INDOT
Quality Based Selection
Consultant Contract Process

QBS Regulations & Policies

- Title 40 USC, Chapter 10, Subchapter VI
  "Brooks Act"

- Title 49 USC, Subtitle A, Part 18, Subpart C, Section 18.36 –
  “Uniform Administration Requirements for Grants and
  Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments”
  “Common Rule”

- Title 23, Chapter 1, Subchapter 1, Section 112 “Letting of
  Contracts”

- 23 CFR Part 172 – “Administration of Engineering and
  Design Related Services Contracts” (Revised 06/12/02)

- FHWA Revised Guidance, Issued on 10/23/02.
QBS – Applicability

- Applies to Design Work that is Federally funded or State/Local funded as Match for Federal funds as follows:
  - Program Management
  - Construction Management
  - Feasibility Studies
  - Preliminary Engineering
  - Design
  - Engineering
  - Surveying
  - Mapping
  - Architectural Related Services

QBS – Required Outcomes

- Ensure that the highest qualified consultant is obtained through a Qualifications Based Selection process
- Ensure that the prescribed work is properly accomplished in a timely manner, and at a fair and reasonable cost
QBS – INDOT Responsibilities

- INDOT must develop Written Procedures that will be reviewed and approved by FHWA.
- INDOT shall **ENSURE** that sub-recipients comply with **ALL** Federal Requirements.
  - SAFETEA-LU Section 1904 makes INDOT responsible for Ensuring that:
    - LPA’s have adequate Project Delivery Systems for projects.
    - LPA’s have sufficient Accounting Controls to properly manage Federal Funds.
- INDOT may require LPA’s to follow the approved INDOT procedures or allow LPA’s to develop written procedures, however, INDOT must review and approve LPA procedures, monitor and ensure compliance, including rescinding funds if necessary.

QBS – Required Elements

- **Written Procedures must Include:**
  - How the project Scope of Work is developed.
  - How the Evaluation Factors are developed.
  - How costs for services are estimated.
  - Ensure that a public advertisement occurs that ensures that In-State and Out-of-State consultants are given fair opportunity to compete.
  - Ensure that proposals are evaluated and Ranked in order of priority (1,2,3).
QBS – Required Elements

- Ensure that an audit from another Cognizant Agency is accepted (Federal or State Agency), or one is conducted
- Ensure that negotiations commence with the highest qualified firm in an attempt to reach an agreed upon fair and reasonable price
- Ensure that if the Agency is unable to reach agreement, negotiations with #1 firm will be terminated and negotiations will commence with the #2 firms, etc.

QBS – Required Elements

- Ensure that the consultant’s work is monitored and evaluated when the work is completed
- Ensure that the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program provisions are applied
- Ensure that preferences are not included, such as:
  - In-State preferences (Buy-Indiana)
  - Locality preferences
  - Indiana M/WBE Programs
- Ensure that costs are not allowed as a criterion during the evaluation phase of the selection process
INDOT Vision - Principles to Follow

- FHWA requirements must be satisfied
- Follow best practices
- Maximize use of Federal Funds for INDOT and LPA's
- Empower professionals at ownership / initiator levels to make decisions
- Ensure performance through accountability standards

Methodology Followed

- Identified customers
- Identified state and federal statutory requirements - Brooks Act QBS
- Interviewed INDOT professionals from all technical areas and offices
- Reviewed AASHTO guidance and procedures of other DOT's
- Interviewed consultant representatives
- Interviewed owners
Prequalification

- Legal & financial prequalification required for all consultants and subconsultants
- Technical prequalification required for defined work categories – approximately 40.

Prequalification
Legal & Financial Requirements

- Registered with Indiana Secretary of State
- In good standing with Dept of Revenue & Dept. of Workforce Development
- Professional liability insurance
Prequalification
Legal & Financial Requirements

- Acceptable / auditable accounting system

- Overhead rate package
  - Cognizant agency approved; or
  - FAR Compliant and CPA Certified; or
  - Services less than $250,000/year...
    self-certified accounting package
  - Not required for Unit price only contracting

Prequalification
Technical Requirements

- For pre-defined categories, such as:
  - Complex or non-complex roadway design
  - Level 1 or Level 2 bridge design
  - Environmental document preparation

- Not required for less-used services
  - Will be specified on case by case basis in advertisements
Advertisement

- RFP’s scheduled in advance, 3 to 6 per year
- Owner offices identify projects and services to be advertised and provide the following information to the contracts office:
  - Approved determination of need
  - Documentation of project programming
  - Documentation of funding availability
  - Project / services scope document

Advertisement (cont.)

- Advertisements will list category prequalifications and any additional special qualifications required
- Advertisements to identify DBE or MBE/WBE goals
- Currently three-week advertisement period, in the future two-week advertisement period with advance notice
Proposals / Statements of Interest

- Statements of interest and proposals submitted electronically

- Proposals for programmatic / non-complex projects to include:
  - Project Approach
  - Key staff list
  - Any requested special qualification information

Selection Scoring

- Three to five person scoring team from initiating office independently scores all proposals
  - Using selection evaluation form
  - Each score sheet is certified with signature
Selection Scoring (cont.)

- The initiating office forwards all evaluation forms to the central office contracts administrator within 21 days
  - Including signed spreadsheet tabulation of scores by evaluators
  - In order, highest to lowest score

Selection Recommendation Analysis

- Central office Consultant Services Section initiates reviews of the high ranking firms to:
  - Verify no more than 20% of INDOT’s annual program area budgets for consulting to a firm
  - 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 made up of:
  - Contract Administration Director
  - Production Management Director
  - Economic Opportunity Director
  - Planning Director

Selection Recommendation Review (cont.)

- 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 are eliminated from consideration
Central Office Review Committee approves the remaining highest ranked firm for each contract along with 2 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.

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.

Letters of Interest, scoring documentation, and committee and commissioner actions for all submittals to be published on the internet after contracts are awarded.
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**
  - +1 Exceeds
  - 0 Satisfactory
  - -1 Needs Improvement
  - -3 Unsatisfactory

---

**Selection Evaluation Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</td>
<td>No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes &gt; 3 mos. old.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Performance.</td>
<td>Timeliness score from performance database.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.</td>
<td>Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical expertise: Unique Resources &amp; Equipment that yield a relevant added value to the deliverable.</td>
<td>Demonstrated outstanding expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expertise and resources at appropriate level.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient expertise and/or resources.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.</td>
<td>Demonstrated outstanding experience in similar type and complexity.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume'.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience in different type or lower complexity.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient experience.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.</td>
<td>High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic understanding of the Project.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of project understanding.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.</td>
<td>Within 50 mi.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 to 150 mi.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151 to 500 mi.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than 500 mi.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection Rating for RFP: No. ___, Item No. ___**

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

**Approach to Project past Performance Location Project Manager**

**Consultant Name: ___________________ Services Description: __________________**

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

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

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 manual
  - 80% complete
- Consultant procedure manual
  - 80% complete
Work Remaining

- Completion of previously-mentioned manuals and procedures
- Systems intranet interfaces and databases
- Develop and implement web-based training
- Training of contracts managers, analysts, project managers
- Definition of any independent LPA processes

Prequalification Progress

- 205 Technical review completed and approved for RFP eligibility
- 100 Financially prequalified
  - 38 Awaiting for additional information
- 172 Fully prequalified
Update numbers
Administrator, 3/20/2006
**RFP Statistics**

- **05-01**
  - No. of items - 15
  - Total contracts selected - 14
  - Different firms selected - 12
  - Different scoring evaluators - 19
- **05-02**
  - No. of items - 37
  - Total contracts selected - 106
  - Different firms selected - 58
  - Different scoring evaluators - 48

**INDOT Consultant Contract Process**

*Please pass in any questions?*

[www.state.in.us/dot/business/](http://www.state.in.us/dot/business/)