

Exhibit O, Evaluation Tool (ESEC) RFA No. HHS0015545 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Emergency Management Preparedness (30%)			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's demonstrated knowledge and partnerships with local and statewide emergency management organizations.	10%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's demonstrated training strategies and implementation for continuing education and escalation of services.	10%		
1.3	Evaluate the Applicant's experience with creating communications regarding disaster related information and maintaining resources related to a disaster.	10%		
Subtotal		30%		
2	Emergency Management Escalation (20%)			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's demonstrated volunteer recruitment strategies to meet the minimum staffing requirements.	10%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's demonstrated infrastructure and provisions to support escalation and continuity of services.	10%		
Subtotal		20%		
3	Project Workplan for State of Texas Emergency Assistance Registry (STEAR) (30%)			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's understanding of the STEAR requirements and proposed strategy to implement and conduct STEAR applications.	30%		
Subtotal		30%		
4	Cost (20%)			
4.1	Evaluate the reasonableness of Total Initial Cost.	10%		
4.2	Evaluate the Applicant's allowable proposed costs for reasonableness outlined in the RFA.	10%		
Subtotal		20%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Exhibit O, Evaluation Tool (ESEC) RFA No. HHS0015545		
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.

Exhibit O, Evaluation Tool (ESEC) RFA No. HHS0015545		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Emergency Management Preparedness	30%
2	Emergency Management Escalation	20%
3	Project Workplan for State of Texas for Emergency Assistance Registry (STEAR)	30%
4	Cost	20%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%