

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The general criteria to be used by DOTD (when applicable) in evaluating responses for the selection of a Consultant to perform these services are:

1. Consultant's firm experience on similar projects, weighting factor of 3;
2. Consultant's personnel experience on similar projects, weighting factor of 4;
3. Consultant's firm size as related to the estimated project cost, weighting factor of 3;
4. Consultant's past performance on similar DOTD projects, weighting factor of 6; **
5. Consultant's current work load with DOTD, weighting factor of 5;
6. Location where the work will be performed, weighting factor of 4;*
7. Consultant's Tier II Presentation

** The Firm's Composite performance rating will be used for this project.

* All respondents will receive a 4 in this category.

The complexity level for this project is **moderate**.

Consultants will be evaluated as indicated in Items 1- 7. The evaluation will be by means of a point-based rating system. Each of the above criteria will receive a rating on a scale of 0-4. The rating will then be multiplied by the corresponding weighting factor. The firm's rating in each category will then be added to arrive at the Consultant's final rating.

If Sub-Consultants are used, each member of the Consultant/Team will be evaluated on their part of the contract, proportional to the amount of their work. The individual team member ratings will then be added to arrive at the Consultant/Team rating.

DOTD's Consultant Evaluation Committee will be responsible for performing the above described evaluation, and will present a short list of the three (if three are qualified) highest rated Consultants to the Secretary of the DOTD. The Secretary will make the final selection.

TIER II Evaluation: Consultants/Teams on the TIER I short-list of the **five** (if **five** are qualified) highest rated Consultant/Teams will be asked to attend an Interview/Presentation (Item 7) in the DOTD Headquarters 3rd floor classroom (date and time to be announced). During the presentations each Consultant/Team will be given 40 minutes for the Presentation/Interviews and an additional 20 minutes to answer any questions. The schedule of Presentation/Interviews will be announced at the time of the announcement of the alphabetical TIER I short-list.

The Consultant's Interviews/Presentations (Item 7) will be used to develop the ranked TIER II short-list. The TIER I ranking may be a part of the ranking for the TIER II short-list. A ranked TIER II short-list of the three (if three are qualified) highest rated Consultant/Teams will be submitted to the Secretary of the DOTD. The Secretary will make the final selection. DOTD's Consultant Evaluation Committee will be responsible

for performing the above described evaluation, and preparation of the TIER I and TIER II short-lists.

Items to be considered during the interview are:

- Experience/Training/Background of personnel for their positions of responsibility.
- Flexibility and resources available for accelerated activities.
- Explain CPM timeline.
- Control of documentation.
- A discussion of the overall philosophical approach to managing the required work.

The Tier II evaluation will be based on an adjectival rating process. Each member of the evaluation committee will individually rate each evaluation criterion and assign intensity ratings as defined in the Table below. Plus (+) and Minus (-) signs can also be used to further separate firms within a rating class.

<u>Intensity/Rating</u>	<u>Adjunctive/Description</u>
E	Excellent – Exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. Significant strengths with no weaknesses.
G	Good – Exceeds requirements and demonstrates understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. Strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
A	Acceptable – Proposal meets the requirements and demonstrates an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project. There are measurable strengths or weaknesses.
W	Weak – Weaknesses outbalance the strengths.
U	Unacceptable – Does not meet the requirements or demonstrate an understanding of the goals and objectives of the project.

Once each board member completes evaluations for all factors, the process moves to group consensus. In consensus, members of the evaluation committee seek a mutually agreeable outcome that all members can support. All members will meet as a group, under the direction of the chairperson to arrive at a consensus evaluation for each presentation.