at a time.

4. Interviews and Communications with Bidders following Proposal Submission Date

The City's evaluation team may conduct an interview with selected companies that have submitted a Proposal in response to this RFP. The City makes no commitment to hold any interviews with any Bidder and offers no rights or expectations of any kind to any company who has submitted a Proposal. If an interview is granted, it is expected to be no longer than sixty (60) minutes in length and will include an allowance for a question and answer period. The granting of an interview does not provide any Bidder with an opportunity to improve upon or correct their Proposal submission. Attempts by any Bidder to improve upon or correct a Proposal submission will result in the rejection of the said Proposal by the City.

5. Evaluation Criteria

The City will evaluate the Proposal submissions based upon the following weighted criteria. Bidders must respond to these criteria factors by attaching a separate page or pages for each criterion.

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

6. Bidder's Acknowledgment

- a) Price alone is not the only, nor necessarily the most important criteria the City will use to determine the value of services offered.
- b) The City is under no obligation whatsoever to meet with all or any Proponents who have submitted a Proposal in response to this RFP.
- c) A debriefing at the written request of a proponent shall only be conducted after the contract is executed with the selected Proponent. Under no circumstances will debriefing be held prior to the contract execution. Any proponent may request a debriefing with the Procurement Representative, with respect to their proposal submission.
- d) The City is not obligated to reveal any reasons whatsoever for its choice of a Contractor (if any) and the City is not obligated to reveal any information regarding any Proposal submitted to the City.
- e) The City reserves the right to check all references provided by the Proponent and to check additional references not stated by the Proponent. Both oral and written reference checks completed by the City will be binding on the determination of past performance by the Proponent.
- f) Proposals will be evaluated and scored based on the evaluation criteria for two (2) different playground equipment options. The average score between option one (1) and option (2) will be used for the final scoring process. For criteria in which the responses may be the same for design option one (1) and two (2), the points will be scored as if both options received the same score. If the responses for the evaluation criteria: proponent team, quality of system and price are different for design options one (1) and two (2) the proposal should provide additional pages to outline the differences. In the latter case the criterion will be scored separately and then averaged.
- g) The City will score pricing based upon a simple mathematical formula with the lowest priced Proposal scoring the full points assigned and all other Proposals will be scored as a percentage of the lowest priced Proposal submitted.

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Criterion	Maximum Points for Option 1	Maximum Points for Option 2	(Option 1 Points + Option 2 Points) ÷ 2 = Average Review Points	Weight Factor	Independent Review Points x Weight ÷ 10 = Score
1. Proponent Team	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		10	
Comments:					
2. Play Value	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		25	
Comments:					
3. Accessibility	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		10	
Comments:					
4. Quality of System	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		15	
Comments:					
5. Warranty	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		15	
Comments:					
6. Appearance	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		10	
Comments:					
7. Service Operations	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		5	
Comments:					
8. Price $S = \frac{\min x M}{P}$	S = Score Min = Lowest Priced Proposal M = Total	S = Score Min = Lowest Priced Proposal M = Total		10	
Comments:					
TOTALS			TOTALS	100	

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Instructions to Evaluator: Complete a separate evaluation form for each Proposal reviewed. Each criterion must be assigned a score unless you are instructed otherwise on the form. Make additional notes in the comments section for reference and discussion during meetings of the full evaluation panel.

The point value entered above reflects my best independent judgment of the merits of the identified bidder's Proposal.

Cor	nmittee Membe	er: Dept.:
(ple	ase print)	
Sig	nature:	Date:
PRO	OPOSAL EVAL	UATION TABLE
RA⊺	ΓING	DESCRIPTION
10	Excellent	Exceeds the requirements of the criterion in superlative beneficial ways/very desirable.
9	Very Good	Exceeds the requirements of the criterion in ways that are beneficial to the City's needs.
8	Good	Exceeds the requirements of the criterion but in a manner which is not particularly beneficial to the City's needs.
7		Fully meets all requirements of the criterion.
6	Average	Adequately meets most of the requirements of the criterion. May be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
5		Addresses most, but not all, of the requirements of the criterion to the minimum acceptable level. May be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
4	Poor	Barely meets most of the requirements of the criterion to the minimum acceptable level. May be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
3		Poor to Very Poor.
2		Minimally addresses some, but not all, of the requirements of the criterion. Lacking in critical areas.
1		Very Poor to Unsatisfactory.

Unsatisfactory Does not satisfy the requirements of the criterion in any manner.

0

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

Instructions to Evaluator: Complete Proposal Evaluation Summary indicating the name of each Company and their Total Score. Additional comments may be included.

COMPANY	TOTAL SCORE	COMMENTS
Committee Member:(please print)		_ Dept.:
Signature:		_ Date:

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Evaluation Category: Proponent Team

(Points Available: 10)

Proponents are required to fully explain their proponent team and their experience undertaking similar projects. Higher points will be given proponent teams that have successfully completed numerous projects of similar scale as a cohesive team and can meet the project time-line of the City of Niagara Falls.

Team Members

Indicate all members of the proponent team. This includes all companies who will be involved in the project with the key individuals.

Name of project manager for lead company	Years of experience as a project manager of similar work	
Other key individuals for lead company and responsibilities		
Name of sub-contractors required to complete work as proposed. Indicate scope of work for sub-contractor and key individuals with the company.		
Indicate the number of similar Playground projects completed by this proponent team as proposed.		

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - SERVICES RFP22-2021

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

SUPPLY & INSTALLATION OF PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT AT OAKES PARK

Evaluation Category: Play Value

(Points Available: 25)

Provide information about what kind of experience playground users will have with your Proposal. Higher points will go to proponents that can provide for a wide variety of play experiences for all age groups.

	Option 1:	Option 2:
Total number of play features (all types).		
Number of overhead play features.		
Number of climbing features (not overhead.)		
Number of slides and sizes/heights		
Number of elevated play features		
Number of ground level play features		
(Optional) Briefly explain any specific play features you want to highlight.		

Provide a detailed plan layout for both options of the Playground design. The plans shall clearly illustrate all features being proposed.

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Evaluation	Category:	Accessibility
-------------------	-----------	---------------

(Points Available: 10)

The design of the Playground area shall have accessible components. Proponents shall make full use of the accessible site. Higher marks will go to proponents that can incorporate accessible features within the design. Note, accessibility is meant in a broad and universal meaning and does not limit only to those who use a wheelchair.

	Option 1:	Option 2:	
Number of components with accessible features and experiences.			
(Optional) Briefly describe any accessible features you want to highlight.			

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Evaluation Category: Quality of System

(Points Available: 15)

The materials, manufacturing and paint systems used by Playground manufacturers vary. Proponents shall clearly indicate the different components and what systems are used. Higher points will be awarded to Proposal that demonstrate a high level of quality in all aspects of the Playground equipment.

State the manufacturer's name, and product line(s) of the play equipment.	State the number of years that the manufacturer has been operating in Canada.	
Provide a brief description of any other matters that evaluators should consider that are relevant to product quality.		

Evaluation Category: Warranty

(Points Available: 15)

Provide information on the warranty period for various aspects of the Playground equipment Proposal. Higher points will be given to proponents that offer the longest and most comprehensive warranty. The detailed terms and conditions of the warranties may be provided on a separate sheet.

	Option 1:	Option 2:
State the manufacturer's warranty period for all component groups. Example: structural decks and posts, plastic panels, etc		

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Evaluation Category: Appearance

(Points Available: 10)

Provide information on the appearance of the proposed Playground equipment. Demonstrate through text as well as illustrations/renderings how your Playground design is pleasing to the eye. Higher points will be provided to the Proposal that demonstrate a great aesthetic that is inviting to the public and makes sense in the surroundings.

	Option 1:	Option 2:	
(Optional) Provide a brief description of aesthetic items that you want to highlight.			
Provide Playground Proposal your two (2) design options.	renderings, illustrations, photog	graphs as necessary to convey	
Provide a colour selection palette to illustrate colour options.			

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Evaluation Category: Service Operations

(Points Available: 5)

Provide information on the service operations of the proposed Playground equipment. Higher points will be awarded to a Proposal that can provide a Playground that will have lower requirements for operation.

	Option 1:	Option 2:	
State any features that reduce the requirement of service/maintenance on the proposed Playground equipment. This includes vandalism issues.			

Evaluation Category: Price

(Points Available: 10)

State the lump sum price (excluding HST) to supply and install the Playground equipment as per the terms of the Request For Proposal and your Proposal on *Appendix A: Form of Proposal*. The maximum budget is \$80,000.00 (excluding HST). Higher points for this category may be awarded to lower prices. Failure to meet this budget may result in Proposal disqualification. Formula below will be used for scoring pricing.

1. Price:	S = Score
Min x M	Min = Lowest Priced Proposal
$S = {P}$	M = Total Points Available for Price
•	P = Price on this Proposal