

Evaluation Criteria		Cascade		IPL		OTTO		Rehrig	
<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria Weighting</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
1. Firm Qualifications	10%	9.20	0.92	7.80	0.78	8.70	0.87	0.00	0.00
2. Overall Price	35%	9.07	3.18	9.13	3.19	8.62	3.02	8.83	3.09
3. Outreach and Cart Selection Plan	35%	9.60	3.36	7.10	2.49	7.10	2.49	0.00	0.00
4. Quality of the Cart	20%	4.17	0.83	1.25	0.25	5.21	1.04	0.00	0.00
Raw Total	100%		8.29		6.71		7.41		3.09

This form is to indicate if the proposal included the minimum items. Do not consider price, services, or any other criteria when completing this form.

City of Broken Arrow

Cart Procurement

Checklists

PROPOSAL COMPLETENESS EVALUATION							
For each item, if the subject is addressed in complete in the proposal, put the number 1 in the corresponding cell.	Cascade	IPL	OTTO	Rehrig	Schafer	Toter	Notes
Required Forms							
Capabilities and specialized experience statement	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Record of projects similar in scope	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Team organization and resumes of personnel	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Statement of any relationship between Proposer company and the City of Broken Arrow	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
General scope of work with a statement of the prevailing philosophy	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Planned approach for each specific professional service to be accomplished	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Schedule of the work to be performed, the time frames required and a projection of the allocation of estimated work-hours to each task	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Record of performance	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Terms and signature sheet	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Proposal Affidavit	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Interest Affidavit	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Raw Score (out of 11)	11	11	11	11	11	11	
Balanced score	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
				DISQUALIFIED DUE TO CART SPECS			

Quality of Services											Not scored due to disqualification on Quality of the Cart				
These criteria should be GRADED (not ranked) on a scale of zero to five (0-5). Each criteria has an explanation of what is			100%	Cascade		IPL		OTTO		Rehrig		Schafer		Toter	
Evaluation Criteria	Explanation	Grading system:	Criteria Weighting	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Capabilities and specialized experience statement	Details the firm's capabilities and specialized experience in residential recycling/refuse cart distribution and residential communication strategies.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing 1 = Poor, firm does not demonstrate that it has the required capabilities and experience 2 = Bad, firm discusses capabilities and experience relevant to the requirements, but capabilities and experience are insufficient for scope 3 = Good, firm discusses and has sufficient capabilities and experience relevant to the requirements, but level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, firm discusses and has sufficient capabilities and experience relevant to the requirements, provides very good detail to support these statements, content reflects quality 5 = Excellent, discussion reflects capabilities and relevant experience of the highest level; content is of high quality and is tailored to the assignment	25%	5.00	2.50	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		NOTES		Many examples of problems relevant to BA and of projects of similar size		firm is very equipped		long experience; many projects of even greater size							
Size, staffing, resources, and financial capability of the firm versus the size of the assignment	This discussion should be indicative of the relative ability and confidence in the firm that it can successfully complete the project at hand in the required timeframe and for the cost proposed.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing 1 = Poor, discussion does not demonstrate that firm has the ability to successfully complete the project on time and in budget 2 = Bad, firm includes relevant discussion but the capabilities described do not instill confidence for success 3 = Good, discussion of abilities instills moderate level of confidence for success, but level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, firm discusses and has sufficient capabilities and provides very good detail to support these statements and instill a high degree of confidence for success 5 = Excellent, discussion reflects highest level of cabilities and instills the highest level of confidence for success, including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	25%	5.00	2.50	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		NOTES		stories of challenges, explanation of how much space they need for staging and why, long history of this exact work		long list of clients and references, long company experience; did not discuss problem solving		long company experience, did not discuss problem solving							
Firm's knowledge and experience with City facilities and programs involved in the assignment	Firm should be familiar with the City's current programs, facilities, documents and any other information which is necessary and relevant to the scope of the RFP. This discussion should indicate the level of familiarity of knowledge.	0 = Nonresponsive; proposal does not mention City facilities or programs 1 = Poor, discussion related to the City's programs, facilities, and documents is incomplete, generic, or indicates a clear lack of familiarity and knowledge. 2 = Bad, firm provides a discussion of its familiarity with the City's programs, facilities, and documents, but lacks details to illustrate or support this. 3 = Good, firm provides a discussion of its familiarity with the City's programs, facilities, and documents, but does not provide a high level of detail. 4 = Very good, firm provides a detailed discussion and illustrates a high degree of familiarity with the City's programs, facilities, and documents. Firm has not physically been to the City's facilities to see them in person but anticipates potential challenges associated with these facilities. 5 = Excellent, firm demonstrates that it is fully familiar with the City's programs and documents as well as physically familiar with the City's facilities (has been to the sites) and understands and explains how it will address any challenges associated and identified with these facilities.	10%	3.00	0.60	3.00	0.60	3.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		NOTES		demonstrates comprehension and understanding from the RFP but little additional research/insight		demonstrates comprehension and understanding from the RFP but little additional research/insight		demonstrates comprehension and understanding from the RFP but little additional research/insight							
Record of performance	Details the firm's overall historical record of performance in achieving its stated goals; not limited to reference projects similar in size and scope to the project at hand.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing 1 = Poor, firm does not have a proven historical record of performance 2 = Bad, firm discusses historical record of performance, but record does not indicate that the firm has achieved stated goals over time 3 = Good, firm discusses historical record of performance and achievement of stated goals, but level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, firm discusses impressive historical record of performance and achievement of goals, provides very good detail to support these statements, content reflects quality 5 = Excellent, discussion reflects historical record of performance and achievement of goals of the highest level; content is of high quality and is well suited to the assignment	20%	4.00	1.60	4.00	1.60	4.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		NOTES		Exceptionally long list of references given											

Record of projects similar in scope	Details the firm's record of projects similar in scope to this project. Each project listed should include the names and telephone numbers of at least three responsible individuals who may be contacted as references.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing / no contact information has been provided 1 = Poor, firm's record of projects are not at all similar in scope, more than one individual reference contact may be missing 2 = Bad, firm's record of projects are not entirely similar in scope, more than one individual reference contact may be missing 3 = Good, firm's record of projects given are comparable or similar in scope, but level of detail is not remarkable, firm may be missing one individual reference contact 4 = Very good, firm's record of projects are very similar in scope with a very good level of detail provided, content reflects quality, firm may be missing one individual reference contact 5 = Excellent, firm's record of projects are very similar in scope with a high level of detail provided, content reflects the highest quality projects, all three individual reference contacts are provided for each project	20%	5.00	2.00	4.00	1.60	5.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		NOTES		all references provided; sent emails on April 28; positive response	did not provide the triple references as requested; emailed references provided and received positive response	Some detail lacking; resounding recommendation from reference in Sacramento							
Total			100%	9.20	7.80	8.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	DISQUALIFIED DUE TO FAIURE TO MEET C		

These criteria should be GRADED (not ranked) on a scale of zero to five (0-5). Each criteria has an explanation of what is				100%	Cascade		IPL		OTTO		Rehrig	
Evaluation Criteria	Explanation	Grading system:	Criteria Weighting	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	
Capabilities and specialized experience statement	Details the firm's capabilities and specialized experience in residential recycling/refuse cart distribution and residential communication strategies.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing 1 = Poor, firm does not demonstrate that it has the required capabilities and experience 2 = Bad, firm discusses capabilities and experience relevant to the requirements, but capabilities and experience are insufficient for scope 3 = Good, firm discusses and has sufficient capabilities and experience relevant to the requirements, but level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, firm discusses and has sufficient capabilities and experience relevant to the requirements, provides very good detail to support these statements, content reflects quality 5 = Excellent, discussion reflects capabilities and relevant experience of the highest level; content is of high quality and is tailored to the assignment	25%	3.50	1.75	3.00	1.50	3.25	1.63	2.50	1.25	
		NOTES		Very good detail provided regarding cart manufacturing, assembly, and distribution, but lacks details regarding communications plans and implementation		Limited detail provided regarding cart manufacturing, assembly, and distribution, lacks details regarding communications plans and implementation		Moderate detail provided regarding cart manufacturing, assembly, and distribution, but lacks details regarding communications plans and implementation		Very limited discussion included in cover letter only and mostly related to cart manufacturing, assembly and distribution. Lacks details regarding communications plans and implementation		
Size, staffing, resources, and financial capability of the firm versus the size of the assignment	This discussion should be indicative of the relative ability and confidence in the firm that it can successfully complete the project at hand in the required timeframe and for the cost proposed.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing 1 = Poor, discussion does not demonstrate that firm has the ability to successfully complete the project on time and in budget 2 = Bad, firm includes relevant discussion but the capabilities described do not instill confidence for success 3 = Good, discussion of abilities instills moderate level of confidence for success, but level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, firm discusses and has sufficient capabilities and provides very good detail to support these statements and instill a high degree of confidence for success 5 = Excellent, discussion reflects highest level of cabilities and instills the highest level of confidence for success, including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	25%	4.00	2.00	3.00	1.50	3.50	1.75	1.50	0.75	
		NOTES		Large established firm with demonstrated staffing resources, and financial capability; however, no reference to communications plans and strategies		Large established firm with demonstrated staffing resources, and financial capability; however, no reference to communications plans and strategies and overall detail is lacking		Large established firm with demonstrated staffing resources; no financial information included; no reference to communications plans and strategies		Established firm with manufacturing resources; no financial information included; no size or staffing information provided; no reference to communications plans and strategies		
Firm's knowledge and experience with City facilities and programs involved in the assignment	Firm should be familiar with the City's current programs, facilities, documents and any other information which is necessary and relevant to the scope of the RFP. This discussion should indicate the level of familiarity of knowledge.	0 = Nonresponsive; proposal does not mention City facilities or programs 1 = Poor, discussion related to the City's programs, facilities, and documents is incomplete, generic, or indicates a clear lack of familiarity and knowledge. 2 = Bad, firm provides a discussion of its familiarity with the City's programs, facilities, and documents, but lacks details to illustrate or support this. 3 = Good, firm provides a discussion of its familiarity with the City's programs, facilities, and documents, but does not provide a high level of detail. 4 = Very good, firm provides a detailed discussion and illustrates a high degree of familiarity with the City's programs, facilities, and documents. Firm has not physically been to the City's facilities to see them in person but anticipates potential challenges associated with these facilities. 5 = Excellent, firm demonstrates that it is fully familiar with the City's programs and documents as well as physically familiar with the City's facilities (has been to the sites) and understands and explains how it will address any challenges associated and identified with these facilities.	10%	1.00	0.20	2.00	0.40	1.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	

		NOTES		Discussion of CartLogic, Project Management, Scope, Operations, and Staging Space Requirements, but discussion is not specific to the City. Only City-specific reference is to quantity and type of cart and does not address those who may need physical assistance, as specified in RFP	Addresses City-specific needs for quantity and type of cart as well as those who may need physical assistance for service Discusses space that will be required of City facilities but there is no indication that such a space exists or that IPL has been there and no discussion of what would happen if space is not available	Does not address the option for residents to opt out of recycling or those who may need physical assistance for service Acknowledges that staging area will be required of City facilities but does not indicate if such a space exists or that Otto has been there and no discussion of what would happen if space is not available	Discussion of CARTS system, but discussion is not specific to the City. No reference to quantity and type of cart, option to opt-out, or those who may need physical assistance, as specified in RFP. Acknowledges that staging area will be required of City facilities but does not indicate if such a space exists or that Rehrig has been there and no discussion of what would happen if space is not available				
Record of performance	Details the firm’s overall historical record of performance in achieving its stated goals; not limited to reference projects similar in size and scope to the project at hand.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing 1 = Poor, firm does not have a proven historical record of performance 2 = Bad, firm discusses historical record of performance, but record does not indicate that the firm has achieved stated goals over time 3 = Good, firm discusses historical record of performance and achievement of stated goals, but level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, firm discusses impressive historical record of performance and achievement of goals, provides very good detail to support these statements, content reflects quality 5 = Excellent, discussion reflects historical record of performance and achievement of goals of the highest level; content is of high quality and is well suited to the assignment	20%	4.00	1.60	3.00	1.20	3.50	1.40	2.00	0.80
		NOTES		Discussion of firm history, production, and assembly to date, including past cart installations dating from 1995. No communications strategy discussion	Discussion of firm history is very brief and mostly limited to quantity of carts produced over time	Moderate discussion of firm history, production, and assembly to date, limited historical references/records. No communications strategy discussion	Very limited discussion of firm history and manufacturing facilities (included in cover letter only). Vague references to names of previous clients only. No communications strategy discussion				
Record of projects similar in scope	Details the firm’s record of projects similar in scope to this project. Each project listed should include the names and telephone numbers of at least three responsible individuals who may be contacted as references.	0 = Nonresponsive; information missing / no contact information has been provided 1 = Poor, firm's record of projects are not at all similar in scope, more than one individual reference contact may be missing 2 = Bad, firm's record of projects are not entirely similar in scope, more than one individual reference contact may be missing 3 = Good, firm's record of projects given are comparable or similar in scope, but level of detail is not remarkable, firm may be missing one individual reference contact 4 = Very good, firm's record of projects are very similar in scope with a very good level of detail provided, content reflects quality, firm may be missing one individual reference contact 5 = Excellent, firm's record of projects are very similar in scope with a high level of detail provided, content reflects the highest quality projects, all three individual reference contacts are provided for each project	20%	4.00	1.60	2.00	0.80	2.00	0.80	3.50	1.40
		NOTES		Information discusses overcoming challenges related to logistics and timelines, but no discussion related to communications strategy and plans.	Limited detail provided; no discussion related to communications strategy and plans; only lists 1 contact for each reference	Limited detail provided; no discussion related to communications strategy and plans; only lists 1 contact for each reference	Projects provided are recent and similar in scope, including reference to RFID tags, mailers, and website for customer selection. 3 points of contact listed; general detail is moderately limited.				
Total			100%		7.15		5.40		5.78		4.20

CART PRICING																DISQUALIFIED DUE TO FAIURE TO MEET CART SPECIFICATIONS											
For each service, list the actual price given in the proposal. If no answer is given for a particular service, leave blank (DO NOT ENTER ZERO).			Cascade					IPL					OTTO					Rehrig					Schafer				
Quantity	Criteria	Criteria Weighting	Actual Price Given	Pricing Notes	Adjusted Price	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Actual Price Given	Pricing Notes	Adjusted Price	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Actual Price Given	Pricing Notes	Adjusted Price	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Actual Price Given	Pricing Notes	Adjusted Price	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Actual Price Given	Pricing Notes	Adjusted Price	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score
31,450	Refuse Cart, 96 Gal. Complete	0.0%	38.21	Price is per cart	\$1,201,704.50	4.45	0.00	33.98	Price is per cart	\$1,068,671.00	5.00	0.00	38.79	Price is per cart	\$1,219,945.50	4.38	0.00	38.00	Price is per cart	\$1,195,100.00	4.47	0.00	36.15	Price is per cart	\$1,136,917.50	4.70	0.00
6,350	Refuse Cart, 64 Gal.Complete	0.0%	35.03	Price is per cart	\$222,440.50	4.02	0.00	28.15	Price is per cart	\$178,752.50	5.00	0.00	35.79	Price is per cart	\$227,266.50	3.93	0.00	35.00	Price is per cart	\$222,250.00	4.02	0.00	32.98	Price is per cart	\$209,423.00	4.27	0.00
36,800	Recycling Cart, 96 Gal.Complete	0.0%	39.56	Price is per cart	\$1,455,808.00	4.29	0.00	33.98	Price is per cart	\$1,250,464.00	5.00	0.00	38.79	Price is per cart	\$1,427,472.00	4.38	0.00	39.65	Price is per cart	\$1,459,120.00	4.28	0.00	36.15	Price is per cart	\$1,330,320.00	4.70	0.00
50	Refuse Cart , 32 Gal. with Black Lid	0.0%	35.00	Price is per cart	\$1,750.00	3.74	0.00	26.20	Price is per cart	\$1,310.00	5.00	0.00	31.50	Price is per cart	\$1,575.00	4.16	0.00	31.00	Price is per cart	\$1,550.00	4.23	0.00	29.63	Price is per cart	\$1,481.50	4.42	0.00
50	Refuse Cart , 32 Gal. with Blue Recycling Lid	0.0%	35.75	Price is per cart	\$1,787.50	3.66	0.00	26.20	Price is per cart	\$1,310.00	5.00	0.00	31.50	Price is per cart	\$1,575.00	4.16	0.00	31.00	Price is per cart	\$1,550.00	4.23	0.00	29.63	Price is per cart	\$1,481.50	4.42	0.00
70,460	Assembly & distribution (Approximately 34,960 recycle carts and 35,500 refuse carts)	0.0%	3.60	Price is per cart	\$253,656.00	4.71	0.00	3.94	Price is per cart	\$277,612.40	4.30	0.00	3.95	Price is per cart	\$278,317.00	4.29	0.00	3.85	Price is per cart	\$271,271.00	4.40	0.00	3.39	Price is per cart	\$238,859.40	5.00	0.00
1	Freight	0.0%	0.00	included in unit price	\$0.00	5.00	0.00	265029.00		\$265,029.00	0.00	0.00	149200.00		\$149,200.00	0.00	0.00	90000.00		\$90,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	included	\$0.00	5.00	0.00
1	Customer Cart and Service Plan	0.0%	51888.00		\$51,888.00	0.00	0.00	112050.00	\$1.50 ea piece (for traditional mailer program, no swap option)	\$112,050.00	0.00	0.00	68699.00		\$68,699.00	0.00	0.00	39341.08	Includes only: postcard design & printing, postcard processing fees and postage, website setup hosting & processing. Does not include, e.g., non-standard website design, website coding or programming costs Awil is only tool required; "multiple" awils will be provided at no cost	\$39,341.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	included	\$0.00	5.00	0.00
3	Tools to Service: Lids,Wheels,Axles,Lift Bars	0.0%	0.00	Included for no charge	\$0.00	5.00	0.00	5.00		\$15.00	0.03	0.00	6.00		\$18.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	n/a - no specialty tools required	\$0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00		\$0.00	5.00	0.00
\$	Total Price for Quantity Shown (DOES NOT INCLUDE SPARE PARTS)	97.5%			\$3,189,034.50	4.58	8.92			\$3,155,213.90	4.62	9.02			\$3,374,068.00	4.32	8.43			\$3,280,182.08	4.45	8.67			\$2,918,482.90	5.00	9.75
																		DISQUALIFIED DUE TO FAIURE TO MEET CART SPECIFICATIONS									
\$	SAMPLE SPARE PARTS PACKAGE PRICING	2.5%			\$1,307.50	3.04	0.15			\$1,825.00	2.17	0.11			\$1,075.00	3.69	0.18			\$1,250.00	3.18	0.16			\$793.75	5.00	0.25
	Residential Pricing Total	100%					9.07					9.13					8.62					8.83				10.00	

Not scored du

These criteria should be GRADED (not ranked) on a scale of zero to five (0-5). Each criteria has an explanation of what is				Quality of Services								
				100%	Cascade		IPL		OTTO		Rehrig	
Evaluation Criteria	Explanation	Grading system:	Criteria Weighting	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	
Overall Responsiveness to RFP document	This criteria is to provide grading on how well, overall, the proposer responded to the content and intent of the RFP document. It should consider readability, organization, quality, adherence to instructions, and tone of the proposal.	0 = Very poor, significant amount of content missing, requested structure not complied with, little original content ("form letter" feel) 1 = Poor, difficult to locate required items, some missing forms, three or more topics addressed insufficiently or not at all 2 = Bad, overall document does not reflect quality or effort, missing forms, two or more topics addressed insufficiently or not at all 3 = Good, document utilizes structure requested, all topics are addressed at least generally or better, level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, document properly uses requested structure, with all details addressed within as in the RFP content is specific to the City, plans for action and execution are thorough, content reflects quality 5 = Excellent, document is if the highest quality and usability, with most/all topic addressed in detail and plans for action and implementation which are detailed and complete; content is tailored to the City	10%	3.00	0.60	3.00	0.60	3.00	0.60		0.00	
		NOTES		Proposal is very detailed and the plan is of quality; lack of details specific to Broken Arrow make it a 3 instead of a 4.		Proposal is very detailed and the plan is of quality; lack of details specific to Broken Arrow make it a 3 instead of a 4.		Proposal is very detailed and the plan is of quality; lack of details specific to Broken Arrow make it a 3 instead of a 4.				
Phase 1: Develop and execute a communication strategy	Presents a communication strategy and execution plan that informs Broken Arrow’s refuse customers of the upcoming waste collection changes and their cart and service options. It should describe how the Proposer will collect basic customer information (including name, phone number, and physical address) and the customer’s cart and service selections. This section should also describe how the proposer will use different means of communication, such as digital and/or print materials, mailings, and other types of announcements, and how they may incorporate the City’s designs of outreach materials used for the pilot project. The proposer should indicate if they can offer communication materials in additional languages other than English.	0 = Nonresponsive; communication or execution plan missing 1 = Communication and execution plans are minimally described; many details missing 2 = Communication and execution plan are somewhat described; execution for ensuring efficient collection partially addressed 3 = Communication and execution plans are are somewhat described; execution for ensuring efficient collection sufficiently addressed 4 = Communication and execution plans are are described in full; execution for ensuring efficient collection addressed in full 5 = Communication and execution plans are are clear and complete. The proposal describes in great detail how the contractor will meet or exceed the database requirements including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	25%	5.00	2.50	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.50		0.00	
		NOTES		Three-pronged approach to communication very good. SMS options excellent. Explanation of how they will document people who could not be reached and provide that information to the City good.		The proposer does not recommend allowing pre-selection or opt-out, and did not provide detail description of a robust plan requested; however, the proposer also did not provide a detailed description or plan for their recommended course of action.		The proposal is not detailed and includes only a mailer with a phone or mail-back for response				
Phase 2: Create cart delivery and service database	Presents a cart delivery and service database design and implementation strategy that will document Phase 1’s communication findings. This database should ensure the efficient curbside distribution of the correct cart(s) to the appropriate customer. This database should also be developed using standard software that can be utilized by the City of Broken Arrow to make future customer entries.	0 = Nonresponsive; database does not use standard software 1 = Database is minimally described; execution for ensuring efficient distribution missing or minimally addressed 2 = Database utilization is somewhat described; execution for ensuring efficient distribution partially addressed 3 = Database utilization and data management are somewhat described; execution for ensuring efficient distribution addressed 4 = Database utilization and data management are described in full; execution for ensuring efficient distribution addressed in full 5 = Database utilization and data management are clear and complete. The proposal describes in great detail how the contractor will meet or exceed the database requirements including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	40%	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00		0.00	

		NOTES		Assigning the customer number at the very beginning of the process in order to avoid data entry errors and keep all addresses valid even if they are inactive		demonstration of interlinked databases and the output the City will receive		demonstration of interlinked databases and the output the City will receive			
Phase 3: Cart distribution	Presents a plan for cart distribution to Broken Arrow’s refuse customers in a timely fashion such that collection service can begin in the month of September 2020 (no later than October 1, 2020). Any provider that cannot meet the timeframe of delivery of the carts to the appropriate customers at their physical addresses will be considered nonresponsive.	0 = Nonresponsive 1 = Strategy is minimally addressed; provides no detail 2 = Stragegy minimally addressed; details are simply listed 3 = Strategy design includes information but some details are missing or not apparent 4 = Most/all strategy details are addressed directly, and the approach to meeting timeframe is described iin full 5 = Strategy design is clear and complete. The proposal describes in great detail how the contractor will meet or exceed the timeframe requirements including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	25%	5.00	2.50	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	
		NOTES		Details include how the field team will respond to unexpected inability to deliver		Lacks some detail regarding how to handle challenges or mishaps		Lacks some detail regarding how to handle challenges or mishaps			
Total			100%		9.60		7.10		7.10		0.00

Quality of Services											
These criteria should be GRADED (not ranked) on a scale of zero to five (0-5). Each criteria has an explanation of what is			100%	Cascade		IPL		OTTO		Rehrig	
Evaluation Criteria	Explanation	Grading system:	Criteria Weighting	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score
Overall Responsiveness to RFP document	This criteria is to provide grading on how well, overall, the proposer responded to the content and intent of the RFP document. It should consider readability, organization, quality, adherence to instructions, and tone of the proposal.	0 = Very poor, significant amount of content missing, requested structure not complied with, little original content ("form letter" feel) 1 = Poor, difficult to locate required items, some missing forms, three or more topics addressed insufficiently or not at all 2 = Bad, overall document does not reflect quality or effort, missing forms, two or more topics addressed insufficiently or not at all 3 = Good, document utilizes structure requested, all topics are addressed at least generally or better, level of detail is not remarkable 4 = Very good, document properly uses requested structure, with all details addressed within as in the RFP content is specific to the City, plans for action and execution are thorough, content reflects quality 5 = Excellent, document is if the highest quality and usability, with most/all topic addressed in detail and plans for action and implementation which are detailed and complete; content is tailored to the City	10%	3.00	0.60	4.00	0.80	3.00	0.60	0.00	0.00
		NOTES		Parts of the response feel like they are canned or a form letter; some areas not well organized, with information commingled together		Good, straightforward organization of information; Gantt chart schedule difficult to read		Average		Form feel letter, many firm qualification items missing, organization lacking, particularly in the outreach and selection plan details	
Phase 1: Develop and execute a communication strategy	Presents a communication strategy and execution plan that informs Broken Arrow's refuse customers of the upcoming waste collection changes and their cart and service options. It should describe how the Proposer will collect basic customer information (including name, phone number, and physical address) and the customer's cart and service selections. This section should also describe how the proposer will use different means of communication, such as digital and/or print materials, mailings, and other types of announcements, and how they may incorporate the City's designs of outreach materials used for the pilot project. The proposer should indicate if they can offer communication materials in additional languages other than English.	0 = Nonresponsive; communication or execution plan missing 1 = Communication and execution plans are minimally described; many details missing 2 = Communication and execution plan are somewhat described; execution for ensuring efficient collection partially addressed 3 = Communication and execution plans are are somewhat described; execution for ensuring efficient collection sufficiently addressed 4 = Communication and execution plans are are described in full; execution for ensuring efficient collection addressed in full 5 = Communication and execution plans are are clear and complete. The proposal describes in great detail how the contractor will meet or exceed the database requirements including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	25%	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Phase 3: Cart distribution	Presents a plan for cart distribution to Broken Arrow’s refuse customers in a timely fashion such that collection service can begin in the month of September 2020 (no later than October 1, 2020). Any provider that cannot meet the timeframe of delivery of the carts to the appropriate customers at their physical addresses will be considered nonresponsive.	0 = Nonresponsive 1 = Strategy is minimally addressed; provides no detail 2 = Strategy minimally addressed; details are simply listed 3 = Strategy design includes information but some details are missing or not apparent 4 = Most/all strategy details are addressed directly, and the approach to meeting timeframe is described in full 5 = Strategy design is clear and complete. The proposal describes in great detail how the contractor will meet or exceed the timeframe requirements including examples of how failures will be avoided or addressed	25%	4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	1.50	3.00	1.50
		NOTES		Illustrates how the carts will be produced, delivered, and distributed over the required timeframe but chart is slightly confusing Addresses placement, electronic tracking and assignment, and potential distribution issues Data to be provided daily to the City in Excel or CSV, plus real time web dashboard Discussion of CartLogic, Project Management, Scope, Operations, and Staging Space Requirements, but discussion is not specific to the City	IPL Bindel Platform allows realtime viewing of cart delivery and assignmnet of associated serial number/RFID Records GPD coordinates of each container delivered Can input exception codes for issues encountered Reports can be generated in PDF or Excel Discussion of logistics, safety, shipping and staging, including space that will be required (not apparent that IPL has physically been there)	References all homes to receive two carts with no reference to opting out of recycling service Timeline and logistics are described and meet requirements, but not presented in visually accessible format Delivery summaries to be communicated daily No reference to realtime updates Discusses DOT compliance and required PPE during delivery operations Seems to imply that City has to provide route information	Assembly and distribution is handled in-house Use CARTS online portal for delivery and inventory information Address list will be scrubbed against USPS database prior to delivery Delivery reports are provided daily and are automated Handheld barcode scanner used during delivery to document each cart delivered at each address, ties into CARTS system, to audit routes/addresses simultaneously City will be provided with a detailed assembly & distribution checklist Exception codes entered when issues occur during delivery GPS coordinates documented at delivery Detailed description of safety and operational protocols during delivery Detailed schedule of cart production, transportation, and delivery (e.g. number of carts per day) not provided No reference to literature on the cart at delivery				
Total			100%		7.80		8.00		3.90		4.10

This form is to consider cart quality ONLY. Do not consider services, price

Proposal Evaluation Form

City of Broken Arrow

Cart Procurement

Cart Specifications

For each service, list the actual price given in the proposal. If no answer is given for a particular service or frequency, leave blank (DO NOT ENTER 0)	
	Cart Criteria * <i>(Note criteria responses listed are for 96 gallon carts only, unless otherwise noted)</i>
	MINIMUM CART SPECIFICATIONS
	Passing ANSI Type B Label Sheet Provided for each cart type (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Correct design provided (rolling cart with lid for either semi-automated or fully-automated collection) (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Correct material provided (HDPE plastic) (1=yes, 0=no)
	Correct size options provided (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Correct color options provided (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Steel or metal composite lift bar (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Prevailing wind resistance (pass/fail, minimum 30 miles per hour)
	Wind gust resistance (pass/fail, minimum 45 miles per hour)
	Minimum temperature for guaranteed performance (pass/fail, 0 degrees Fahrenheit or less)

	Maximum temperature for guaranteed performance (pass/fail, 100 degrees Fahrenheit or more)
	Imprint on side with BA logo in white ink (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Imprint with instructions and safety information - all lids (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Full color in-mold label imprint - recycling lids (1 = yes, 0 = no)
	Warranty (pass/fail, minimum 10 years)
	OTHER CART SPECIFICATIONS
	Weight of Fully Assembled Cart (Pounds)
	Recycle content of Black Container (%)
	Recycle content of Blue Container (%)
	Resin per cart (Pounds)
	Cart height x width x depth (Inches)
	Load rating (Pounds)
Delivery Timeframe (from receipt of information to all carts at residences)	
Total	

cing, or any other criteria when completing this form.

wer is given for a R ZERO).	Cascade			
Criteria Weighting	Response	Response Notes	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score
0%	1		5.00	0.00
0%	1		5.00	0.00
0%	1		5.00	0.00
0%	1		5.00	0.00
0%	1		5.00	0.00
0%	1		5.00	0.00
0%	49	49(F), 51(S), 60(B)	5.00	0.00
0%	49	49(F), 51(S), 60(B); lowest rating for 64-gal is 40 mph; lowest rating for 32-gal is 35 mph	5.00	0.00
0%	-40	-40	5.00	0.00

0%	184	184	5.00	0.00
0%	1	Custom hot stamp on lid and body; ink color not referenced	5.00	0.00
0%	1	Custom in-mold graphics and hot stap available for lid	5.00	0.00
0%	1	Imprint label, full color not referenced	5.00	0.00
0%	10	10 Years	5.00	0.00
0%	37.25			
12.5%	25	Up to 25% PCR	2.50	0.63
12.5%	25	Up to 25% PCR	4.17	1.04
0%	33			
0%		46x23x31.5		
0%	336			
75%	90.00	Days	1.67	2.50
100%				4.17

CART SPECIFICATION

IPL				
<i>Response</i>	<i>Response Notes</i>	<i>Score (0-5)</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>	<i>Response</i>
1		5.00	0.00	1
1		5.00	0.00	1
1		5.00	0.00	1
1		5.00	0.00	1
1		5.00	0.00	1
1	galvanized steel	5.00	0.00	1
60	60(F), 60(S), 50(B)	5.00	0.00	47
60	60(F), 60(S), 50(B); lowest rating for 64-gal is 40 mph; lowest rating for 32-gal is 30 mph	5.00	0.00	47
-40	-40	5.00	0.00	-40

108	108	5.00	0.00	108
1		5.00	0.00	1
1		5.00	0.00	1
1		5.00	0.00	1
10	10 Years	5.00	0.00	10
38.95				34.5
0%	0%	0.00	0.00	30
0%	0%	0.00	0.00	30
36.82				28.2
	46.25x26.25x33.75			
335				335
180	Days (assumes Option 1 with traditional mailer campain, no swap program)	0.83	1.25	70
			1.25	

S & QUALITY

OTTO			Rehrig	
Response Notes	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Response	Response Notes
	5.00	0.00	1	
	5.00	0.00	1	
	5.00	0.00	1	
	5.00	0.00	1	
	5.00	0.00	1	correct color options depicted in brochure photos only
	5.00	0.00	1	1" corrosion resistant zinc-plated steel
47(F), 56(S), 57(B)	5.00	0.00	35	35(F), 47(S), 56(B)
47(F), 56(S), 57(B); lowest rating for 65-gal is 40 mph; lowest rating for 35-gal 23.5 mph	5.00	0.00	35	35(F), 47(S), 56(B); lowest rating for 65-gal is 39.7 mph; testing data for 35-gal not provided
-40	5.00	0.00	-22	-22

108	5.00	0.00	180	180
No specific reference to white ink	5.00	0.00	1	
Reference was made only to superior hot stamping using the latest heat sink technology	5.00	0.00	1	
Reference was made only to superior hot stamping using the latest heat sink technology	5.00	0.00	1	4-color
10 Years	5.00	0.00	10	10 Years
			35	
Up to 30%	3.00	0.75	30	Up to 30%
Up to 30%	5.00	1.25	30	Up to 30%
			32	
41.25x29.38x33.88				43.5x29.2x33.3
			332.5	
Days; indicated timeline is approx. 150 days	2.14	3.21	45	Days; indicated timeline is approx. 140 days
		5.21		



		Schafer			
Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Response	Response Notes	Score (0-5)	Weighted Score
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	36	36(F), 37(S), 42(B)	5.00	0.00
0.00	0.00	36	36(F), 37(S), 42(B); lowest rating for 65-gal is 30 mph; lowest rating for 35-gal is 33 mph	0.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	-40	-40	5.00	0.00

5.00	0.00	108	108	5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1	white foil will be used instead of ink	5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	1		5.00	0.00
5.00	0.00	10	10 Years	5.00	0.00
		36			
3.00	0.75	25	20-30%	2.50	0.63
5.00	1.25	25	20-30%	4.17	1.04
		30			
			42.9x27.9x29.8		
		333			
3.33	5.00	30	Days	5.00	7.50
	0.00				0.00

Toter			
<i>Response</i>	<i>Response Notes</i>	<i>Score (0-5)</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
1		5.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
0	Material is medium density polyethylene	0.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
43	43(F), 46(S), 50(B)	5.00	0.00
43	43(F), 46(S), 50(B); lowest rating for 64-gal is 40 mph; lowest rating for 32-gal is 36.2 mph	0.00	0.00
-22	-22	5.00	0.00

135	135	5.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
1		5.00	0.00
12	12 Years	5.00	0.00
35.2			
50	Up to 50%	5.00	1.25
10	Up to 10%	1.67	0.42
30.5	*Note - cart construction is rotational mold as opposed to injection mold like the others		
	43x29.75x35.50		
335			
150	Days	1.00	1.50
			0.00