

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



ALTERNATE PROJECT DELIVERY OFFICE

DESIGN-BUILD EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Revised May 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| KEY TERMS | 2 |
| Introduction and Purpose of the Procedures | 4 |
| 1.0 Security of Documents..... | 4 |
| 2.0 Attendees at Evaluation Team Meetings | 5 |
| 3.0 Evaluation Procedures | 5 |
| 4.0 Scoring | 7 |

KEY TERMS

Design-Builder means any company, firm, partnership, corporation, association, joint venture, or other entity permitted by law to practice engineering, architecture, and construction contracting in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Design-Builder shall have the capability, in all respects, to perform fully the contract requirements and has the business integrity and reliability which will assure good faith performance. The Design-Builder shall be pre-qualified by VDOT Construction Division in accordance with the Rules Governing Prequalification Privileges unless otherwise noted in the solicitation. Typically, the term “Design-Builder” refers to the Successful Offeror upon award of the contract.

Evaluation Team means the team approved by the Deputy Chief Engineer to review and evaluate the Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals. All members of the Evaluation Team shall be VDOT employees. The team members may include the PM-D and two or more qualified personnel from the key disciplines involved with the project. The Evaluation Team shall consist of three team members unless the Deputy Chief Engineer approves additional members based on the scope of the RFP. The PM-APD will serve as Team Leader and is responsible for coordinating with Administrative Services Division (ASD) to ensure conformance with procurement laws. In addition, the Evaluation Team may use non-voting Technical Advisors who can provide expertise in areas including, but not limited to: Contract Management, Engineering, Construction, or any other area that requires specialized knowledge and expertise.

Offeror (also referred to as Bidder) means any individual, partnership, corporation, or joint venture that formally submits a Statement of Qualification and/or Proposal in response to the solicitation for the work contemplated, or for any portion thereof, acting directly or through a duly authorized representative. Typically, the term “Offeror” is used prior to the award of a contract.

Project Manager - Alternate Project Delivery Office (PM-APD) means VDOT’s designee for supervising procurement of a Design-Build contract. This individual will be responsible for contract development, solicitation, and award.

Project Manager - District (PM-D) means VDOT’s designee for managing all phases of project development and administering the Design-Build contract. The PM-D is responsible for the scope, schedule and budget of the project.

Project Team means the team responsible for the development of design-build solicitations for the project from conception through award of a contract. A Project Team member may also be a technical resource who provides expertise in their professional discipline. The PM-APD will provide each pertinent Division and District Administrator with a preliminary scope and request him or her (through memo from Director of APD) to designate an appropriate individual to serve on the Project Team. The primary district representative should be the pertinent responsible Engineer in charge or the anticipated PM-D.

Proposal (also referred to as Bid) means the offer of a Bidder, submitted in response to a Request for Proposal (RFP), to perform the work and furnish the materials and labor at

the price set forth therein; valid only when properly signed and guaranteed. This documentation may include a Letter of Submittal (LOS), Technical and Price Proposals required by the RFP. The Offer's Proposal shall be considered a "Bid" in reference to Division I of VDOT Road and Bridge Specifications.

Request for Proposal (RFP) means all documents, whether attached or incorporated by reference, utilized for soliciting proposals. The RFP is the only solicitation in a single-phase selection process. The RFP is the second phase in a two-phase selection process where VDOT issues a written request to those Offerors on the Short-list to submit both technical and price proposals.

Request for Qualifications (RFQ) means all documents, whether attached or incorporated by reference, utilized for soliciting interested Offerors for consideration for Short-list. The RFQ is the first phase of a two-phase selection process for the purpose of inviting interested Offerors to submit qualifications for a project.

Scoring/ Ranking Meeting means the meeting at which the SOQs or Proposals are scored and ranked.

Sequestering Meeting means the meeting at which Evaluation Team Members collectively discuss strengths and weaknesses of each SOQ or Proposal.

Short-list used in a two-phase selection process, means the narrowing of the field of Offerors through ranking of the most highly ranked, qualified Offerors who have responded to an RFQ with the intent to advance to the next stage, soliciting an RFP. Only Short-listed firms will be invited to submit a Proposal in response to an RFP.

Single Phase Selection Process means the procurement using an RFP only.

Solicitation(s) means a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) issued to obtain qualifications for the purpose of creating a Short-list or a Request for Proposals (RFP) issued to obtain proposals for the purpose of entering into a contract.

Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) means the documents submitted by an Offeror in response to an RFQ.

Technical Advisor means an individual from VDOT or a consultant that assists the Evaluation Team with reviewing and commenting on SOQs or Proposals. There may be more than one Technical Advisor.

Two Phase Selection Process means the procurement using both an RFQ and an RFP.

VDOT or "Department" means the Virginia Department of Transportation or any duly authorized representative thereof.

Introduction and Purpose of the Procedures

This document provides an overview of the methodology and procedures for evaluation of SOQs and Proposals received by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) in response to Solicitations for design-build projects.

The purpose of the Guidelines is to ensure impartial and equitable evaluation for the purposes of Short-listing and selecting the highest ranking Offeror(s).

1.0 Security of Documents

The security of documents begins when the Department receives an Offeror's SOQ or Proposal. VDOT will date and time stamp all documents at the time they are received and will insure timely receipt and compliance with delivery requirements as described in each solicitation.

Each member of the Evaluation Team and Technical Advisors will be issued a copy of each SOQ or Proposal, which will be individually numbered so its custody can be tracked throughout the evaluation process. The PM-APD will use a tracking log to monitor custody of documents. Each Evaluation Team Member and Technical Advisor will be responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of SOQs, Proposals, work papers, and evaluation materials. Further, each Evaluation Team Member and Technical Advisor will sign the form found in Appendix A regarding the security of the evaluation and selection processes when assigned as a member of an Evaluation Team or as a Technical Advisor.

When working with the SOQs or Proposals, Evaluation Team members and Technical Advisors will keep all of the evaluation materials under their direct control, and always secure their numbered copy of SOQs or Proposals from others not associated with the Evaluation Team. At all other times, all evaluation materials will be stored in a safe and secure location.

Only the PM-APD has the authority to release or publicly disclose information pertaining to the contents of SOQs, Proposals, deliberations by the Evaluation Team or Technical Advisors, the Short-list notification to the Deputy Chief Engineer, or other information relating to any aspect of the evaluation process.

Anyone possessing copies of SOQs, Proposals or evaluation materials will:

- Direct all inquiries for release of information to the PM-APD.
- Handle any information designated as "proprietary" with particular care.

All SOQs and Proposals submitted by Offerors and all documentation developed by the Evaluation Team shall be kept confidential and stored in accordance with the above procedures. All SOQs, Proposals and all evaluation documentation will be secured at the end of each working day and/or at all other times that such material is not under the direct control of any authorized personnel. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, all members of the Evaluation Team and Technical Advisors shall return all copies of SOQs or Proposals to the PM-APD and shall not retain any work papers, or any part of the SOQs or Proposals, without first obtaining authorization from the PM-APD.

2.0 Attendees at Evaluation Team Meetings

The Evaluation Team and PM-APD will attend all meetings pertaining to the evaluation of SOQs and Proposals. Any information discussed during Evaluation Team meetings shall be kept confidential.

An Administrative Services Division (ASD) representative will attend the Scoring/Ranking Meeting. The APD Director or D-B Program Manager may attend the Sequestering and will attend the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting to provide programmatic oversight. A Civil Rights representative will be invited to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting. A Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will be invited to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting if the project has been identified as a Federal Oversight project. The PM-APD has the discretion to invite any other individuals to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting as needed.

3.0 Evaluation Procedures

3.1 Initial Responsiveness Review

Upon receipt of SOQs or Proposals, the PM-APD will arrange for initial responsiveness checks to ensure the SOQ or Proposal was completed in accordance with the submittal requirements identified in the Solicitation documents. This will include verifying compliance with applicable governmental registrations and licensing requirements as outlined in the solicitation. This review will focus on whether each SOQ or Proposal meets administrative responsiveness requirements, for example, containing all necessary pages and mandatory forms and answers all necessary parts. This review may not identify other non-responsive issues that may arise during the review of submittals by the Evaluation Team and/or Technical Advisors.

The PM-APD may request from an Offeror an appropriate clarification of any information either found in or omitted from any SOQ or Proposal discovered during this review. Any SOQ or Proposal that is determined to be non-responsive will be returned to the Offeror by the PM-APD with a written notification stating the reason(s) for non-responsiveness.

3.2 Distribution of SOQs and Proposals

The PM-APD will distribute the Evaluation Guidelines and the SOQs or Proposals to the Evaluation Team Members and provide an overview of the responsibilities of the Evaluation Team that includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Attend all required evaluation meetings.
- Read and review each SOQ or Proposal.
- Establish a consensus score for each SOQ or Proposal consistent with the criteria established in the Solicitation.
- Under no circumstances shall the Evaluation Team Members or Technical Advisors independently discuss the project with any of the Offerors.
- Keep all documents secure.

Each Evaluation Team Member and Technical Advisor will sign the form found in Appendix A certifying they have read the Design-Build Evaluation Guidelines, comprehend these procedures, and agree to abide by the procedures set forth with regard to the evaluation of SOQs and Proposals. Each Evaluation Team Member and Technical Advisor will also sign the Non-

Conflict of Interest Form found in Appendix B certifying they have no conflict of interest in serving on or advising the Evaluation Team.

If an Evaluation Team Member has questions regarding any of the evaluation criteria, the evaluation processes, or any other documents related to the procurement they are evaluating, they should seek clarification from the PM-APD.

3.3 Evaluation

Initially, the Evaluation Team members will individually review each SOQ or Proposal relative to the evaluation criteria. If an Evaluation Team member discovers any potential evaluation ambiguities, or has any questions or concerns regarding his or her individual review of any SOQ or Proposal, the Evaluation Team member shall immediately contact the PM-APD for guidance. The PM-APD will address any questions or concerns raised by the Evaluation Team and seek clarifications from the Offerors as appropriate. The PM-APD shall provide additional guidance, and will share any resulting clarifications with the entire Evaluation Team.

3.4 Sequestering Meeting

Prior to attending the Sequestering Meeting, each Evaluation Team member will individually review each SOQ or Proposal in accordance with these Evaluation Guidelines. The Evaluation Team is expected to come to the Sequestering Meeting prepared to discuss the merits of each SOQ or Proposal. Each Evaluation Team member is required to attend the Sequestering Meeting in person. This stage of the evaluation process may take up to five (5) days to complete.

At the Sequestering Meeting the findings of the Technical Advisors will be presented and discussed related to each SOQ or Proposal. The Evaluation Team will collectively discuss each SOQ or Proposal and prepare a Team Evaluation Form. Prior to the conclusion of the Sequestering Meeting, a Team Evaluation Form must be completed for each SOQ or Proposal. The Evaluation Team will not assign scores to the SOQs or Proposals at the Sequestering Meeting.

3.5 Scoring/Ranking Meeting for Evaluations

Typically, the Scoring/Ranking Meeting will be scheduled the day after the conclusion of the Sequestering Meeting unless additional time is needed due to schedule conflicts.

At the Scoring/Ranking Meeting, the Evaluation Team will score and rank each SOQ or Proposal based on the Team Evaluation Forms completed during the Sequestering Meeting in accordance with the rating descriptors provided in Section 4.0 of this guide. The Evaluation Team will not assign scores to any SOQ or Proposal relative to another SOQ or Proposal and shall consider each SOQ or Proposal on its own merits.

The use of a consensus approach will be utilized to assign scores for each SOQ or Proposal. Members of the Evaluation Team will not score the proposals individually. The Evaluation Team will arrive at a consensus as to assignment of points for each evaluation criterion. The consensus scores will be based on the evaluation criteria and must be substantiated by the written comments contained on each Team Evaluation Form. If a change is made to a Team Evaluation Form as a result of discussion during the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting, the original comment will be lined through in ink and the new information entered and initialed in ink by each member of the Evaluation Team.

Consensus scores and final tabulated results will be documented by the PM-APD. The Short-listing and/or final selection will be determined in accordance with the evaluation process established in the Solicitation. The ASD representative will verify that the process was followed appropriately and will certify that the scoring process has been conducted properly. The completed scoring and ranking information will then be submitted to the APD Director for approval by the Deputy Chief Engineer.

4.0 Scoring

The score of each SOQ or Proposal evaluation criterion is based on a rating scale of 1-10 as listed below. Scores can be recorded to the nearest half-point. Each evaluation criterion may require an Offeror to respond to multiple subcomponents, each of which will be evaluated separately and then considered as a whole, to assign an overall score.

The Evaluation Team will then determine a final consensus score for each evaluation criterion based on these ratings.

Rating Descriptors

Excellent (9-10): The Offeror has significantly exceeded the stated criteria in a way that is beneficial to the Department. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level of quality for the stated criteria, with very little or no risk that the Offeror would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. As to the stated criteria, there are essentially no Weaknesses (as defined below).

Good (6-8): The Offeror has exceeded the stated criteria. This rating indicates a generally better-than-acceptable quality for the stated criteria, with little or no risk that the Offeror would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor.

Fair (4-5): The Offeror has met the stated criteria. This rating indicates a minimally acceptable level of quality for the stated criteria, and the Offeror demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses are minor and can be readily corrected.

Poor (1-3): The Offeror has failed to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. This rating demonstrates significant Weaknesses and/or unacceptable quality. There is no reasonable likelihood of success; Weaknesses are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the SOQ or Proposal would be required to make it even potentially acceptable.

The term “Weakness” as used above, means any flaw in the SOQ or Proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A significant Weakness in the SOQ or Proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

APPENDIX A
EVALUATION GUIDELINES

CERTIFICATION OF DESIGN-BUILD EVALUATION GUIDELINES

**BEFORE SCORING SOQs or PROPOSALS,
SIGN AND RETURN TO:**

Project Manager - Alternate Project Delivery Office (PM-APD)

Project: [\[Insert Project Name\]](#)

Project Number: [\[Insert Project #\]](#)

I certify that I have read the Design-Build Evaluation Guidelines and understand the procedures set forth with regard to the evaluation of SOQs and Proposals. Furthermore, I agree that the SOQs and Proposals for this Project are to be considered confidential and shall be stored in a secure location.

I agree to explicitly follow the procedures provided in the Guidelines and will score and evaluate all SOQs and Proposals in accordance with the methodology provided.

(Date)

(Name)

(Title)

(Signature)

APPENDIX B
CONFLICT OF INTEREST

CERTIFICATION OF NON-CONFLICT OF INTEREST
(As defined in Code of VA Title II – Chapter 43 Section 2.2-4369)

**BEFORE SCORING SOQs or PROPOSALS,
SIGN AND RETURN TO:**

Project Manager - Alternate Project Delivery Office (PM-APD)

Project: [\[Insert Project Name\]](#)

Project Number: [\[Insert Project #\]](#)

I certify that I am not contemporaneously employed by any Offeror or member of Offeror’s team, involved in this procurement; and

I, my partner, or any member of my immediate family does not hold a position with an Offeror, or member of Offeror’s team such as an officer, director, trustee, partner or the like, or is employed in a capacity involving personal and substantial participation in the procurement transaction, or owns or controls an interest in more than three percent (3%); and

I, my partner, or any member of my immediate family does not have a pecuniary interest arising from the procurement transactions; and

I, my partner, or any member of my immediate family is not negotiating, or has an arrangement concerning, prospective employment with an Offeror or a member of Offeror’s team.

(Date)

(Name)

(Title)

(Signature)