

Award Justification Statement
Solicitation # AS16003
Contract Name: Wildlife Exposition

Conclusion

Overall, the evaluation committee determined that the proposal submitted by Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) provides the best value to the State.

Evaluation Process

Proposals were submitted by Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) and another organization, referred to herein as "Offeror B." Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Part 7 of the Utah Procurement Code by an Evaluation Committee comprised of representatives from the Governor's Office, the Department of Natural Resources Administration, the Department of Technology Services, and the Division of Wildlife Resources. A representative from State Purchasing attended the evaluation committee meetings to ensure that the process outlined in the Procurement Code was followed, but was not a voting member of the evaluation committee. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued by the State to select a conservation organization to distribute wildlife expo permits. Under Utah Code 63G-6a-702(2), the RFP process was used because criteria other than cost were considered important in determining which proposal provides the best value to the State. These other factors (other than cost) were highly significant in determining which offeror's proposal provided the best value to the State. The following paragraphs describe each scoring category and explain and compare the scores assigned to each proposal by the State's evaluation committee.

1. Business Plan – Expo Operations (100 points possible)

RFP Requirements: Discuss the past performance of your organization in planning and operating large scale events, conventions, and expositions, including activities undertaken in support of the conservation permit program described in Utah Admin. Code R657-41. Describe in detail how you will organize and run the expo. Provide an estimate of the number of attendees expected per year, the number of expo permit applications expected per year, the proposed location of the expo, proposed dates of the 2017 expo, and a detailed description of the proposed venue, including whether the venue is secured or if there is a reasonable expectation that the venue can be secured. List conservation and business organizations you expect to draw to the expo.

a. SFW:

The SFW proposal shows demonstrated experience running a national convention in Utah, including marketing conservation permits. The proposal uses historical data to

support attendance numbers and attendance projections. The proposal contains documentation and discussion of potential application numbers. The venue is identified and described; the venue is reserved through 2021. The proposal contains details on how the expo will be run and organized. The proposal includes a list of organizations confirmed to participate.

b. Offeror B:

The Offeror B proposal shows demonstrated experience with a national convention and Offeror B's exposition. It also shows experience with banquets used to market conservation permits. Although the proposal anticipates attendance of 42,500 with growth in future years, and also anticipates the number of permit applications will grow due to Offeror B's large membership, the proposal lacks documentation to support these claims. The proposal provides only a general location of the expo and does not provide a detailed description of the venue. The proposal does not indicate if the venue could be secured. The proposal provides little detail on how the expo would be run and organized. The proposal includes a list of organizations that may participate.

c. Discussion:

The SFW proposal provided much more detail and documentation to support the claims in the proposal. As a result, additional points were awarded to SFW.

Of a possible 100 points in this category, SFW scored a 100 and Offeror B scored a 70. In the opinion of the State evaluation committee, SFW provides the best value to the State in this category.

2. Business Plan – Economic Considerations (50 points possible)

RFP Requirements: Discuss your past performance in advertising and marketing large scale events, conventions, and expositions, including activities undertaken in support of the conservation permit program described in Utah Admin. Code R657-41. Describe your advertising and marketing strategy for the expo and how it will result in expanded attendance and participation by conservation organizations, Offerors, and the public. Describe the projected economic benefits to the State of Utah stemming from the expo on an annual basis.

a. SFW:

The SFW proposal discusses past performance at recent Utah expos, as well as at other conventions/banquets. The proposal identifies a targeted marketing strategy that will include radio, television, magazines, direct mail, and social media. Marketing will occur

inside and outside of Utah. Significant economic benefits to the state of Utah are discussed, quantified, and supported.

b. Offeror B:

The Offeror B proposal identifies and quantifies an extensive multi-platform marketing strategy to increase national, regional, and local participation in the expo. The expo will be promoted on national television through Offeror B assets, via print media, and on social media. The proposal does not discuss past performance in marketing large-scale events. The proposal contains little detail and lacks supporting information on economic benefits to the State of Utah.

c. Discussion:

Both proposals outlined a good marketing strategy and provided adequate detail to support the marketing-related claims in the proposal. The SFW proposal discussed past performance marketing large-scale events, but the Offeror B proposal did not. The SFW proposal also discussed economic benefits to the State of Utah in more detail than the proposal from Offeror B. As a result, additional points were awarded to SFW.

Of a possible 50 points in this category, SFW scored a 47.5 and Offeror B scored a 37.5. In the opinion of the State evaluation committee, SFW provides the best value to the State in this category.

3. Business Plan – Promotion of Hunting, Fishing, and Trapping in Utah (50 points possible)

RFP Requirements: Describe how your operation of the expo will benefit Utah sportsmen and women and wildlife conservation in Utah. Describe how your expo will result in recruitment, retention, and reactivation of Utah sportsmen and women of all ages. Describe how your operation of the expo will help further UDWR's mission, including the square footage of floor space you would donate to UDWR, if any, for administration and outreach activities for items such as National Archery in the Schools Program (2 day state championship), Help Stop Poaching, Outreach, DWR Information, and general meeting space.

a. SFW:

The expo will provide many opportunities to hunters of all types, and will include numerous outfitters and guides. The proposal states that the expo will raise significant funds for conservation and provides data to support this assertion. The proposal discusses NASP, but does not focus on other recruitment, retention, and reactivation

strategies. Details on floor space provided for NASP and DWR are included in the proposal.

b. Offeror B:

The proposal clearly supports recruitment, retention, and reactivation of Utah sportsmen and women of all ages. The proposal discusses interactive exhibits that foster public engagement. The proposal discusses a social media campaign to recruit, retain, and reactivate hunters, anglers, and wildlife enthusiasts. The expo will host seminars and workshops. Floor space will be provided to DWR, but this floor space is not quantified. The proposal states that 50% of net revenue from the expo will be provided to DWR for conservation projects, but no revenue projections or documentation are included.

c. Discussion:

Both proposals performed well in the category. As a result, the same number of points was awarded to each proposal.

Of a possible 50 points in this category, SFW scored a 40 and Offeror B scored a 40. In the opinion of the State evaluation committee, both proposals provide similar value to the State in this category.

4. Permit Drawing Procedures and Data Security Plan (100 points possible)

RFP Requirements: As background information, UDWR will make available to Offeror a procedure allowing the look-up of data on applicants that will facilitate the confirmation of their eligibility to apply for expo permits. If the Offeror chooses to sell hunting licenses through their own interface at the wildlife exposition, UDWR will provide a procedure allowing for the insert of a license record for an individual with whom the Offeror is conducting business. Describe in detail what coordination you will require from UDWR on these matters. Describe in detail how you will organize and conduct the permit draw, including expo permit application process, license requirement verification, draw process, in-person validation of expo permit applications, identification of successful applicants, creation of an alternate list, data retention, drawing venue, etc. Include a detailed description of data security and how you will protect applicant data from unauthorized release or data breach, and how you will respond to a breach. Include what data you will collect in order to perform the duties described in this RFP, what data you will retain following each expo permit drawing, and how you plan to use that data to market future wildlife expositions and wildlife conservation in Utah. Provide an explanation on how you will ensure that personally identifying data will not be sold or shared with other entities unless applicants

specifically provide their written authorization to do so. Provide assurance that confidential data, such as social security numbers and driver's license numbers, that may be used to interact with UDWR systems, will not be stored or retained on Offeror systems. Describe your understanding of applicant license requirements and explain how you will ensure compliance with the big game permit requirements identified in Utah Code 23-19-22. Demonstrate evidence of current PCI compliance for your organization and verify that all operations at the expo will comply with PCI standards.

a. SFW:

The SFW response clearly and with extensive detail addresses the components of this category. The detail provided in the proposal indicates the drawing, data security, data management, and interface with DWR databases can be successfully completed with minimal involvement from DWR. The proposal contains significant detail on how PCI compliance will be ensured at the expo.

b. Offeror B:

The Offeror B response addresses the main components of this category, but omits the details necessary to effectively review the proposal. The proposal states Offeror B will comply with the standards in the RFP, but gives few details on how they will do so. Offeror B states that they will hire a contractor in the future, but the proposal gives no details on how they will run a complex drawing, maintain data security, manage data, or interface with DWR databases. The proposal contains minimal details on PCI compliance at the expo.

c. Discussion:

The SFW proposal provided much more detail and documentation to support the claims in the proposal and give the State confidence that the drawing can be conducted well and data can be secured. As a result, additional points were awarded to SFW.

Of a possible 100 points in this category, SFW scored a 100 and Offeror B scored a 60. In the opinion of the State evaluation committee, SFW provides the best value to the State in this category.

5. Application Fee Revenue (150 points possible)

RFP Requirements: Revenue from permit application fees for expo permits is set at \$5.00 per application. The contractor retains the entire \$5.00, however must commit/spend \$1.50 from each application fee collected on division-approved projects by September 1, two years following collection. Describe any proposed use of the remaining \$3.50 to benefit protected wildlife in Utah. Estimate the total revenue from

application fees that will be used to benefit protected wildlife in Utah, including any money provided directly to the State of Utah. Provide support and verification of your assertions and expectations, such as historical documentation of past performance, any market analysis or projections your organization may have performed, or other materials that may lend credibility to your estimates.

a. SFW:

The \$3.50 will be retained by the conservation organizations to benefit protected wildlife through policies, programs, projects, and personnel that support conservation initiatives in Utah. The proposal states that a goal is to leverage the funding. The proposal contains documentation to support revenue numbers. Supporting materials show increases in private dollars for wildlife projects while the current expo partners have run the expo in Utah.

b. Offeror B:

Offeror B will commit 100% of the \$5 application fee to fund Utah conservation projects. Based on historic data from another organization's Expo, Offeror B estimates this will result in \$1 million or more in annual revenue for projects. The proposal also states that 50% of net revenue from the Expo will be used for conservation projects in Utah. There is no documentation to support Offeror B revenue numbers and no market analysis or other supporting materials.

c. Discussion:

Both organizations would provide a significant benefit to Utah wildlife and sportsmen through expo permit revenue. The Offeror B proposal will provide more funding directly to the state in comparison to the SFW proposal. As a result, additional points were awarded to Offeror B.

Of a possible 150 points in this category, SFW scored a 97.5 and Offeror B scored a 142.5. In the opinion of the State evaluation committee, Offeror B provides the best value to the State in this category.

6. Historical Contributions/Past Performance (50 points possible)

RFP Requirements: Describe in detail the historical contribution of your organization to wildlife in Utah, focusing on your conservation organization's previous performance in wildlife conservation activities, as well as promotion and development of hunting, fishing, and trapping in Utah.

a. SFW:

SFW and partners have contributed to numerous conservation projects ranging from youth involvement, to fishing, to upland game, to big game. They have also been involved with important wildlife legislation and have brought a successful national wildlife expo to Utah. The proposal contains letters of support for past contributions. The proposal demonstrates a commitment to the conservation of protected wildlife in Utah through documented conservation activities that touch on numerous aspects of wildlife conservation.

b. Offeror B:

Offeror B and partners have contributed to numerous projects in Utah. In particular, Offeror B excels in land conservation efforts. Offeror B is regularly involved in the conservation of protected wildlife in Utah.

c. Discussion:

Both groups are valued conservation partners and have provided significant efforts and resources to benefit conservation in Utah. The SFW proposal demonstrates a wider breadth of activities in Utah in comparison to the Offeror B proposal. As a result, additional points were awarded to SFW.

Of a possible 50 points in this category, SFW scored a 50 and Offeror B scored a 37.5. In the opinion of the State evaluation committee, SFW provides the best value to the State in this category.

7. Cost.

Per the RFP document, this is a no cost Request for Proposal, therefore cost was not evaluated as part of this RFP.

8. Conclusion

Out of 500 total points, SFW scored 435 and Offeror B scored 387.5. Based on the justifications outlined above, it is the opinion of the Evaluation Committee that the proposal submitted by Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW) provides the best value to the State.