



INDOT Quality Based Selection Consultant Contract Process

Driving Indiana's Economic Growth

INDOT

Quality Based Selection Process

Vs 07 including

Design Efficiency Factor



Selection Scoring

- Three to five person scoring team from initiating office *independently* scores all proposals
 - *Using advertised selection evaluation form*
 - *Each score sheet is certified with signature*
 - *Scoring for past performance, disputes and location to be input directly from database*



Selection Evaluation Form

Selection Rating for RFP No. _____ Item No. ____

Consultant Name: _____		Services Description: _____	
Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers			
Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Weight
Capacity to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time. Ability of score to adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT. Ability to meet the schedule. Ability to meet the schedule. Ability to meet the schedule.	1 2 3	20
Team's Demonstrated Proficiency	Technical expertise. Unique Resources that add a relevant added value to the deliverables. Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for past services for value added benefits. Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for past services for value added benefits. Experience and resources at appropriate level. Relevant experience and/or contract.	1 2 3 4 5	15
Project Manager	Predicted ability to manage the project, based on experience in this complexity, type, size, documentation skills. Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity. Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity. Experience in similar type and complexity, demonstrated in contract. Experience in different type or lowest complexity. Relevant experience.	1 2 3 4 5	10
Approach to Project	Project Understanding and Innovations that give INDOT cost and/or time savings. High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed. High level of understanding of the project. Basic understanding of the project. Lack of project understanding.	1 2 3 4 5	15
Location (This score will be submitted for the future.)	Location of assigned staff office relative to project. Within 50 mi. 25 to 100 mi. 15 to 500 mi. Greater than 500 mi. For 100% state funded agreements, non-bidder firms.	1 2 3 4 5	5
		Weighted Sub-Total: _____	

The scores assigned above represent my best judgment of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed _____ Title _____ Date _____

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources			
Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Weight
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes. No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old. Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0 1 2	20
Past Performance	Performance evaluation score average from historical performance data. Quality score for similar work from performance database. Schedule score from performance database. Resources score from performance database. Budget score from performance database. Contractability score from performance database.	0 1 2 3 4 5	12
		Weighted Sub-Total: _____	

For categories that are not relevant to the particular firm being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be documented in the RFP.
* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total: _____



Selection / Performance

Evaluation Scoring Philosophy

- Selection Scoring
 - +2 Outstanding Qualifications
 - +1 Highly Qualified
 - 0 Qualified
 - 1 Slightly Below Desired Qualification
 - 3 Insufficient Qualification
- Performance Ratings
 - +2 Exceeds
 - 0 Satisfactory
 - 1 Needs Improvement
 - 3 Unsatisfactory



Evaluation by Scorers

Consultant Name:		Services Description:			
Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT	1		20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule	0			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule	-1			
	Technical expertise: Unique Resources that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	2		15	0
	Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit	1			
Project Manager	Expertise and resources at appropriate level	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources	-3			
	Predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity	2		10	0
	Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity	1			
Approach to Project	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity	-1			
	Insufficient experience	-3			
	Project Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed	2		15	0
	High level of understanding of the project	1			
	Basic understanding of the project	0			
	Lack of project understanding	-3			
	Location of assigned staff office relative to project.				
Location (This score will be automated in the future.)	Within 50 mi	1		5	0
	51 to 150 mi	0			
	151 to 500 mi	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indian firms	-3			
				Weighted Sub-Total	0

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed: _____
 Title: _____
 Date: _____



Evaluation from database

Evaluation Ratings to be Assigned from Office of Contracts Data Sources						
Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score	
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.					
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0	
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3				
Past Performance	Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.					
	Quality score for similar work from performance database.			12	0	
	Schedule score from performance database.			7	0	
	Responsiveness score from performance database.			7	0	
	*Budget score from performance database.			N/A	7	
	*Constructability score from performance database.			N/A	7	
				Weighted Sub-Total	0	

For categories that are not relevant to the particular item being evaluated leave the category score as N/A. This is to be as documented in the RFP.

* Only applicable for transportation project development contracts. Data not available yet.

Weighted Total



Future Score Sheet Modifications

- The distance factor shall be moved to the database section when BITTS completes the automation process
- Occasional special modifications on a very limited basis and with FHWA approval



Selection Scoring (cont.)

- The initiating office forwards all evaluation forms to the central office contracts administrator within 14 days
 - *Including signed spreadsheet tabulation of scores by evaluators*
 - *Ranked, highest to lowest based on **lowest ordinal totals***



Selection Recommendation Analysis

- Central office Consultant Services Section initiates reviews of the high ranking firms to:
 - *Verify annual services no more than 200% of consultant's previous year's total wages & Salaries*
 - *\$150,000 minimum limit*
 - *Coordinate with Economic Opportunity Division to verify compliance with DBE or MBE/WBE goals or good faith efforts for meeting goals*
- The Consultant Services Section prepares documentation of the above for the Central Office review Committee



Selection Recommendation

Review

- INDOT's Central Office Review Committee reviews the scoring information provided for each item to:
 - *Verify scoring procedure compliance*
 - *Review results of DBE or MBE/WBE compliance checks*
 - *Review results of capacity computations*
- Firms not meeting set criteria (including late/non-conforming submittals, negative total evaluation score, etc.) are eliminated from consideration
- Applies DEF adjustments and re-ranks by ordinals



Selection Recommendation

Approval

- Central Office Review Committee approves the remaining highest ranked firms by ordinals for each contract along with two alternates for each item
- Approval is indicated on the scoring tabulation forms submitted by the initiating offices by signature of each person on the review committee



Selection Recommendation

Approval

- Results of the review committee actions are tabulated and certified as accurate by the Contracts Manager
- Selection recommendations are approved by the Commissioner by signature to the same tabulation and posted to the Consultant Services RFP Website and a notice is sent to RFP listserv members
- Letters of Interest, scoring documentation, and committee and Commissioner actions for all submittals to be published on the internet after contracts are awarded



Design Efficiency Factor

- Purpose – To make better use of the consulting industry and thereby accelerate the delivery of Major Moves.
- DEF is applicable to project development contracts only, including:
 - Project specific design contracts;
 - On-call road project development contracts; &
 - On-call bridge development contracts.



Why DEF?

- Brooks Act was developed in a time when DOTs self-performed the vast majority of their own design work
- Brooks Act is therefore a project by project regulation without allowance for a DOT's program capacity issues



Why DEF Now?

- Items necessary before DEF could be considered:
 - Demonstrated Need
 - One years data under new Consultant Selection Process for validation
 - Priority Listing in LOI
 - Industry acceptance to implement DEF
 - FHWA conditional approval



DEF Required Outcomes

- Complete Transparency
- Easily Communicate
- Multiple Selections Possible
- No Selections of Non-Performing Firms
- Factors in Firm's Workload
- Data Driven



DEF Development Process

- Meet with Industry Stakeholders;
- Conduct Multiple Stakeholder Meetings;
- Defined Goals;
- Developed Set of Potential Solutions;
- Assigned Work Groups for Best Solutions;
- Validated All Leading Solutions;
- Conducted Stakeholder Review;
- Consulting Industry written approval of DEF modification;
- Submitted the Best Solutions for FHWA Approval;
- Received Conditional Approval from FHWA; &
- Initiated DEF on RFP 07-01



DEF Process

- RFP process conducted as normal
- Owners score and Tabulate as normal
- Consultant Selection Review Committee has added responsibility of applying DEF adjustments to tabulations
- After adjustments, consulting teams re-ranked by ordinals
- Selection
- Approval by INDOT Commissioner



How DEF Works

- A five (5) point deduction is made on every scorers total score for a lead consulting firm's award of a applicable selection during the previous twelve (12) month period
- The total scores are recalculated and the firms re-ranked by ordinals
- For lead consulting firms with multiple selections, the priority list submitted with the LOI is examined and the highest ranked item is selected
- The DEF is re-applied to that specific firm's other submittals.



07-02 Tabulation w/DEF

#	Consultant Name	DEF	Katherine Smutzer			Kenny Franklin			Gary Pence			Raunf Shi			Before DEF Ordinal Total	After DEF Ordinal Total	Before DEF Ranking	After DEF Ranking
			Scores	Scores After DEF	Rank	Scores	Scores After DEF	Rank	Scores	Scores After DEF	Rank	Scores	Scores After DEF	Rank				
17		0	88.3	88.3194444	7	6	88.3	88.3194444	4	2	98.3	98.3194444	5	1	13.3	13.3194444	21	18
20		-10	74.1	64.0756315	15	17	94.1	84.0756315	2	3	104.1	94.0756315	3	4	49.1	39.0756315	4	4
7		-10	113.1	103.140021	1	3	93.1	83.140021	3	4	63.1	53.140021	20	21	103.1	93.140021	1	1
4		-5	113.1	108.061598	2	1	88.1	83.061598	5	5	88.1	83.061598	13	14	28.1	23.061598	12	11
14		-5	109.9	104.865241	3	2	24.9	19.865241	16	17	94.9	89.865241	8	7	39.9	34.865241	7	6
3		-5	72.9	67.9224365	17	15	82.9	77.9224365	6	8	92.9	87.9224365	9	9	52.9	47.9224365	3	3
6		0	79.2	79.2238095	11	9	19.2	19.2238095	19	18	89.2	89.2238095	11	8	54.2	54.2238095	2	2
10		-5	88.0	83.020727	8	8	28.0	23.020727	13	13	98.0	93.020727	6	6	28.0	23.020727	13	12
2		0	97.3	97.3377365	4	4	82.3	82.3377365	7	6	72.3	72.3377365	18	17	22.3	22.3377365	16	14
15		0	75.0	75	12	10	100.0	100	1	1	85.0	85	15	10	0.0	0	23	22
18		-10	81.3	71.3035044	9	13	81.3	71.3035044	8	9	106.3	96.3035044	2	3	21.3	11.3035044	17	19
16		0	75.0	75	12	10	80.0	80	9	7	85.0	85	15	10	15.0	15	19	17
19		0	67.7	67.6685648	18	16	22.7	22.6685648	17	14	97.7	97.6685648	7	2	22.7	22.6685648	15	13
13		0	89.8	89.7854828	6	4	29.8	29.7854828	11	11	44.8	44.7854828	22	22	29.8	29.7854828	10	8
21		-5	73.8	68.796874	16	14	63.8	58.796874	10	10	88.8	83.796874	12	13	28.8	23.796874	11	9
8		-5	67.4	62.3784915	19	19	27.4	22.3784915	14	15	87.4	82.3784915	14	15	42.4	37.3784915	6	5
11		-10	95.8	85.8071181	5	7	25.8	15.8071181	15	20	90.8	80.8071181	10	16	30.8	20.8071181	9	15
23		0	75.0	75	12	10	20.0	20	18	16	85.0	85	15	10	0.0	0	23	22
24		0	53.6	53.6297216	23	21	28.6	28.6297216	12	12	68.6	68.6297216	19	18	23.6	23.6297216	14	10



07-02 DEF Results

RFP	ITEM	DEF Chg?	No. 1 Ranked Firm Prior to DEF Application, if Different	Selection	Item Description
07-01	6	N		Firm A	SR 14 Allen Co ATL Proj. Development
07-01	7	Y	Firm B Firm A	Firm C	SR 15, Kosciusko Co. ATL Project
07-01	8	N		Firm B	I-65/SR 58, Interchange Modification
07-01	16	Y	Firm D	Firm E	SR 42 Rd Reconstruction in Vigo County
07-01	17	Y	Firm F	Firm G	SR 240 Pavement Replacement
07-01	21	N		Firm H	Road Project Development Services, Greenfield District



07-02 DEF Validation Notes

- Three of six selected firms had not previously been selected by the new selection process implemented in 8/05.
- No firm was selected on these items that had been previously selected more than one time by the new process.
- No firm was selected for more than one of these items on the same RFP.
- The number of firms submitting per item has been reduced by approximately 6 to an average of 23.



Performance Evaluation

- Completed for all contracts
- Evaluation for each major deliverable including construction specification packages
- Cumulative evaluation maintained for each contract
- Eleven evaluation opportunities
- Project evaluation scores amended by any additional information arising during construction
- Closeout evaluation meetings held at the end of each agreement



Summary of Modifications

- Ordinal Ranking of Scores
- DEF
- Increased weight to project manager & approach of 5 weight points
- Visual modification to score sheet
- Development of improved performance evaluation (still in draft)



Completion To Date

- Prequalification manual
 - *Complete, but will be revised*
- Audit procedure
 - *Complete*
- Consultant selection procedure
 - *Complete, details to be documented in procedure manual*
- Performance evaluation system
 - *80% complete*
- Consultant procedure manual
 - *80% complete*



Work Remaining

- Completion of previously-mentioned manuals and procedures
- Online prequalification system
- Online LoI submittal system
- Automated selection scoring system
- Develop and implement web-based training



Prequalification Progress

- 317 Applicants to date
- 283 Fully pre-qualified firms
- 47 Applicants pending
 - 44 in audit review
 - 8 in technical review



INDOT

Consultant Contract Process

Please pass in any questions?

www.state.in.us/dot/business/



LPA Consultant Selection Process

- Two processes available:
 - INDOT's Consultant Selection Process
 - Alternate Process for LPA's only
 - Use of the Alternate Process requires INDOT Contracts Administration Division to ensure compliance
 - As of 1 March 2007 the Alternate Process is not approved by FHWA and LPA's must use the INDOT process until approval is obtained from FHWA



LPA - POC

- Local Public Agency Planning Oversight Committee
- Purpose – Defines the process for submitting LPA projects & approval
- Status – In final draft form



LPA Master Project Co-Ordination Contract

- Purpose- Add definition to project plan, such as: responsibility of parties; cost; funding source breakdown; schedule; reduce the number of contracts related to a project; and improve project flow
- Status – In final draft



Economic Opportunity Division

- Martha Kenley - Director

