

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



ALTERNATE PROJECT DELIVERY OFFICE

DESIGN-BUILD EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Revised October 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY TERMS2

Introduction and Purpose of the Procedures5

1.0 Security of Documents.....5

2.0 Attendees at Evaluation Team Meetings6

3.0 Evaluation Guidelines Certification.....6

4.0 Evaluation Procedures6

5.0 Scoring9

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 Scheduling and Contract 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.

Distribution Meeting means the meeting at which the SOQs or Proposals are provided to members of the Evaluation Team.

Engineer means the Department’s Chief Engineer, who acts directly or through his duly authorized representative. The representative acts within the scope of the particular duties assigned to him or the authority given to him.

Evaluation Team means the team appointed by the Deputy Chief Engineer to review and evaluate the Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals. The Evaluation Team members will be limited to VDOT staff, unless otherwise approved by the Chief Engineer. 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 Deputy Chief Engineer approves additional members based on the scope of the RFP. At least one member shall be from the Central Office key discipline; however, no more than two members of the Evaluation Team shall be from the same key discipline. The PM-APD will serve as Team Leader and is responsible for coordinating with Administrative Services Division and/or Scheduling and Contract Division 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 Technical and Price 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 - An individual from a professional discipline that assists the Evaluation Team with reviewing and commenting on SOQs and Technical Proposals. A Technical

Advisor does not participate in the actual evaluation. 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 Advisor 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 a Confidentiality Agreement 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, Proposals and other evaluation materials, each member of the Evaluation Team and Technical Advisor 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 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, Proposals, work papers, and evaluation materials 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 evaluation team meetings. Any information discussed during Evaluation Team meetings shall be kept confidential.

A Civil Rights representative may be invited to the Distribution Meeting. A Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) representative may be invited to the Distribution Meeting if the project has been identified as a Federal Oversight project. The PM-APD has the discretion to invite these individuals or others to the Distribution Meeting as needed.

An ASD representative will attend the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting. A Civil Rights representative may be invited to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting. A Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) may 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 Guidelines Certification

Prior to the initiation of any evaluation procedures, all Evaluation Team Members will sign the form found at Appendix A, certifying they have read these Design-Build Evaluation Guidelines, comprehend these procedures, and agree to abide by these procedures.

4.0 Evaluation Procedures

The Evaluation Team will evaluate all responsive SOQs and Proposals using the guidance found in this section.

4.1 Clarifications

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 prior to evaluating any SOQs or Proposals. The PM-APD shall provide additional guidance, and may share any resulting clarifications with the entire Evaluation Team.

4.2 Initial Responsiveness Review

Upon receipt of SOQs or Proposals, the PM-APD will arrange for initial responsiveness checks to ensure the SOQ or Proposal is complete in accordance with the submittal requirements identified on the applicable checklists. This will include verifying compliance with applicable governmental registrations and licensing requirements as outlined in the solicitation. This review will mainly concern itself with 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 does not preclude any non-responsiveness issues from arising 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.

4.3 Distribution Meeting

The Evaluation Team Members, and PM-APD will attend the Distribution Meeting. The PM-APD has the discretion to invite Technical Advisors and others to the meeting as needed. The PM-APD will begin the Distribution Meeting by verifying there are no potential conflicts of interest between an Offeror's Team and any Evaluation Team Member. Evaluation Team Members will be required to sign and submit the Non-Conflict of Interest Form found at Appendix B certifying they have no conflict of interest in serving on or advising the Evaluation Team.

The PM-APD will then distribute the Evaluation Guidelines and all of the SOQs or Proposals to the Evaluation Team Members.

The PM-APD will provide an overview of the project and provide an overview of these Guidelines, to include, but not be limited to the following:

- Attend all required evaluation meetings.
- Read and review each SOQ or Proposal and record its strengths and weaknesses.
- Individually score 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.
- Under no circumstances shall the Evaluation Team Members discuss their independent initial scoring with anyone until the PM-APD conducts the Scoring/Ranking Meeting for evaluations. Questions related the evaluations shall be directed to PM-APD.
- Keep all documents secure.

4.4 Evaluation

Initially, the Evaluation Team Members will individually evaluate 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 evaluation of any SOQ or Proposal, the Evaluation Team Member shall immediately contact the PM-APD for guidance. The PM-APD shall address any questions or concerns raised by any Evaluation Team Members, and provide guidance as appropriate. The PM-APD may consult with any resources deemed appropriate to address any questions or concerns.

Each Evaluation Team Member will individually complete the evaluation forms in accordance with the Evaluation Guidelines and the guidance provided at the Distribution Meeting. The evaluation forms will be distributed by the PM-APD at the Distribution Meeting. Each Evaluation Team Member will then individually review each SOQ or Proposal and document strengths and weaknesses relative to the evaluation criteria.

4.5 Sequestering Meeting

A Sequestering Meeting may be scheduled, in which case each Evaluation Team Member shall attend. At this meeting, the findings of the Technical Advisors will be presented and discussed related to each SOQ or Proposal. Then the Evaluation Team will begin collectively discussing the strengths and weaknesses of each SOQ or Proposal. Each Evaluation Team member is allowed to edit the strengths and weaknesses on their evaluation forms due to further clarification and understanding of the information provided in the SOQs or Proposals. The Evaluation Team members will not discuss scoring at this meeting.

4.6 Scoring/Ranking Meeting for Evaluations

The PM-APD will facilitate the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting. The meeting will be attended by all Evaluation Team Members, the PM-APD, and the ASD representative. A Civil Rights representative may be invited to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting and a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) representative may attend as well. As with the other meetings, the PM-APD has the discretion to invite others to the meeting as needed.

Prior to the Scoring/Ranking Meeting each Evaluation Team member will individually assign their score for each SOQ or Proposal in accordance with the Rating Descriptors identified in the Solicitation. The Evaluation Team member will bring their completed score sheet to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting. Evaluation Team Members 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 Evaluation Team member will also bring their final completed evaluation forms to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting and this form along with their completed score sheets shall be considered their individual assessment of the SOQ or Proposal.

During the meeting, each Evaluation Team Member will present their individual scores against each evaluation criteria and will provide written comments substantiating each of their scores for each SOQ or Proposal. If there is a significant disparity between or among the individual scores of the Evaluation Team Members, all of the Evaluation Team Members will discuss their findings in greater depth. Any individual Evaluation Team Member may adjust their score(s) to reflect additional consideration of the other Evaluation Team Members findings, the RFQ/RFP, and the SOQs or Proposals submitted for evaluation. If a change is made to a score and/or evaluation form as a result of this discussion, the original will be lined through in ink and the new information entered and initialed in ink. The original score shall remain legible. The Evaluation Team member should provide a brief comment in writing as to why the change was necessary for procurement records.

All of the scoring 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 Assistant Division Administrator of APD for approval.

5.0 Scoring

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

On the evaluation forms, the strengths and weaknesses will be recorded. For any evaluation criterion, an Evaluation Team Member may record a combination of strengths and weaknesses corresponding to different subcomponents of an Offeror's response. The overall distribution of strengths and weaknesses will help each Evaluation Team Member develop a rating for each evaluation criterion. Each Evaluation Team Member will then determine a final 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
CERTIFICATION

DESIGN-BUILD EVALUATION GUIDELINES

TO: Evaluation Team Members

FROM: Jeffrey A. Roby, P.E.
Design-Build Program Manager
Alternative Project Delivery Office

RE: [Insert Project #]

Within two business days of the Distribution Meeting, you are required to signed and return this form to:

VDOT Alternative Project Delivery Office
Attn: [XYZ - Project Manager]
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Should you have any questions regarding this Certification, please contact [Insert PM-APD Name] at [Insert Phone #].

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.

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)

Instructions to Evaluation Team:

All scores are to be written in ink. If changes are made in your score either prior to the Scoring/ Ranking Meeting or during that meeting, these score changes must be made by drawing a line through the incorrect score, writing the correct score and initialing the changes. All changes shall be made in ink.

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:**

Administration Services Division, Central Office

Contract: **[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 a 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 five percent; 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)