

**Attachment to Addendum 7-Revised Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015355
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Organizational (10%)			
1.1	Evaluate the organization's narrative description of the organization's history and structure.	10%		
Subtotal		10%		
2	Experience and Access (45%)			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's providing Evidence-Based or promising practice curriculums and implementing plans for the populations to be served.	15%		
2.2	Evaluate how the Applicant will ensures treatment Services are accessible to individuals in isolated communities.	10%		
2.3	Evaluate how the Applicant will ensures treatment Services are accessible to vulnerable people in the community.	10%		
2.4	Evaluate how the Applicant will ensures treatment Services are accessible to individuals in under-resourced communities.	10%		
Subtotal		45%		
3	Community Needs (45%)			
3.1	Evaluate how the Applicant will provide treatment Services accessible to people with limited transportation options.	15%		
3.2	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed plan to address barriers when admitting people who will transition from a Secured Environment.	10%		
3.3	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed plan to address language differences for people seeking Substance Use Treatment.	10%		
3.4	Evaluate the Applicant's strategies and tools utilized with collaborative partners to benefit and enhance the Applicant's treatment Services.	10%		
Subtotal		45%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Attachment to Addendum 7-Revised Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015355		
Evaluation Scoring Guide		
Score	Level	Description
Unacceptable	1	Response does not address requirement. Response is completely unacceptable.
Unacceptable	2	Response mentions requirement, but is not responsive to the elements of the requirement.
Unacceptable	3	Response addresses requirement, but response described does not allow the agency to fulfill mission.
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	4	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (would require both the agency and Respondent to make significant changes not currently anticipated).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	5	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require both the agency and Respondent to make minor changes not currently anticipated).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	6	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require changes to be made by Respondent only).
Acceptable	7	Response clearly satisfies requirement but has some minor weaknesses.
Acceptable	8	Response clearly satisfies requirement.
Acceptable	9	Response satisfies requirements and has some benefits above requirement.
Exceptional	10	Response far exceeds all aspects of requirement.

For the purposes of this exhibit, "the agency" means the contracting state agency as specified in the solicitation.

**Attachment to Addendum 7-Revised Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015355**

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Organizational	10%
2	Experience and Access	45%
3	Community Needs	45%
GRAND TOTAL		100%