



Final Report of Working Team 2A Accomplishments and Outcomes

**Actions and outcomes address the key steps in the
“Consultant Contract Program Collaboration Project-Final Report April 2010”**

Desired Outcome: Improve the Pre-Qualification Program

STRATEGY 2A: Evaluate, simplify, and streamline Pre-Qualification Program work type structure

2A Working Team:

Jim Hall, Chair - ACEC/MN
Susan Rani - ACEC/MN
Tim Chalupnik - ACEC/MN
Nancy Radle - MnDOT

Brad Hamilton, Chair - MnDOT
Jan Heuer - MnDOT
Ron Bisek - MnDOT
Kelly Arneson - MnDOT

| Key Steps and Subsequent Actions/Outcomes |
|--|
| ~Involve the transportation community in the evaluation and change process~ |
| Through the ACEC/MN - MnDOT Collaboration framework, a working team was established that consisted of MnDOT and ACEC/MN members (see above). The transportation community was involved in the evaluation and change process through the following: MnDOT Pre-Qualification Program Work Type Owner interviews; working team member input; ACEC/MN – MnDOT Collaboration Team oversight; ACEC/MN Transportation Committee input; and the data gathered from MnDOT and the consultant community during the Collaboration Project (interviews, surveys and workshop). |
| ~Identify strengths and weaknesses of the current work type structure and best practices of other states~ |
| ~Analyze work type structure~ |
| Strengths and weaknesses of the current work type structure were determined through working team discussions, the Consultant Contract Program Collaboration Project Final Report and interviews with Pre-Qualification Program Work Type Owners. Each Work Type Owner was asked the following questions to help decide what in the work type structures works well and what needs improvements: |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What works? What doesn't? 2. Why are requirements set as they are? 3. Are examples firm focused or individual focused? 4. Can non-MnDOT work examples be provided? Considering that there have been fewer projects in the past few years, should the requirements for the number of projects within a specified time period be reevaluated? 5. If work type has multiple levels, are the levels needed and distinct enough? Can they be consolidated or even eliminated? 6. What suggestions do you have to get more small business consultants involved? 7. What are consultant applicants consistently missing or not understanding? 8. How can we make requirements more clear? |
| After these interviews and data analysis, the team made the following summary determinations: |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work type language needs to be consistent from work type to work type • Some work type example requirements are too restrictive for qualified small businesses and those firms that have not been awarded much work in the recent past |

- Firms should be pre-qualified solely on the merits of the personnel submitted, not on firm's qualifications
- Work examples and qualifying experience should not be from MnDOT or Minnesota examples only
- Work type levels for the majority of work types will remain the same
- Redundant language and requirements need to be addressed in the work type structures
- Formats for submittals should be consistent from all applicants and across work types
- Submittals should be electronic

Best practices of other states were also taken into consideration, as team member Susan Rani researched and compiled information on procurement programs and procedures from 8 different states. After review and analysis of this data, the team determined that a modified version of the Federal Form SF-330 should be used in place of resumes and the current project experience matrix.

~Identify ways of combining and simplifying work types, if possible~

The working team identified one work type (5.6 - Endangered and Threatened Species Surveys) that is underutilized and recommended that it be removed from the Program. The work will be covered with assistance from the DNR or will be sub consulted under other work types on the Program.

Other streamlining efforts include removal of redundant and confusing language in the work types and simplifying the format for submittals. Most work types definitions and submittal requirements will be reduced in size and complexity by up to 50%. The team is also recommending that all submittals be electronic.

The streamlining will bring a greater clarity and consistency from work type to work type. This will result in an ease of submittal production for applicants and timely review by work type selection committees.

~Develop a process to involve more small businesses, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs), and Targeted Group Businesses (TGBs)~

As a result of the Work Type Owner interviews, the working team has removed restrictive language from some work types, including the requirement of MnDOT or Minnesota examples and the requirement of a local office. Some work types also will be increasing the number of years that project examples can go back and will be decreasing the number of required examples. These changes should result in more small business involvement.

MnDOT has notified all known DBEs that MnDOT is willing to come to their business and help them with Pre-Qualification Program applications and guide them through the process. In the last few months there have also been some small under \$5K contracts awarded to DBEs to help them gain experience for the Pre-Qualification Program requirements. In addition to these initiatives, MnDOT Districts are being encouraged and are starting to utilize more DBEs from the Pre-Qualification Program whenever possible.

Also, a group of DBEs and MnDOT staff have been meeting regularly (DBE Roundtable) to discuss how to have more DBEs involved in the Pre-Qualification Program. That group will continue to explore how to increase small business involvement.

~Develop final recommendations and determine approval process~

~Implement Changes~

Final recommendations and implementation:

- The working team developed a new work type definition format and standard submittal format and these were implemented and published on the Consultant Services web site November 2011. The web site is:
www.dot.state.mn.us/consult
- The new format includes a new form, Resume and Relevant Project Experience Form (PQ1) that is based on the SF 330 federal form. The form eliminates the submittal of resumes and takes the place of the project experience matrix. It also allows the work type selection committee to track the work examples submitted for the project utilizing a clarified summary format.
- The revised work type template and new form (PQ1) was vetted through the ACEC/MN – MnDOT Collaboration framework and the work type owners and work type committees.
- All work type submittals and administrative documents under the Program will now be submitted electronically and in a standard format.