




Appendix A: Overall MSCP Reach Map



Appendix B: Laguna Division Conservation Area



Appendix C: 2004 Vegetation Type Mapping



Appendix D: Project Area Photos



Figure 1: Aerial View of Laguna Dam (Aug 2006)



Figure 2: Aerial View of Area Between Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam (Apr 2007)



Figure 3: Aerial View of Area Between Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam (Apr 2007)



Figure 4: Aerial View of Area Between Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam (Apr 2007)



Figure 5: Aerial View of Area Between Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam (Apr 2007)



Figure 6: Aerial View of Imperial Dam (Dec 2002)



Figure 7: Aerial View of Imperial Dam (Aug 2006)



Figure 8: Aerial View of Imperial Dam (Apr 2007)

Appendix E: Evaluation Criteria
Request for Proposals for Conceptual Restoration Alternatives, Laguna
Division Conservation Area

1. Technical Factors to be Evaluated

Factor	Name
1	<p><u>Expertise.</u> Offeror's are to demonstrate satisfactory understanding of the statement of work and required objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project methodologies and/or management techniques are presented. • Depth of professional expertise of proposed personnel as it relates to the tasks. • Offerors are required to submit a list of key personnel to be assigned for direct work on the project, including the individuals' education, background and experience, experience with equipment for projects similar in scope to this project, certifications, licenses, and other pertinent information.
2	<p><u>Previous Experience.</u> Offeror's experience in providing services similar to the complexity and scope of the tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offeror's are to provide similar projects in scope and magnitude to the work <u>required</u> under this solicitation, which the offeror has completed during the last 3 years. • This criterion addresses whether the applicant possesses the necessary knowledge of engineering practices, previous experience with similar projects, and administrative resources to prepare the technical investigation. It shall also address prior work experience in this general line of work.
3	<p><u>Price.</u> Offeror total price to be evaluated on a best value basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget is clearly defined and linked to stated deliverables. • Offerors list cost sharers.

Factor 1 is weighted at 30% importance, with factor 2 at 40%, and factor 3 at 30%. For this project, it is the Government's intent to award a contract to the responsible offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors listed within this document.

2. Ratings: The following rating parameters will be used in this evaluation. The purpose of the ratings is to present evaluation parameters for individual evaluators.

Weight Allocation Table

Adjective Rating Parameter	Description
Outstanding (5 points)	Proposal exceeds the requirements. The offeror has stated the Government's needs in all areas and offers a unique solution or an unexpected benefit (value).
Excellent (4 points)	Proposal exceeds the requirements but may require minor clarifications. The offeror has stated the Government's needs in all areas and/or offers some modest added value.
Acceptable (3 points)	Proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the requirements but may require some minor clarifications or discussions to clarify the intent of some portion of the proposal or to supply missing information.
Marginal (2 points)	Proposal demonstrates some understanding of the requirements but requires significant clarifications or discussions.
Poor/Absent (1 point)	Proposal does not demonstrate understanding of the requirements.

Ratings are determined as follows:

Factor	Standards
1 Expertise	<p>Acceptable: Offeror demonstrates overall satisfactory performance on <u>1 projects</u> conducting technical investigations of restoration sites during the past 3 years. Offeror demonstrates that the key personnel to be used on the project have the necessary training, experience, and/or certifications to perform the full range of duties, as described in the statement of work.</p> <p>Excellent: Offeror demonstrates overall excellent performance on <u>2 projects</u> conducting technical investigations of restoration sites during the past 3 years. Offeror demonstrates that the key personnel to be used on the project have the necessary training, experience, and/or certifications to perform the full range duties, as described in the statement of work to include, <u>previous experience with similar projects.</u></p> <p>Outstanding: Offer demonstrates overall outstanding performance on <u>2 or more projects</u> in conducting technical investigations of restoration sites during the past 3 years <u>along the LCR.</u> Offeror demonstrates that the key personnel to be used on the project have the necessary training, experience, and/or certifications to perform the full range duties, as described in the statement of work to include, previous experience with similar projects <u>along the LCR,</u> certifications.</p>

<p>2 Previous Experience</p>	<p>Acceptable: Offeror demonstrates experience in similar projects in at least <u>1 grant</u> or contract during the past 3 years.</p> <p>Excellent: Offeror demonstrates experience in similar projects in at least <u>2 grants</u> or contracts during the past 3 years <u>along the LCR</u>.</p> <p>Outstanding: Offeror demonstrates experience in similar projects in at least <u>3 grants</u> or contracts during the past 3 years <u>along the LCR</u>.</p>
<p>3 Price</p>	<p>Acceptable: The project schedule, work task, deliverables and budget are clearly stated, clearly linked, and provide a logical sequence to produce the stated deliverables. The proposal represents a <u>good value</u> after evaluation in accordance with the factors listed within this document.</p> <p>Excellent: The project schedule, work task, deliverables and budget are clearly stated, clearly linked, and provide a logical sequence to produce the stated deliverables. The proposal represents a <u>better value</u> after evaluation in accordance with the factors listed within this document.</p> <p>Outstanding: The project schedule, work task, deliverables and budget are clearly stated, clearly linked, and provide a logical sequence to produce the stated deliverables. The proposal represents the <u>best value</u> after evaluation in accordance with the factors listed within this document.</p>

Special Note Regarding Previous Experience: The Government will contact the offeror's references for information and may review performance ratings on file for prior Government projects the offeror may have performed. Previous Experience information obtained from other sources than those identified by the offeror may be used. All relevant facts and circumstances gathered from information in the offeror's listed references and other sources of information available to the Government will be used to evaluate the offeror's overall past performance and quality of performance. If an offeror has not had a chance to comment on negative past performance evaluations obtained by the Evaluation Board, they will be given a chance during "exchanges" (clarifications, communications, or discussions) with offerors after receipt of proposals (FAR 15.306). If award will be made without conducting discussions, offerors would be allowed to address past performance information during "clarifications". If offerors' past performance is the determining factor preventing them from being placed within the competitive range, "communications" will be conducted with those

offerors. If discussions are required, and past performance issues remain, these issues will be addressed during discussions. An offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will be given a neutral rating.

Rating Table:

Factor	Factor Name	Offeror A	Offeror B	Offeror C	Offeror D
		Objective Rating	Objective Rating	Objective Rating	Objective Rating
1	Expertise (30%)				
2	Previous Experience (40%)				
3	Price (30%)				
Overall Rating					