

DOTD / ACEC
 Group 1, Procurement
 Proposed Changes to Evaluation Criteria
 February 4, 2016

1. Firm Size designations

Based on specific staffing information, firms will be assigned firm size designations as follows:

Firm Size Designation	Number of Transportation Personnel
Micro	≤ 13
Small	10 to 22
Medium	20 to 33
Large	30 to 55
Mega	≥ 50

These ranges giving some flexibility to the firm's designation. Firms with the number of transportation personnel falling within the overlap may choose one of the two firm size designations. The firm size designation will be assigned annually and used for all selections within the designated year. This firm size designation is used as determining criteria in both compatibility and work load rating.

2. Project Magnitude Designation

The magnitude of a project is a combination of the project complexity, contract time, contract amount, and route classification. The DOTD Project Manager shall determine the appropriate value for the criteria as follows:

Criteria Value		Value		
		1	2	3
Criteria	Complexity	Simple	Medium	Complex
	Contract Time	Typical	Compressed	Critical
	Contract Amount	≤ \$250,000	\$250,000 to \$2,500,000	≥ \$2,500,000
	Route Classification	Non-NHS Local	Non-NHS State	NHS

Project Magnitude Designation	Combined Criteria Values
Micro	4 to 5
Small	5 to 7
Medium	7 or 9
Large	9 to 11
Mega	11 to 12

For example, a project of medium complexity with a typical contract time and a contract amount of \$3.0 million on a non-NHS State route would have a combined criteria value of 8 (2+1+3+3), and would be assigned a "Medium" project magnitude designation.

For a project with a Combined Criteria Value that falls between two Project Magnitude Designations, the decision of which to use will be made by the DOTD Project Manager.

The Project Magnitude Designation will be used as a determining criterion in the Compatibility Rating Category.

3. Compatibility

The intent of this category is to optimize the firm's size to the size of the project. The firm's size shall be as established by the Firm Size Designation. When a team is considered, each firm will receive the same Compatibility Rating as the primary firm. The size of the project shall be as established by the Project Magnitude Designation. The Compatibility Rating will be based on the compatibility of the two designations as follows:

Compatibility Rating						
		Project Magnitude Designation				
		Micro	Small	Medium	Large	Mega
Firm Size Designation	Micro	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Small	4.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	1.0

	Medium	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	1.0
	Large	1.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.0
	Mega	1.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	5.0

4. Workload

The intent of this category is to balance the amount of DOTD work allotted to a consultant with the capacity of the consultant to perform the work. When a team is considered, each firm whose work percentage in the project meets or exceeds 10% will receive a Workload Rating. Firms with less than 10% work in the project will receive the same Workload Rating as the primary firm.

The Workload Rating will be based on the compatibility of the established Firm Size Designation with the amount of remaining DOTD work encumbered to the consultant as follows:

		Workload Rating		
		5.0	5.0 → 1.0	1.0
		Remaining DOTD Work		
Firm Size Designation	Micro	≤ \$20,000	\$20,000 → \$1,625,000	≥ \$1,625,000
	Small	≤ \$110,000	\$110,000 → \$2,750,000	≥ \$2,750,000
	Medium	≤ \$210,000	\$210,000 → \$4,125,000	≥ \$4,125,000
	Large	≤ \$320,000	\$320,000 → \$6,875,000	≥ \$6,875,000
	Mega	≤ \$530,000	\$530,000 → \$12,500,000	≥ \$12,500,000

Use linear interpolation for where value ranges are given.

5. Category Weighting Sensitivity Analysis

The goal of the scoring process is to balance the distribution of work opportunity while maintaining a practical level of experience. Scoring is based on 6 categories:

The "experience" categories are currently weighted as follows:

1. Firm Experience	3
2. Staff Experience	4
3. Past Performance	6
Total:	13

The "non-experience" categories are currently weighted as follows:

1. Compatibility	3
2. Work Load	5
3. Location	4
Total:	12

"Experience" accounts for over 50% of each final score; however, since there is usually very little variance in "Experience" scores, typically the "non-experience" scores dominate the final ranking. The current practice of neutralizing "non-experience" factors is an attempt to help alleviate this issue. Based on a small sample, indications are that by using a 60/40 weighting ratio of "experience" to "non-experience" respectively, results in 50% of the rankings governed by "experience". Therefore, the recommendation is to adjust the weighting factors to achieve this 60/40 ratio.

The "experience" categories are proposed to be weighted as follows:

1. Firm Experience	3
2. Staff Experience	4
3. Past Performance	5
Total:	12

The "non-experience" categories are proposed to be weighted as follows:

1. Compatibility	2
2. Work Load	4
3. Location	2
Total:	8

6. Past Performance on DOTD Projects

This rating is based on the results of input from the DOTD Project Managers at various project milestones. They evaluate the firms that they have managed within the last five years. The existing policy is:

"Firms who have not received a rating for a work category will be assigned the average rating of the firms submitting; with ratings capped at the statewide average rating for that category as of the date the advertisement was posted."

The recommendation is to change the above to the following:

"Firms that do not have a current rating for a particular past performance work category will be assigned a rating the lower of the following: the average rating of the firms submitting; the statewide average rating for that category as of the date the advertisement was posted; the Satisfactory rating (3)."