



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

**PUBLIC WORKS
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
PROCESS
GUIDELINES**

2018 Edition

**Tom Wolf
Governor**

**Curt Topper
Secretary**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section

1. Introduction
2. Written Determination
3. Request for Proposal (RFP) Coordinator
4. Forming the Proposal Evaluation Committee
5. Committee Statements of Confidentiality And No Conflict Of Interest
6. Committee Audits
7. Committee Activities Prior to RFP Release
8. Public Notice
9. Issuance of RFP
10. Pre-Proposal Conference
11. Receipt of Proposals
12. Proposal Responsible / Responsive and Cost Review
13. Technical Submission Rating Guidance
14. Cost Submission Evaluation
15. Disadvantaged Business Submission Evaluation
16. Proposal Selection
17. Notice of Selection
18. Notification to Non-Responsible and Unsuccessful Proposers
19. Debriefing
20. DGS Rights Reserved

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- A Sample Determination Matrix
- B Sample Determination Decision
- C Statement of Confidentiality
- D. Statement of No Conflict of Interest
- E. Proposal Compliance– Responsiveness Form
- F. Proposal Compliance - Rejected Proposals
- G. Proposal Cost Review - Cost Summary
- H. Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Request for Proposal Guidelines (Guidelines) is to describe the Request for Proposals (RFP) process and steps that will be undertaken by the Department of General Services Public Works personnel (DGS) when procuring single or multiple prime contractors on a construction project by the competitive sealed proposal process. The Project specific RFP may differ from these Guidelines.

2. WRITTEN DETERMINATION

A written determination by the Deputy Secretary for Public Works that the standard competitive sealed bidding process is either not practical or advantageous to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Commonwealth) is required before the competitive sealed proposal process can be utilized for obtaining proposals. A copy of the matrix used by the Deputy in considering whether a project should be procured by competitive sealed proposals is attached to these guidelines as **Exhibit A**. The matrix serves as a starting point; not all of these factors may be considered, depending upon the circumstances of the project being considered for procurement. Additional factors not appearing on this template may also be considered in making the determination. A template of the determination memo is attached to these guidelines as **Exhibit B**. A copy of the Deputy's determination for all projects proceeding under the sealed proposal process (i.e., RFP) will be posted on DGS' website upon its execution and remain posted for a minimum of thirty (30) days after award or cancellation of the project.

3. RFP COORDINATOR

All RFP Proposal Evaluation Committees will be chaired by the RFP Coordinator. This Coordinator is a non-voting facilitator and is the DGS contact person for all RFP issues and shall be responsible for:

- Coordinating with the Director of the Bureau of Pre-Construction to schedule determination meetings for projects that may be considered for the sealed proposal process.
- Ensuring that certain RFP documents are posted to the DGS Website.
- Contacting the Proposal Evaluation Committee members to schedule the RFP template modification meeting and scheduling the subsequent scoring meeting. The RFP Coordinator will guide the discussion during these meetings but will not dictate results or decide upon the content of the RFP or the scores of the voting members.
- Ensuring all Committee members sign the Statement of Confidentiality and the No Conflict of Interest statements and retaining these statements on file.
- Ensuring the confidentiality of all cost submissions by keeping the sealed documents in a secured location.
- Modifying the RFP template to reflect the decisions by the voting members regarding the important factors that Proposers should address on each project.
- Modifying the Committee scoring sheet to reflect the specific scores assigned by the voting members for the factors that Proposers should address and attaching this as an appendix to the RFP issued for the project.
- Serving as contact person for all issues arising out of the proposal process, including accepting questions, ensuring timely issuance of addenda (but not responsible for the content of the bulletin) and accepting the proposals on submission date.

- As necessary, working with the design professional to contact all references and prepare summary reports, Dunn and Bradstreet reports and other reports deemed necessary and provided to the scoring members of the Evaluation Committee.
- Drafting the memo to the Deputy recommending award to the successful Proposers.
- Scheduling and conducting the debriefing meetings.

4. FORMING THE PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Proposal Evaluation Committee (Committee) will be a multidisciplinary team that brings construction, engineering, architectural, financial, legal, and/or customer perspectives to the project. The Deputy Secretary of Public Works will appoint Committee members following the determination to proceed with the RFP process. The Committee will be comprised of career-professional managers with programmatic and technical expertise. The size and composition of the Committee can vary depending upon the scope and size of a project. The Committee will usually include three voting and five non-voting members.

The three (3) voting members of the Committee will be a combination that consist of:

- A Public Works, Bureau of Pre-Construction Representative
- A Public Works, Bureau of Construction Representative
- A Client Agency, Representative

The voting members of the Committee are responsible for customizing the standard RFP to reflect project specific requirements, developing the proposal evaluation forms, and evaluating and scoring the Technical Submissions of the proposals. These responsibilities are described in more detail herein.

The non-voting members of the Committee may include representatives from

- Comptroller Operations
- DGS' Office of Chief Counsel
- Professional Design Team
- DGS' Bureau of Diversity, Inclusion, and Small Business Opportunities
- Construction Management Team, if applicable

Non-voting members may participate at their discretion but will not dictate results or decide upon the content of the RFP or the scores of the voting members.

Cabinet secretaries and other senior level political appointees will not play a direct role in evaluating proposals.

5. COMMITTEE STATEMENTS OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST

All Committee members are required to sign a Statement of Confidentiality (**Exhibit C**) and the voting members are required to sign a Statement of No Conflict of Interest (**Exhibit D**). Committee members will sign the Statement of Confidentiality when they are appointed or invited to serve on the Committee or attend a Committee meeting. The Statement of Confidentiality ensures that non-public information and the contents of proposals remain confidential and outside parties do not have access to Committee or proposal information and cannot influence the outcome. The voting Committee

members sign the Statement of No Conflict of Interest after they have received the responsive Proposals to be scored and reviewed the identities of all prime contractors and any listed subcontractors for conflicts. Any Committee member who violates the terms of these statements is subject to termination.

All others requiring non-public information regarding the RFP shall sign a Statement of Confidentiality (Exhibit C).

6. COMMITTEE AUDITS

The Committee will be subject to random audits by Commonwealth personnel. The audits may include the review of Committee procedures, documents, and decision-making processes.

7. VOTING COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO RFP RELEASE

Once the Deputy Secretary for Public Works appoints the voting Committee, the RFP Coordinator will convene them to initiate the RFP process. After consulting with the Client Agency, the voting Committee will review and modify the RFP and its appendices and proposal evaluation forms to assure successful project execution and completion.

8. PUBLIC NOTICE

Public notice of the Determination will be posted to DGS' website approximately thirty (30) days prior to the Notice to Proposers being issued. Public notice of the Project will be given in the same manner as a public notice is given for the competitive sealed bidding process. Proposers will be given a reasonable time, approximately six weeks between the Notice for Proposals and the Proposal Submission Deadline, to prepare their proposals.

9. ISSUANCE OF RFP

The RFP documents, including the Notice to Proposers, will be available to Proposers through eMarketplace and within the e-Builder Enterprise Software Program system. The Notice to Proposers, at a minimum, will contain the following:

- Data, time and place of the Pre-Proposal Conference.
- Deadline to submit written questions concerning the RFP.
- Proposal Submission Deadline. This is the deadline by which proposals must be delivered to the RFP Coordinator in Harrisburg.
- Name and telephone number of the RFP Coordinator.

10. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

The Calendar of Events within the RFP document will indicate the date, time and location for a Pre-Proposal Conference. This will be scheduled approximately two weeks after issuing the RFP. This two-week period will provide Proposers adequate time to review the RFP documents and to submit written questions to the RFP Coordinator.

The Professional will host the Pre-Proposal Conference and will address the following issues.

Background Information

The Professional will present the basics of the project to the attendees and describe any special aspects of the project.

Answer Proposers' Questions on the RFP

The Professional may present answers to the questions that have been submitted in writing prior to the Pre-Proposal Conference. To facilitate addressing other questions, Proposers will complete question forms that may be distributed at the conference. It is important to note that although the Professional may respond to questions at the conference, any answer given at the Pre-Proposal Conference is not binding on the Department until the answer is confirmed in writing and issued in an addendum. The questioner will not be identified.

11. RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

All proposals shall be submitted to DGS as described in the RFP by the date and time established in the Notice to Proposers. Any proposal received after the Proposal Submission Deadline will be rejected.

12. PROPOSAL RESPONSIBILITY/RESPONSIVENESS AND COST REVIEW

Following the receipt of the proposals, a representative from DGS' Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) and the RFP Coordinator will conduct a Proposal Responsibility/Responsiveness Review and a Cost Review.

The purpose of the Proposal Responsibility/Responsiveness Review is to review each proposal according to the Requirements Checklist (appendix to RFP) (**Exhibit E**) and any requirement of the RFP. If a mandatory requirement is not met, the Proposal will be rejected as non-responsive. The OCC representative will create a Rejected Proposals Form (**Exhibit F**) listing the rejected proposals for each discipline and setting forth the reason(s) for the rejection. These completed forms will be submitted to the Coordinator. Rejected proposals will not be evaluated beyond the Proposal Responsibility/Responsiveness Review and the rejected Proposers will be notified of their rejection in a timely manner. If a Proposer disagrees with the rejection, they may file a protest in accordance with the protest procedures set forth in the RFP, but there will be no debriefing for proposals rejected as non-responsive.

In addition, a Cost Review will determine if the sum of the lowest Cost Submissions for all Prime Contracts exceeds the funds allocated for the project. The OCC representative will complete the Cost Summary (**Exhibit G**) by listing the lowest Cost Submission price for each Base Bid and discipline (.1/.2/.3/.4) **without identifying the Proposers**. In the event that this sum exceeds the allocation, the RFP Coordinator will notify the Public Works Fiscal Office who will conduct a fiscal analysis and discuss funding options with the Client Agency. Once any funding issues are resolved, all responsive proposals will be distributed by the RFP Coordinator to the voting Committee members ensuring the confidentiality and integrity of the RFP process.

Depending on the number of responsible Proposals, the RFP Coordinator will establish a date to reconvene the Committee.

13. TECHNICAL SUBMITTAL RATING GUIDANCE

In evaluating and rating each section of the Technical Submittal, the Committee will use the following rating system as a scoring guide. The ratings reflect the Commonwealth's confidence in each Proposer's ability, as demonstrated in its Proposal, to perform the requirements stated in the RFP.

Excellent

When applied to an individual evaluation factor, a rating of excellent should be given if the Proposer excels in all or virtually all aspects and criteria relating to the factor. The proposal demonstrates that the Proposer or their Project Team has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Commonwealth. Performance risk is very low. The Proposer or Project Team would rate well above average according to what is expected from qualified contractors and stand out as leaders in the industry as related to the factor.

When determining the final score for a factor of the Technical Submittal, the range of 91 to 100 percent of the maximum score should be awarded.

Good

When applied to an individual evaluation factor, a good rating should be given if the Proposer or Project Team demonstrates strong qualities relating the factor. While the Proposer or Project Team's rating for a given factor may not justify an excellent rating, the Proposer or Project Team proves very qualified and capable in all or virtually all-important criteria relating to the evaluation factor. The document demonstrates that the Proposer or Project Team has one or more strengths that will benefit the Commonwealth and if deficiencies exist, they are minor and do not seriously undermine the overall capability for a given factor. Performance risk is low. The Proposer or Project Team would rate above average according to what is expected from qualified contractors.

When determining the final score for a factor of the Technical Submittal the range of 81 to 90 percent of the maximum score should be awarded.

Satisfactory

When applied to an individual evaluation factor the Proposer's or Project Team's qualifications are average. It may be fairly strong in some aspects of the criteria relating to a given evaluation factor, but weak on others (e.g., with regard to management plan, it has an adequate management Project Team, but its technical approach to the project does not demonstrate a good understanding of the requirements). The document demonstrates few or no strengths. Deficiencies exist, but do not rise to the level of rendering the Proposer or Project Team technically incompetent. However, there would be a moderate performance risk involved. The Proposer or Project Team would rate average according to what is expected from qualified contractors.

When determining the final score for a factor of the Technical Submittal a range of 75 to 80 percent of the maximum score should be awarded.

Unsatisfactory

When applied to an individual evaluation factor the Proposer's or Project Team's qualifications are unacceptable. The Proposer or Project Team fails to meet even a minimum acceptability relating to a given evaluation factor. Multiple serious deficiencies exist and indicate the Proposer or Project Team

would pose unacceptable risks in performance. The Proposer or Project Team would rate well below average according to what is expected from qualified contractors.

When determining the final score for a factor of the Technical Submittal a range of 0 to 74 percent of the maximum score should be awarded.

If a Scoring Member elects to score a factor as Unsatisfactory, they are expected to provide a brief written comment in their notes on why the factor merits an unsatisfactory score.

14. TECHNICAL SUBMISSION EVALUATION

The voting members of the Committee will receive the responsible proposers' Technical Submissions as soon as the Responsibility/Responsiveness Review and any funding issues have been resolved. Each voting Committee member will evaluate and score each Technical Submission for each discipline (general, HVAC, plumbing, electrical) and record his/her scores using a project specific version of the Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix (**Exhibit H**). Each voting Committee member will review each Technical Submission independently and score according to the project specific Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix. To determine the appropriate score to be assigned to each evaluation factor, they will use the above guide, their professional expertise and business judgment. A score will be assigned only after considering all documentation provided on the Proposer and subcontractors (if applicable). The maximum Technical Submission Score is written in the RFP.

During the evaluation of the Technical Submissions, the RFP Coordinator may issue a two-day technical clarification letter to solicit the necessary clarifying information from a Proposer. The 'two-day letter' will be used to clarify information but not to remedy any defects in the Mandatory Requirements.

The RFP Coordinator may provide the voting members of the Committee a copy of a Dunn & Bradstreet report on each Proposer. In addition, the RFP Coordinator, or a designee, may research the references provided in the proposals and provide the information to the Committee.

After the voting Committee members have completed their evaluations for each Proposal and recorded the scores on the Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix, the RFP Coordinator will convene them to calculate the final scores for the proposals. The agenda for this meeting may be as follows:

- First, each voting Committee member will reveal/confirm their individual score for each Technical Submission evaluation factor listed on the Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix. The RFP Coordinator will record these scores.
- Second, the RFP Coordinator will calculate the average of the individual scores for each evaluation factor.
 - If an individual score deviates by more than 15% from the average scores for that evaluation factor, the RFP Coordinator will request that the voting Committee member with the higher or lower score discuss the basis for their score (e.g., the proposal's relative strengths, capabilities, weaknesses, risks or deficiencies of that portion of the Technical Submission). All voting Committee members may provide their viewpoints however, it is their sole discretion to alter or not alter their score.

- After the voting Committee members have disclosed and finalized their scores, each will sign and date his/her Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix and submit it to the RFP Coordinator.
- The RFP Coordinator will then calculate the Evaluation Committee Scoring Matrix for each proposal, which will be the averages of the individual Committee member scores.
- After the RFP Coordinator has recorded the Technical Submission Scores, the RFP Coordinator will proceed to open the Small Diverse Business and Small Business Submission score and Cost Submissions and finish calculating the scores for each proposal in accordance with the RFP.

Committee members do not see and are not allowed to consider either the Cost Submissions or Small Diverse Business and Small Business Submissions when evaluating the Technical Submittals. This confidentiality is necessary to ensure that the voting members' technical evaluations are not influenced by this information.

The Maximum Allowable Points (MAP) allocated to the Technical Submission is determined by the Evaluation Committee. The score for the remaining proposals will be calculated using the formula presented below.

$$MAP - \frac{(MAP \times (\text{Highest Technical Score} - \text{Proposer's Technical Score}))}{(\text{Highest Technical Score})}$$

15. COST SUBMISSION EVALUATION

The RFP Coordinator, in the presence of OCC representative, will open the sealed Cost Submissions. The proposal for each discipline (general, HVAC, plumbing, electrical) with the lowest possible Cost Submission will get the MAP for the Cost Submission. The score for the remaining proposals will be calculated using the formula presented below.

$$MAP - \frac{(MAP \times (\$ \text{ Proposers Cost Submission} - \$ \text{ Lowest Proposers Cost Submission}))}{(\$ \text{ Lowest Proposers Costs Submission})}$$

16. SMALL BUSINESS AND SMALL DIVERSE BUSINESS SUBMISSION EVALUATION

The Small Diverse Business (SDB) and Small Business (SB) Submission will consist of a SDB and SB percentage commitments as described in detail in the project specific RFP. The Bureau of Diversity, Inclusion and Small Business Opportunities will calculate a SDBSB score for each Proposer using the formulas presented in the RFP. The proposal for each discipline (general, HVAC, plumbing, electrical) with the highest Small Diverse Business and Small Business raw score will receive the MAP.

16. PROPOSAL SELECTION

Upon completion of the detailed evaluation and scoring of the Technical Submissions, Cost Submissions and Small Diverse Business and Small Business Submissions, the RFP Coordinator will calculate each Total Proposal Score using the formula identified in the RFP. The following formula is provided as an example for calculating the Total Proposal Score. In the event of a tie, the scores will be extended out to sufficient decimal places to eliminate the tie. The maximum Total Proposal Score is specific to each RFP.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Proposal Score} &= \text{Technical Score} + \text{Cost Score} \\ &+ \text{Small Diverse Business and Small Business Score} \end{aligned}$$

After finalizing the Total Proposal Scores, the RFP Coordinator will prepare a recommendation report that is sent to the Deputy Secretary listing the final scores of all responsive and responsible qualified Proposers and highlighting the Proposer(s) with the highest Proposal Score(s).

The Deputy Secretary will verify that there are sufficient funds to award the contracts to the Proposers and will then, if needed, forward the recommendation report to the Secretary for review.

The Secretary has the discretion to reject all proposals or, if he/she has good cause to believe that the recommendation is not sound, he/she can return the recommendation to the Committee with any concerns. The Committee should consider the concerns but is under no obligation to revise its scores or recommendation. The Secretary must approve the recommendation before proceeding with the normal procedure for awarding and executing the contract(s).

17. NOTICE OF SELECTION

Upon receiving the Secretary's or Deputy Secretary's confirmation of the selected Proposer(s), the RFP Coordinator will notify the selected Proposers and initiate execution of the contract(s) by the Public Works Fiscal Office. The RFP Coordinator is responsible for ensuring the posting of the successful proposals and the summary of the final scores of all of the Proposers, with only the successful Proposer's name listed, to DGS' website in compliance with the RFP.

18. NOTIFICATION TO NON-RESPONSIBLE AND UNSUCCESSFUL PROPOSERS

The RFP Coordinator will notify all Proposers deemed non-responsive and unsuccessful promptly after their proposals are eliminated from consideration. The contents of the notification will depend upon whether the elimination was based upon a rejection for non-responsiveness made before the proposals were distributed for scoring, non-responsive due to not meeting the threshold requirement of the Technical Submission, or whether the elimination was based upon not being the highest scored proposal.

- If the proposal is rejected as non-responsive, the notification to the unsuccessful Proposer will include an explanation of the basis for the rejection and a brief summary of the Proposer's option to file a protest. There will be no debriefing for any proposals rejected as non-responsive.
- If the proposal is rejected as non-responsible, the notification to the unsuccessful Proposer will include an explanation of the basis for the rejection, their non-prorated Technical Score, and a brief summary of the Proposer's option to file a protest. There may be a debriefing for any proposal rejected as non-responsible. Refer to the RFP.
- If the proposal is eliminated as not the highest scored proposal, then the notice to the unsuccessful Proposer will include the name of the selected Proposer, its Total Proposal Score and its Cost and a reference to the DGS' website. The notification will also inform the unsuccessful Proposer of its opportunity for a debriefing and the requirement that, if a debriefing is desired, the Proposer must request the debriefing within two (2) calendar days of the date of the Notification of Non-Selection. The timeframe for debriefing of unsuccessful proposers neither extends nor modifies in any

way the deadlines for the RFP Protest Procedure. If a Proposer exercises its opportunity to be debriefed, this shall not constitute the filing of a protest.

19. DEBRIEFING

The purpose of the debriefing is to provide a general explanation of the evaluation of the Proposer's proposal. The procedures and content of a debriefing are summarized below.

- The non-responsible or unsuccessful Proposer must submit a request for a debriefing to the RFP Coordinator within two (2) calendar days of the Notice of Non-Selection or rejection, The RFP Coordinator will schedule all debriefings within five (5) calendar days of receipt of a written request for debriefing but no later than seven (7) calendar days from the date of the Notice of Selection.
 - The Department will attempt to avoid issuing Notices of Selection to successful Proposers on Thursday or Friday. This will enable unsuccessful Proposers to receive the Notice of Non-Selection and to submit a debriefing request by the end of the work week.
- During the debriefing, the RFP Coordinator will provide a review of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, the Proposer's relative rank in the final scoring process, and the awardee's total cost. This will be followed by reasonable responses to relevant questions. Whenever appropriate the debriefing should include comments taken directly from the Committee's evaluation process.
- The identity of the Committee members, their notes, evaluation scores, and any other record of the Committee will not be released.

20. DGS RIGHTS RESERVED

DGS reserves the right to change these Guidelines. The amended Guidelines will be posted on the DGS website with the changes highlighted for easy comparison to the prior version of the Guidelines. If changes are made to the Guidelines, the new guidelines will apply only to RFPs issued after the date the changes are posted on the website. In addition, DGS reserves the right to change the Standard RFP documents. The amended Standard RFP documents will be posted on the DGS website.

END OF TEXT

EXHIBIT A

DETERMINATION MATRIX

	Title	\$	
	Project #		
	BV	LB	
Site Considerations			Comments
Prison			
Haz. Mat. abatement			
Restricted access/tunnels			
Unbalanced cut/fill operation			
Limited Lay down area			
Interfacing with existing structures			
LEED criteria			
Critical Project Conditions			
.1 Architectural factors			
Large-scale demolition			
Unusual/Unique construction			
Skin			
Foundations			
Roof			
LEED Certification/Eligible			
.2 HVAC Factors			
Laboratory facility			
Boiler Replacement			
Master Plant Control System			
.3 Plumbing Factors			
Difficult access			
.4 Electrical Factors			
Computer Science labs			
Acoustical/Theatrical considerations			
Other Factors to Consider			
Historical status			
Schedule Considerations			
Evacuation of facility			
Occupied facility			
Expedited/Mandated use date			
Tight coordination of primes			
Demolition concurrent with construction			
Renovation/ New Construction concurrent			
Overall Determination:			

EXHIBIT B

DETERMINATION DECISION MEMO

PROJECT TITLE

Project Number: D.G.S.

Contract Number:

Project Location:

**DETERMINATION REGARDING THE USE OF THE
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) METHOD OF PROCUREMENT**

The use of the standard competitive sealed bid method of procurement for the [contractor(s)] on [project title insert] is/is not practical and/but is/is not advantageous to the Commonwealth. The [project] is for [description of contract/project]. Specifically, the [contractor] scope involves:

- [Insert bullets describing the results/discussion of the factors listed on the Determination Matrix.]

The above factors do/do not demonstrate the unique and particular construction considerations for the [contractor(s)] on this project, which requires specific contractor knowledge, skill and experience to complete the project work successfully and to expedite the construction schedule. Consequently, it is/is not practical and/but it is/is not advantageous for the Commonwealth to use the competitive sealed bidding process to procure contractors because the low bid approach does/does not allow the Commonwealth to consider these specific and particular factors presented herein, in conjunction with cost, during the procurement process.

Deputy Secretary for Public Works

Date

EXHIBIT C

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This statement must be signed by all that require non-public information regarding this RFP.

To protect the integrity of the public procurement process and in order to ensure fairness in the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to a RFP, it is very important that non-public information and the contents of proposals remain confidential throughout the evaluation process.

I certify that:

1. I will not divulge nor make known, in any manner whatsoever, to any person, other than a member of the RFP Proposal Evaluation Committee or other individual who has signed a confidentiality statement for the same Project, or to an investigatory or law enforcement authority, after consultation with the individual's Office of Chief Counsel, any information (which has not already been made available to the public or all interested Proposers) pertaining to any and all aspects of the RFP including but not limited to the Members of the Evaluation Committee, discussions during the RFP Template review meeting, the contents of Proposers' proposals, the scoring method, points allotted, evaluator scores, costs, or any other non-public/confidential information regarding the RFP process.
2. I understand that unauthorized sharing of information may give a Proposer an unfair advantage over another Proposer and thereby render the process invalid.
3. I understand that if I divulge such information I may be subject to disciplinary action, including termination of my employment with the Commonwealth.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read and understand the certifications set forth above in this Statement of Confidentiality.

Signature

Date

Name

RFP or Contract Number

Employing Agency

EXHIBIT D

STATEMENT OF NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST

To protect the integrity of the public procurement process, it is essential that proposals be evaluated in an unbiased manner and without conflict of interest. You have been selected to participate as a member of the Proposal Evaluation Committee for the referenced RFP not only because of your technical expertise, but also because the Deputy Secretary and your supervisor are not aware of any bias, business or family relationships, or any other conflicts that could affect, or which could be perceived to affect, your fair, honest and impartial participation in the evaluation of proposals. As an evaluator you are expected to: 1) discharge your duties impartially so as to assure fair, competitive access to Commonwealth procurement by responsible contractors, and 2) conduct yourself in a manner which fosters public confidence in the integrity of the Commonwealth procurement process.

No Foreseeable Conflict of Interest or Bias

I certify that I, and to the best of my knowledge, my spouse, parent, child, brother or sister (“immediate family”), as defined in the *Public Official and Employee Ethics Act*, 65 Pa. C. S.A. §1102:

1. Are not current or former employees of any of the Proposers.
2. Are not directors, officers, owners, partners, agents, or representatives of any of the Proposers.
3. Do not hold any stock or any financial interest in any of the Proposers.

I certify that I will NOT, during the RFP process:

1. Solicit or accept, directly or indirectly, any promise of future employment or business opportunity from, or engage, directly or indirectly, in any discussion of future employment or business opportunity with, any director, officer, owner, partner, employee, representative, agent or consultant of a Proposer or their proposed subcontractors.
2. Ask for, demand, exact, solicit, seek, accept, receive, or agree to receive, directly or indirectly, any money, gratuity, or other thing of value from any director, officer, owner, partner, employee, representative, agent, or consultant of a Proposer or their proposed subcontractors for this project. I will advise my immediate family that the acceptance of any such gratuity may be imputed to me as a violation, and must therefore be avoided by them.

STATEMENT OF NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Initials _____

Page 1 of 2

I understand that my obligations under this certification are of a continuing nature. I will immediately seek the advice of the Department of General Services' Office of Chief Counsel and report the circumstances to my supervisor and to the Deputy Secretary of Public Works if at any time during the RFP process:

1. I receive a contact from a Proposer that submitted a proposal, or their proposed subcontractors, concerning employment or other business opportunity.
2. I receive an offer of a gift from a Proposer that submitted a proposal, or their proposed subcontractors.
3. I encounter circumstances where my participation might result in a real, apparent, or potential conflict.

Exceptions

Exceptions to the certifications that I have made in completing this certification are listed below. *If additional space is needed, attach additional pages and initial each page of the addition.*

Check here if there are no exceptions to the certifications.

Signature and Certification

I have read and understand the certifications and understanding set out in this document. I further understand that by signing this document, I make the certifications and confirm the understandings herein subject to the provisions and penalties of *18 Pa.C.S. Section 4904 (unsworn falsification to authorities)*.

Signature (must be original ink signature)

Date

Name (print)

RFP or Contract Number

Employing Agency

EXHIBIT E

**PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE AND
RESPONSIVENESS FORM
(Sample)**

OCC Rep.: _____ Date: _____ Proposer's Name: _____

Bidding Unit Rep.: _____ Date: _____

Indicate if the proposal meets each of following mandatory requirements. Any Proposal that has a "No" checked for an applicable item in the Mandatory section will be rejected as non-responsive. The Non-Mandatory section is intended to assist you in completing your Proposal.

<u>MANDATORY</u> REQUIREMENTS (if "No", Proposal rejected as non-responsive):	Yes	No
Technical, Cost, and SDBSB Submissions included and separately sealed		
Non-Collusion Affidavit properly complete and notarized		
Signature Page properly executed with original signatures		
<u>NON-MANDATORY</u> REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST		
Prime Contractor: (EXAMPLES BELOW)	Yes	No
■ Technical Section T-1A Introduction to Project Team		
■ Technical Section T-1B Prime Contractor Qualifications, Experience and Past Performance		

NOTES (FOR DGS USE):

EXHIBIT G

**PROPOSAL COST REVIEW
COST SUMMARY**

(To Be Completed By Office of Chief Counsel Representative)

Base Bid #	Contract	Apparent Low Cost	Available Funds:
1	.1		
	.2		
	.3		
	.4		
	.5		
	Base Bid Total:		
2	.1		
	.2		
	.3		
	.4		
	.5		
	Base Bid Total:		
3	.1		
	.2		
	.3		
	.4		
	.5		
	Base Bid Total:		
4	.1		
	.2		
	.3		
	.4		
	.5		
	Base Bid Total:		

EXHIBIT H

EVALUATION COMMITTEE SCORING MATRIX

SEE SPECIFIC RFP FOR MATRIX