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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of Team to do Work</td>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td>Services Description:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td>Approach to Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td>Capacity of Team to do Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td>Demonstrated Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Approach to Project

Consultant Name:                                                 Services Description:
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Name:</th>
<th>Services Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria to be Rated by Scorers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Scoring Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of Team to do Work</td>
<td>Adequate positive and negative aspects of the project on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate capacity for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient capacity for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical expertise: Unique Resources to yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrated high level of expertise and resources identified for req’d services for value added benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expertise and resources at appropriate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient expertise and/or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrated high level of experience in similar type and complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience in different type or lower complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to Project</td>
<td>Project Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of understanding of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic understanding of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of project understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location of assigned staff office relative to project size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 to 150 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151 to 500 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than 500 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location of service contracts relative to project size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Title:
Date:
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## Evaluation from database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disputes</td>
<td>Outstanding Agreement Disputes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes &gt; 3 mos. old.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Performance</td>
<td>Performance evaluation score averages from historical performance data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality score for similar work from performance database.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule score from performance database.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness score from performance database.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Budget score from performance database.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Constructability score from performance database.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

## 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 year’s 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 scorer's 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>DEF</th>
<th>Prior to DEF</th>
<th>Application, if Different</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB Americas, Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR 14 Allen Co ATL Proj. Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URS Corporation</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 42 Rd Reconstruction in Vigo County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrossRoad Engineers PC</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SR 17 PB Americas ATL Proj. Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Engineering Inc</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson-Fisher Associates PC</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 1460-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Fairman and Seufert Inc</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 11 90-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corradino LLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar Garvey &amp; Associates LLC</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonar Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Baker Jr Inc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQAW Corporation</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons Transportation Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Troyer Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Herceg &amp; Associates Inc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USI Consultants Inc</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLZ Indiana LLC</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Group Engineering Inc</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Smith Associates Inc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox Professional Services LLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR 10 SR 1564-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 07-02 DEF Results

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